

Trial lecture 6th May–collective systems, unions, and broad participation

By Geir Liavåg Strand, IØT, NTNU

Welcome to this lecture on different aspects of the Norwegian work life. My name is Geir Liavåg Strand and I am a researcher at Western Norway Research Institute, and have been a candidate at the NTNU's PhD programme EDWOR II from 2007 to 2010. My goal with this lecture is to compare and contrast the "collective system" among workers with the role of the union in contemporary Norway. In addition I will reflect critically on the argument that broad employee participation is merely a cooptation of employees by management, presenting the case both for and against this position. If you have questions or comments to this lecture, please send me an email. My address is gst@vestforsk.no.

The outline of this lecture is as follows. First, I want to present more details about the subject for this lecture, and how I understand the different parts of it and how I have interpreted the assignment. Secondly, I will present the "collective system" among workers as Lysgaard defined it in 1961, trying to place his work in a historical account: How was the Norwegian work life in the 1950s? Then I'll move to contemporary Norway and present roles of the unions and roles of the "collective system" today comparing and contrasting the two systems taking into account changes that have taken place in Norwegian work life since the 1950s. The last part of the lecture is a discussion of broad employee participation. Is this merely a cooptation of employees by management? Is this manipulation of the employees by management, or does management really wanting employee participation in decision making?

The first part of this lecture is to present what Lysgaard identified as the "collective system" among workers. Lysgaard's book on this collective system, "Arbeiderkollektivet" is written in Norwegian and unfortunately it is not translated to English. The first edition of the book was published in 1961, and is based on Lysgaard's research in a Norwegian industrial company in the 1950s. The Norwegian sociologist Ragnvald Kalleberg at the University of Oslo writes in the preface to the third edition of Lysgaard's book, published in 2001, that it is a masterpiece in Norwegian scientific literature of lasting interest for social scientists. That is probably true, but it is only Scandinavian scientists that are able to read it. As a consequence, most of what is written on Lysgaard's

collective system of workers, are written by Scandinavian scientists. In this lecture I will compare and contrast the “collective system” among workers with the role of the union in contemporary Norway. The collective system as identified by Lysgaard is active at a workplace and plays a role locally. The union plays a role both internationally, nationally, regionally, and at work place. To be able to compare and contrast the collective system with the role of the union, the work place is the main focus for this part of the lecture. The last part of this lecture is on broad employee participation, and includes discussions of this merely is a cooptation of employees by management.

Lysgaard’s identified the collective system among workers based on research in a Norwegian Industrial Company in the 1950s. Norway in the 1950s was characterised by rebuilding after World War II. The Labour Party (Social Democrats) was in Government from 1945 to 1963. According to Wicken (1997), parts of Norway was industrialised the French way with small factories based on handicraft. Other parts of Norway was industrialised the English way with huge factories, often based on available natural resources like waterfalls. In the parts of Norway industrialised according to the English tradition, the typical industrial worker was a white man with little formal education beyond 7 years compulsory school. According to Bjørg Aase Sørensen’s dissertation from 1983, cited from (Sørensen & Grimsmo, 2001), only 4% of the workers were promoted to foremen in the 1950s. So at the work place the workers were a homogeneous group consisting mainly of white men that had little chance of getting a promotion. At times off from work, the workers didn’t talk to management or the engineers in the company. If workers met management, they should be polite, and stand hat in hand (Sørensen & Grimsmo, 2001). According to Sørensen it was dangerous for the workers not to follow these rules. If you were invited to a prominent home your fellow workers would ask you afterwards: “What did they say?”, “What did they want from you?” Further, it was not accepted that workers stood out. At work place the workers should not individually relate to the foremen; you show behave as “one of the crowd” – one of the fellow workers. You should behave collectively. This is how Bjørg Aase Sørensen described the Norwegian work life in the 1950s, and is part of the setting for Lysgaard’s research, and his identification of the collective system among workers.

Lysgaard’s findings are based on his research in a Norwegian Industrial Company in the 1950s. He used mainly qualitative methods. Lysgaard and his fellow researchers took part in the daily work in the company, both at management level and at the shop floor. Based on this research Lysgaard (1961) defined three different systems in the company apart from the “human

system”, the system surrounding the worker. The first system he defined as the technological and administrative system in the company, which is the primary system. Without this system, there will be no organisation, no work and no workers. If this system collapses, the entire company collapses, and the other systems will collapse as well. This technological and administrative system consists of the factory with its machines, the organisational hierarchy, managers, and workers. The managers or leaders in this system is appointed by the board, and have this as a full time occupation. In addition, he defined two secondary systems, the union and the collective system among workers, which both are dependent on the primary system. One of these secondary systems is the union, which is created to organise the employees to achieve common goals by collaborating and negotiating with both management and the board. The union is a formal system with its known members and leaders and has as its mission to protect the workers against management; the primary system. The leaders in this system are elected by the union members, and this is most likely a part-time occupation. This system is part of a larger system of unions at international, national, regional, and local level. Another secondary system is the workers’ collective system (Lysgaard, 1961). This collective tries to solve the subordinates’ dilemma: The need for continuous membership in the technological and administrative system, while also meeting a need to be protected from this system. The workers’ collective system is a barricade, a buffer, against the company (Lysgaard, 1961, p. 209). It is an informal system where the leaders are unknown outside the system. According to Sørensen, the members of the collective system were convinced that the rules at work place were different – one rule for the workers, and another rule for management. Gulowsen (1987) stated that the strength of this collective system among workers depends on the degree of closeness, equality, and a common understanding of “the problem” at work place. With all workers being white men that not expected to be promoted, the collective system could be strong.

The workers’ collective system, as identified by Lysgaard, is an informal system consisting of employees who protect their interests against the employers. The members of the collective system define a “we” – the workers, and “them” – management, engineers and owners. The union legitimises the workers’ collective system by giving it approval and social cogency (Lysgaard, 1961, p. 125). If a worker is promoted to foremen he is immediately expelled from the collective system among workers. As the times goes by, the collective creates norms and rules of how to behave at work place. How much time should a worker spend on different work operations? One example could be a demand that a good employee should not have too close collaboration with management—no closer than necessary. The collective system controls the

interaction between management and employees, and ensures that the gap between management and employees is maintained. Members of the collective ensure that workers don't work too quickly, and that employees don't collaborate too closely with management (Lysgaard, 1961, pp. 219-220). These examples are all from Lysgaard's research, but they are in accordance with other researchers' findings as well. Sørensen points to the fact that a single worker could hide in the collective system. Your membership in the collective was ensured if you followed its rules strictly. But, if you didn't followed the rules you were in rough water. When Heiret (2003b) summarised the characteristics of the Norwegian work life between 1945 and 1977, he states that in the collective system of workers the loyalty to the collective was stronger than the loyalty to management. In the Harwood studies, which were conducted between 1939 and 1945, one of the conclusions was that the more participation by workers in change projects, the better the ability to cope with change and utilise it for productive purposes. Bjørn Gustavsen, in his book "Dialogue and Development" from 1992, presented a Norwegian project from the 1950s where the goal was to replicate the Harwood project (Gustavsen, 1992). According to Gustavsen, in this Norwegian project the relationship between participation and productivity did not emerge. His "explanation was that a set of issues which had to do with such values as solidarity between the workers had interfered in the process. It could be that the workers found a participatively oriented pattern better than the conventional one but they were uncertain about its legitimacy. Was this the right way to change a workplace? What about fellow workers who had not been involved in similar change? Was it right to increase productivity, perhaps beyond the level of other groups? Could one be accused of being a rate buster?" Gustavsen offers the collective system among workers as one of the reasons why the project failed in Norway. I will also mention as a digression, that in the book "Research Enterprise Development" (Levin, 2002) that summarised the Norwegian research programme Enterprise Development 2000, the collective system among workers is claimed to be identified and defined by Emery and Thorsrud (Johnsen & Claussen, 2002, p. 228). Probably a misprint. Then I'll change the attention from the definition of the collective system among workers sixty years ago to contemporary Norway. There have of course been a lot of changes in the society since the 1950s. I'll present some of the changes that influence the workers and the unions.

Gulowsen (1987) states that because of the strong position of the union after the war, many fights are won and what previously was demands by the workers now is workers' rights regulated by the law. Gustavsen (1992) states that the Scandinavian countries are generally thought to be highly organized,

peaceful and collaboratively oriented as working life is concerned. The employees are generally organized and in industry-based, and not craft-based, associations, that the employers are organized in corresponding branch-based organizations and that there exists a network of laws and agreements which deals with most of the issues emerging in working life and ensures peaceful settlements rather than strikes, lockouts, go slow campaigns, and the like. Falkum and Grimsrud (2007) claim that after 100 years of fighting between the employers, the employees, and Government the construction (which is the Norwegian Model and not as such part of this lecture) was in place in the 1980s. Norwegian laws now states that there shall be union representatives at the companies' boards. The Work Environment Act from 1977, among other issues, protects the workers against bad physical and physiological conditions at work place. Many of the demands that the unions had fought over the years were satisfied. Where Norway from 1945 to 1963 had four different majority Governments, all with prime minister from the Labour Party, Norway since 1963 has had 17 different Governments with prime minister from different political parties, since 1971 only two of these have been majority Governments. The proportion of industrial workers has decreased in the Norwegian work force. According to Statistics Norway the number was 160.000 in 1945 and it increased to 390.000 in 1976. In 1993 the number was reduced to 266.000. Today (2008) the number is 290.000. In 1945 approximately 22 % of the Norwegian work force was employed in the industry. According to Statistics Norway the number was reduced to 10% in 2008. 31st December 2008 Norwegian trade unions had 1,621.000 members, including non-employed members (Løken & Stokke, 2009). The trade union density is 52%, a number that has been stable since the 1950s. It is claimed by Colbjørnsen (2003) that people are more individualistic now, and that this leads to workers taking care of their own destiny making the union redundant, but this has not yet shown up in the statistics in Norway. The work force has changed. Now, both men and women are working in industry. In addition a lot of people with another cultural and ethnical belonging than the traditional Norwegian work in industry. According to Sørensen and Grimsmo (2001) 40% of the industrial workers today say they have management tasks as part of their job, compared to the 4% that could expect promotion to foremen in the 1950s. The workers' responsibility over own work has changed. The work force has also more formal education. The industrial workers often have been through vocational training. More and more people pass higher education, and as Fossetøl (2004) writes most of these people have their work outside the universities and the system of higher education. The work force is more educated and takes larger responsibility today than they did before. In addition management are

different. In a scientific book on management in Scandinavia (Schramm-Nielsen, Lawrence, & Sivesund, 2004) from 2004, the authors claim that there is a special management style in Scandinavia. Comparative studies in the Scandinavian countries conclude that the characteristics of this management style are (Schramm-Nielsen, et al., 2004, p. 181):

- A management style characterized by informality, equality and restraint;
- Paralleled by generally flat hierarchies, compressed salary spreads and low fringe benefits;
- A consensual, participative and inclusive approach to decision making and change implementation;
- A reluctance by most managers to articulate their power, an inclination to reasonableness and quiet persuasion rather than to charismatic dominance; and
- A market and/or customer focus tending to promote coordinative mechanisms across hierarchies and between different departments

They further claim that it is difficult to find other countries that replicate this combination of values and practice. But, as Heiret (Heiret, 2003a) concludes, there is a tension in Norway between the national tripartite system of work relations, and the increasing use of international management styles (I will add – often American) that are not grounded in the Scandinavian work relations tradition. But, I'll leave that tension to the last part of today's lecture, and now look more closely at the unions in contemporary Norway.

As mentioned before 52 % of the work force is members of unions. Half of them are members of The Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions (LO). LO has 850.000 members according to their own web site. Internationally, a research project by Huzzard and fellows (Huzzard, Gregory, & Scott, 2004) has researched how unions might shape their own futures by exploring the strategic choices unions could take in different employment relationship. They found out (Huzzard, 2004) that without exception unions are organisations whose basic mission concerns advancing their members' interest. But in addition to this basic mission, the unions also collaborate with the employers, a collaboration that in Norway is advisable and part of the Basic Agreement between the Union and the Employers. This leaves the union in a dilemma between fighting with management, that they do during the wage negotiations once a year, and collaborate with management for instance in enterprise development, a collaboration that lasts all year long, except during the wage negotiations; in the words of Huzzard: a dilemma between boxing or dancing with management. In Norway the dancing part of this relation is part of the

Basic Agreement and this collaboration is institutionalised through the Joint Programme (HF). Further, research from SINTEF in Trondheim (Øyum, et al., 2010) concludes that shop stewards in some companies also play an important role in management of the companies, a role which they named the extended representative co-operation between LO and NHO. This is my own translation of the Norwegian phrase “Det utvidede, representative partssamarbeidet” used in SINTEF’s report. But, as Gulowsen (1987) reminds us of, there are differences between local unions on how close they collaborate with management, some of these differences are caused by geographical conditions, others by differences caused by English or French industrialisation. According to Løseth (2004), Western Norway – the part of Norway I know best, there are no strong tradition of unions playing an extended role beyond the boxing role defined earlier today. Globalisation and reorganising of companies into larger company groups also creates dilemmas for the union. When a local factory in a large group of companies is decided closed or reorganised, unions and managers are sometimes in the same boat fighting against remote owners. Another situation that might occur is that union leaders from one company in a group fight unions in another company of the group protecting own, local interests. Examples of this are described by Falkum and Grimsrud (2007), and covers among others processes at Norsk Hydro Porsgrunn, Norske Skog Follum, and Ulstein Verft. In addition to this fight between unions, Falkum and Grimsrud also point to the fact that there is an all-round pressure on the shop stewards in such processes: should they prioritise to fight for the members that still have a future job at the company, or the ones that are fired in the down-sizing? So, the unions play different roles in contemporary Norway. In some companies the role is that of boxing, in other companies the roles vary between boxing and dancing, the union being an active part in enterprise development and other collaborative activities in the company, and in still other companies the shop stewards change into informal or formal managers. Then, I will leave the union in contemporary Norway looking into the collective system among workers. Does it still exist?

There is little research on the collective system among workers in contemporary Norway, but I have found two studies. Both are from Østfold County where Lysgaard identified the collective system among workers in the 1950s. The first study is made by Inger Lise B. Hansen, a master student at Østfold University College, in 2006. The study, (Hansen, 2007), was published in 2007 with the title “The collective system among workers – 50 years later?” She writes in the preface that the study is inspired by Professor Tor Claussen at Østfold University College, that probably also was her advisor. The project was planned as a replication and follow-up of Lysgaard’s findings: The study was

performed in the same factory as Lysgaard researched. The questionnaires were mostly the same that Lysgaard used, but some small changes had to be done. The study was agreed upon by the union and management at the factory. The factory had 735 employees in 1954 when Lysgaard's study was performed, in contrast to 335 employees in 2006 when Hansen performed her study. The study started out as planned, but during the study the owners decided to fire 110 employees. This influenced her study, and probably also some of her findings. Then to the result of her study: She noticed early that the workers and the other employees at the factory had different tables at the canteen. She asked the workers if this was a conscious choice, and they answered that this is the way it always have been, and that they didn't want to talk to the others. This is in line with Lysgaard's findings. She further asked what happened when people got promoted and she got the answer that: "He (the production manager) was one of us before, but not anymore. He is a great guy, but is now part of the management, and as a consequence he isn't one of us anymore. He can take part in some of our social activities, but we don't talk to him about the same matters that we talk to our fellow workers." Further she states that when the production manager "left the collective system" he changed his working clothes and stopped talking to his previous colleagues outside job. She summarises her study pointing to the fact that she found a collective system among the workers in 2006 as Lysgaard found in 1954. She concludes that this phenomenon, the collective system among workers, is a lasting and valid phenomenon in today's working life and she expresses a surprise that there have been little research on this phenomenon since Lysgaard. Hansen started in April 2011 a PhD study of the collective system among workers in contemporary Norway following up the findings from her master's thesis. Another student project was performed in 2009 by Jan Wilhelm Bugge Amundsen, a master student at the Norwegian University for Life Sciences at Ås. His report (Amundsen, 2009) has the English title "Worker-Collective – Towards an Idealsituation for the Technical/Economical System. A Question of Differences." He reflects on Hansen's findings and her conclusion that the collective system among workers is a lasting and valid phenomenon. He points to the fact that the factory that Hansen researched was in a very special situation with change of ownership and firing of many workers. He claims that this situation possible increased the strength of the collective system, and that this fact influenced Hansen's finding in a way that her findings don't represents the general picture. (I'll leave out a discussion of generalisation based on qualitative data from a single-case study). His ambition was to perform a study without these biases (Amundsen, 2009, p. 23). His conclusion is that, yes there is a collective system among workers in the

factory, but this collective seems weak in contrast to Hansen's findings of a strong collective system among workers. He further states that the system of roles in the collective is vague, especially among younger workers. The older workers know these roles and try to influence the younger workers in situations of special importance or where they are threatened. He further claims that one reason for this could be the change in organisations, with more responsibility given each worker from the technical/economical system. The younger workers agree to take this extended responsibility without problematise management's values, while the older workers discuss this within the collective system and respond collectively in difficult situations. A consequence, according to Amundsen, is that management in this way get what they want: a direct link to each worker without that troublesome collective system in-between. The technical/economic system wins "the battle". As these two studies got different results, there probably should be started a larger research project on these matters in the future and I'm looking forward to the results from Hansen's PhD study.

This was a short presentation of the collective system among workers as identified by Lysgaard and his researchers in the 1950s. I have tried to place his study in Norway in the 1950s by picking some characteristics of that time. Further I have tried to present some of the changes that have taken place in Norway the last 50 years, and presented characteristics of the unions in contemporary Norway. Finally, I have talked about the collective system among workers in contemporary Norway, by presenting two studies that investigate this issue. These two last studies both conclude that there is a phenomenon they identify as the collective system among workers, but the strength and importance of this collective are seen different in the two studies. All these elements are presented in order to be able to compare and contrast the "collective system" among workers with the role of the union in contemporary Norway. Implicit, I have made this comparison already, but this is a table summarising what I regard as the important elements. The union is a formal system with known elected leaders. Unions protect their members' interest against the technical/economical system (or management) like the collective system among workers does. In addition, the unions are also partners with management in many matters. One of these matters is enterprise development. More about the possible challenges this partnership has for the union in the last part of this lecture. In addition, the shop stewards are part of a larger system of unions at local, region, national, and international level. The strength of the local union varies. In contrast, the collective system among workers is an informal system with no known leaders. This collective system is also made to protect its members from the technological/economical system

(management), but it is only the “workers at the bottom” which are members. Membership is withdrawn if you accept promotion of any kind. This informal system is limited to a factory, or even departments within a factory. The strength of the collective system among workers vary, and are possible situational. This concludes the first part of the lecture and I will now turn to the last part. The subject for this part is the question if broad employee participation merely is cooptation of employees by management.

How to define broad participation? Pateman (1970) states that participation is not just one of many ways to persuade employees to accept decisions that have already been taken by management, participation in industry means employees being part of decisions. She defines three different types of participation in industry pseudo participation, partial participation, and full participation. The degree of participation is “measured” by how much employees take part in the development processes and decision-making in companies. Using Olav Eikeland’s definition, “Broad participation” means that the employees to a high degree participate (Eikeland & Berg, 1997, p. 21). What does the word cooptation means? The thesaurus says that the word “co-opt” means: “appoint to membership of a committee or other body by invitation of the existing members”, and the explanation offered “divert to or use in a role different from the usual or original one”. Kotter and Schlesinger wrote an article “Choosing Strategies for Change” in Harvard Business Review in 1979 (Kotter & Schlesinger, 1979) as mentioned before. In this article they defined cooptation as one common form of manipulation. “Co-opting an individual usually involves giving him or her a desirable role in the design or implementation of the change. Co-opting a group involves giving one of its leaders, or someone it respects, a key role in the design or implementation of change. This is not a form of participation, however, because the initiators do not want the advice of the co-opted, merely his or her endorsement” (Kotter & Schlesinger, 1979, p. 455). So, is broad employee participation merely a method management uses to damage the unions? Even though I used an American example of the use of cooptation, I’ll continue by presenting Norwegian examples. First, a case that tells a story about broad employee participation as cooptation of employees by management. Professor Heiret (2003b, p. 152) refers a case (Sørli, 1977) from Bergens Mekaniske Verksted (BMV) where management consciously used the close relations between employees and management to prevent resistance by the workers on management initiated change processes. By giving the workers a feeling that they participated, changes should be carried out WITHOUT real participation. According to Sørli, management at BMV got the idea of how to crash the employees’ resistance by reading Lysgaard and his writings on the collective

system among workers. This is of course a concrete example that broad employee participation merely is cooptation of employees by management. Rolf Utgård, a profiled Norwegian union leader, discusses in a report called "Union's front soldiers, or management's errand boys" (Utgård, 2004) the duality of both being a union leader based on the union's ideal, and at the same time being member of the board of one of the largest Norwegian industrial groups (as representative for the employees). The report is partly based on his own career as union leader for 25 years, the last 15 years as union leader at group level (Konserntillitsvalgt) and member of the group board in the Kværner Group, at that time one of the leading industrial groups in Norway. These dual roles give the union, and the union leader, a dilemma that is not easily solved. Brøgger (2007) states that the tradition of broad participation between unions and employers in Norway is old, and that if LO and NHO still is able to respect each other's roles and responsibility, this tradition could continue also in the future. But, this is not a balanced collaboration in that management is hired by the owners (in principle at least), while the union leaders are elected among the union members. The union's main idea is to protect their members against management. If the collaboration between management and the shop stewards is too close, the union members can react by not re-electing her. Based on this fact it is difficult to imagine that management could co-opt the union by too close participation. Many of the Norwegian companies that utilise broad participation are characterised by a long-lasting collaboration between management and union, in addition to strong unions at company level (Gustavsen, Qvale, Sørensen, Midtbø, & Engelstad, 2010; Øyum, et al., 2010). In a way broad participation requires strong unions that prevent employee cooptation by management. As mentioned before, the collaboration between unions and management are rooted in the Norwegian work life and is thereby part of Norwegian management traditions. As long as Norwegian managers are loyal to the Norwegian management tradition there is, as I see it, small changes that broad employee participation merely is cooptation of employees by management. New Norwegian managers are learning international management methods. Using these methods, whatever the current "hot" management style is called, is using methods usually adopted from the US, which is not rooted in Norwegian management traditions with its accepted collaboration scheme between managers and unions. Employee cooptation by management is part of the recipe in some of these American management methods. Kotter and Schlesinger (1979) as I cited earlier when explaining the word cooptation, prescribe six methods dealing with resistance to change in an organisation. Six

methods that management can choose from in change processes in companies. These are:

1. Education and communication is commonly used in situations where there is a lack of information or inaccurate information and analysis. The advantage of this method is that once persuaded, people will often help with the implementation of the change. Drawbacks is that this method can be very time-consuming if lots of people are involved
2. Participation and involvement is commonly used where the initiators do not have all the information they need to design the change, and where others have considerable power to resist. The advantage of this method is that people who participated will be committed to implement change, and any relevant information they have will be integrated into the change plan. The drawback is that this method can be very time-consuming if participants design an inappropriate change
3. Facilitation and support is commonly used where people are resisting because of adjustment problems. The advantage of this method is that no other approach works as well with adjustments problems. The drawback is that this method can be time-consuming, and still fail
4. Negotiation and agreement is commonly used where someone or some group will clearly lose out in a change, and where that group has considerable power to resist. The advantage of this method is that this sometimes is a relatively easy way to avoid major resistance. The drawback is that this method is that it can be too expensive in many cases if it alerts others to negotiate for compliance
5. Manipulation and co-optation is commonly used where other tactics will not work, or are too expensive. The advantage of this method is that it can be a relatively quick and inexpensive solution to resistance problems. The drawback is that it can lead to future problems if people feel manipulated
6. Explicit or implicit coercion is commonly used where speed is essential, and the change initiators possess considerable power. The advantage of this method is that it is speedy, and can overcome any kind of resistance. The drawback is that it can be risky if it leaves people mad at the initiators

To be fair, I don't think this is common used methods, even in the US, but it is plain speaking! If Norwegian managers in the future use these, or similar methods, instead of methods rooted in Norwegian management tradition, then employee cooptation by management is to be feared in the future.

To summarise: Is broad employee participation merely a cooptation of employees by management? The answer is yes, under some conditions it might be – and no, this is absolutely not the case. It could be both, and it is up to the partners in Norwegian work life which of these outcomes that actually occurs. The original purpose with labour unions was to protect the employees against management. For many local unions this is still the main purpose. In such companies it is difficult to implement broad participation and if that is tried as a method, the union members have strong mechanisms to prevent too close collaboration: Fire the shop steward! This is an argument against broad participation as employee cooptation. The election of shop stewards prevents this happening. Another argument against is that in Norwegian work life traditions, there is a strong history of broad collaboration between employers and unions. This collaboration is part of the Basic Agreement between LO and NHO, and is based on the promise that employees and employers respect each other's different roles as worked out during the last 100 years. Cooptation of employees by management is not part of this tradition, but it is demanding for the unions both boxing and dancing with management. An argument for cooptation is individualism; a work force that are not members of the union. This could lead to cooptation, as one of the results of Amundsen's master theses shows: The younger workers agree to take an extended responsibility without problematise management's values, while the older workers discuss this within the collective system and respond collectively in difficult situations. This individual response eases management's possibility to co-opt the employees. Further, as showed by Utgård's writings, the unions are aware of the cooptation dilemma and works on it. But, as Norwegian managers get their education from abroad and are inspired by foreign (American) management traditions, there is a fear that this traditional view of union collaboration might change. I have presented one American management method that has employee cooptation by management, manipulation, as one of its "legal" elements. Even though many of these American management methods are "translated" to Norwegian, the mindset in these methods are different from the Norwegian mindset, and that might lead to cooptation as a legal method also here in Norway. Future will tell.

This presentation and its manuscript will be made available at Western Norway Research Institute's web pages, www.vestforsk.no, and four pages of

references now follow. I will not walk through these references now; they are just for the records.

If you have any comments or questions, feel free to send me an electronic mail. My address is gst@vestforsk.no. I'll try to answer your mail, but not this week. Thank you for your attention. Bye!

References

- Amundsen, J. W. B. (2009). *Arbeiderkollektivet - Mot en teknisk/økonomisk idealtilstand? Et spørsmål om forskjeller*. Universitetet for Miljø og Biovitenskap (Norwegian University of Life Sciences), Ås.
- Brøgger, B. (2007). Samarbeid som produksjonsfaktor - en introduksjon. In B. Brøgger (Ed.), *Å tjene på samarbeid. Medvirkning - Partssamarbeid - Bedriftsutvikling* (pp. 11-30). Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- Colbjørnsen, T. (2003). *Fleksibilitet og forutsigbarhet. Arbeid og organisasjoner i endring*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Eikeland, O., & Berg, A. M. (1997). *Medvirkningsbasert organisasjonslæring og utviklingsarbeid i kommunene*. Oslo: Kommuneforlaget.
- Falkum, E., & Grimsrud, B. (2007). Mellom institusjon og praksis. In J. E. Dølvik, T. Fløtten, G. Hernes & J. M. Hippe (Eds.), *Hamskifte. Den norske modellen i endring* (pp. 99-122). Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- Fossestøl, K. (2004). Innledning. In K. m. f. Fossestøl (Ed.), *Relasjonsmestere. Om kunnskapsarbeid i det nye arbeidslivet* (pp. 11-26). Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- Gulowsen, J. (1987). *Kvalifikasjoner og arbeidermakt. Samlet og sterk eller splittet og svak?* Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Gustavsen, B. (1992). *Dialogue and development. Theory of communication, action research and the restructuring of working life*. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Gustavsen, B., Qvale, T. U., Sørensen, B. A., Midtbø, M., & Engelstad, P. H. (2010). *Innovasjonssamarbeid mellom bedrifter og forskning - den norske modellen*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- Hansen, I. L. B. (2007). *Arbeiderkollektivet - 50 år etter?*, Høgskolen i Østfold (Østfold University College), Halden.
- Heiret, J. (2003a). Et nasjonalt system i en internasjonal verden 1978-2003. In J. Heiret, O. Korsnes, K. Venneslan & Ø. Bjørnson (Eds.), *Arbeidsliv, historie, samfunn. Norske arbeidslivsrelasjoner i historisk, sosiologisk og arbeidsrettslig perspektiv* (pp. 177-246). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Heiret, J. (2003b). Samarbeid og statlig styring 1945-1977. In J. Heiret, O. Korsnes, K. Venneslan & Ø. Bjørnson (Eds.), *Arbeidsliv, historie, samfunn. Norske arbeidslivsrelasjoner i historisk, sosiologisk og arbeidsrettslig perspektiv* (pp. 109-176). Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Huzzard, T. (2004). Boxing and Dancing - Trade Union Strategic Choices. In T. Huzzard, D. Gregory & R. Scott (Eds.), *Strategic Unionism and Partnership. Boxing or Dancing?* (pp. 20-44). Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Huzzard, T., Gregory, D., & Scott, R. (Eds.). (2004). *Strategic Unionism and Partnership: Boxing or Dancing?* Chippenham & Eastbourne, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Johnsen, H. C. G., & Claussen, T. (2002). Democracy, participation and communicative change. When democracy becomes a means and not an end. In M. Levin (Ed.), *Researching Enterprise Development. Action Research on the cooperation between management and labour in Norway* (pp. 223-238). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kotter, J. P., & Schlesinger, L. A. (1979). Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard Business Review*, 57, 106-114.
- Levin, M. (Ed.). (2002). *Researching Enterprise Development. Action Research on the cooperation between management and labour in Norway*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lysgaard, S. (1961). *Arbeiderkollektivet* (3 - 2001 ed.). Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Løken, E., & Stokke, T. A. (2009). *Labour relations in Norway*. Oslo: Fafo-report 2009:33, Fafo.

- Løseth, A. (2004). Region, kultur og økonomi - Nord-Vestlandet 1850-1975. In H. Gammelsæter, O. Bukve & A. Løseth (Eds.), *Nord-Vestlandet - liv laga?* (pp. 22-51). Ålesund: Sunnmørsposten Forlag.
- Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schramm-Nielsen, J., Lawrence, P., & Sivesund, K. H. (2004). *Management in Scandinavia. Culture, Context and Change*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Sørensen, B. A., & Grimsmo, A. (2001). *Varme og kalde konflikter i det nye arbeidslivet*. Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag.
- Sørli, E. (1977). Bedriftsdemokratiet som tiltak mot arbeiderkollektivet. *Tidsskrift for arbeiderbevegelsens historie*(2/1977).
- Utgård, R. (2004). *Fagbevegelsens frontsoldater eller ledelsens løpegutter. Om konserntillitsvalgtes bidrag i omstillinger i internasjonale konserv*. Oslo: Rapport 454, Fafo.
- Wicken, O. (1997). Regionenes industrialisering - et historisk perspektiv. In A. Isaksen (Ed.), *Innovasjoner, næringsutvikling og regionalpolitikk* (pp. 80-111). Kristiansand: HøyskoleForlaget.
- Øyum, L., Finnstrand, H. G. O., Johnsen, E., Lund, R., Nilssen, T., & Ravn, J. E. (2010). *PALU - Utvikling og praktisering av den norske samarbeidsmodellen*. Trondheim, Oslo: SINTEF, NHO, LO, Hovedorganisasjonenes Fellestiltak.