THE PALGRAVE HANDBOOK OF THE SOCIOLOGY OF WORK IN EUROPE

Edited by
Paul Stewart, Jean-Pierre Durand and
Maria-Magdalena Richea

The Palgrave Handbook of the Sociology of Work in Europe

Paul Stewart · Jean-Pierre Durand
Maria-Magdalena Richea
Editors

The Palgrave Handbook of the Sociology of Work in Europe

palgrave
macmillan

Editors
Paul Stewart
Sociology of Work and Employment,
    Département Homme Organisation et
    Société (DFR HOS), Grenoble Ecole de
    Management
ComUE Universite de Rhone-Alps
Grenoble, France

Jean-Pierre Durand
University d'Évry Paris-Saclay
Évry, France

Maria-Magdalena Richea
University of Strathclyde
Glasgow, UK

Preface

The initial impetus for this project began in 2006 with a comparative study by Jean-Pierre Durand and Paul Stewart of the changing character of labour sociology and the sociology of work in France and the UK respectively. Several aspects of their initial findings were published in the journal of the British Sociological Association, *Work, Employment and Society*.[1] Then in 2012, when the European Union provided funding under the auspices of the EU-FP7 Marie Curie Initial Training Network (ITN) for the graduate and post Doc research programme, *Changing Employment: The changing nature of employment in Europe in the context of challenges, threats and opportunities for employees and employers* we explored the possibility of extending the comparative study of the sub-discipline to a number of other European countries. This was an exciting endeavour and while it proved more difficult than we initially anticipated, not least due to the significant variation in reaching a common understanding of the object of study of the sub-discipline across a range of countries, the outcome of debates within the team proved compelling. We included both experienced and new researchers as well as colleagues from outside our Marie Curie supervisory network.

However, we still required time and more substantial organisational support and this came with the award of a Jean d'Alembert Chaire at Paris Saclay to Professor Paul Stewart during 2016. Moving beyond a good idea we now had the time and resources to organise seminars and travel in a more

integrated and focussed manner. In our discussions it became apparent that there were common features to the way in which the sub-discipline had been evolving across countries with quite different intellectual formations. While these could be linked to the usual borrowings and appropriations we associate with intellectual developments more widely others seemed to be associated also with the changing nature of capitalism or, in case of Eastern European countries, post capitalism. The possibility of exploring what seems to have been a relatively under-examined link in the literature of the sociology of the sociology of work between societal form and the nature of the sociology of work (SoW) across a range of countries formed the leitmotif of our book. We decided to consider the evolution of the sub-discipline since the Second World War linking developments in each country to changes in social structure both at a national level but also in relation to the wider political economy. Thus, in Western Europe we considered the ways in which it evolved in relation to the welfare state and its crisis in the early 1970s, the rise of neo-liberalism, and then in the current period, the impact of financialised capitalism. In Eastern Europe we used the same approach to assess the ways in which post capitalist societies after 1945, and then since the late 1980s and 1990, neo-liberal capitalism, have impacted patterns in the development of the SoW. In subsequent editions we aim to include more European countries but also those in other continents.

We hope that the present Handbook project will provide a teaching resource for students and others working in the area of the Sociology of Work assisting them in their own investigative paths within the sub-discipline. An additional feature in this respect is that we have prepared the conclusion as a series of easily accessible summaries of the main features of the arguments contained in each chapter.

Grenoble, France	Paul Stewart
Évry, France	Jean-Pierre Durand
Glasgow, UK	Maria-Magdalena Richea

Contents

Contributors

Tuomo Alasoini Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Helsinki, Finland

Jean-Pierre Durand University d'Évry Paris-Saclay, Évry, France

Florin Faje Department of Sociology, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Carlos J. Fernández Rodríguez Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

Bengt Furåker Department of Sociology and Work Science, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

Vassil Kirov Institute for the Study of Societies and Knowledge, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria

Holm-Detlev Köhler Department of Sociology, University of Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain

Miguel Martínez Lucio University of Manchester, Manchester, UK

Adam Mrozowicki Institute of Sociology, University of Wrocław, Wrocław, Poland

Norbert Petrovici Department of Sociology, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Valeria Pulignano Centre for Sociological Research (CESO), KU Leuven, Louvain, Belgium

Markku Sippola Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Tampere, Tampere, Finland

Carol Stephenson University of Northumbria, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

Paul Stewart Sociology of Work and Employment, Département Homme Organisation et Société (DFR HOS), Grenoble Ecole de Management, ComUE Universite de Rhone-Alps, Grenoble, France

Guillaume Tiffon Université of Evry Paris-Saclay, Paris, France

David Wray University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, UK

Violetta Zentai Center for Policy Studies, Central European University, Budapest, Hungary

Introduction

The Palgrave Handbook of the Sociology of Work in Europe Since World War Two

Paul Stewart, Jean-Pierre Durand and Maria-Magdalena Richea

We are living in turbulent times. Emergent patterns of migration, scarce resources, climatic change, poverty, febrile international relations, are sustained by deepening patterns of inequality. In this context, job creation and job improvement, job degradation, represent demanding concepts attached to policies and politics that constantly need to adapt, in order to be more encompassing, more cohesive, more inclusive, more humane, but most importantly, to seek concrete problem-solving solutions for workers in the workplace and beyond. With respect to our discipline, which for us is best when it seeks to make sense of these issues in a radical, progressive way, it is axiomatic that sociologists working in the field of the sociology of work have always had to evolve in order that they can meet the challenge of changing work place dynamics. This may not even require pause for thought since it is pretty obviously a feature of a sub-discipline premised on the study of work in capitalism that as work changes so too must critical features of the study of work itself. Thus, the sub-discipline has been defined by variant patterns of conceptual evolution and institutional reframing.

Accordingly, against a background of socio-political turbulence, the changing nature of work and employment requires research focusing (a), on the changing paradigms of work and labour processes, production organisation and employment relations, including the policies of labour

market inclusion, but also (b), an analysis of the organizational cum socio-environmental patterns that lead to workplace exclusion, unemployment and rising inequalities in terms of gender and ethnicity. An interesting question for us is how the sociology of work has changed over time and especially since the end of the Second World War.

In searching for an analytical scheme for sociologists and other social scientists that will allow us to attempt to make sense of work environments, we need to consider the extent of national path dependence. Thus, while the sociology of work assumes universalistic (i.e. non ethnocentric) claims, how far is it possible to accept the claims to universalism? This is not simply a matter of arguing that analyses of work place change in say Germany or Spain in the post-war period are explicable by accounting for variant patterns of fordism in assembly-line work. The development of fordist work processes in different countries can be ascertained easily enough. However, whether it is possible to develop an explanatory framework that ties the *social form* of post-war German, or French capitalism say, to variant, national path-dependent *forms* of sociological analysis, that is, the character, the doxa, not just the agenda (is it Taylorism/what kind of Taylorism?) is more ambitious, to the extent that it is possible at all. While in other respects our aim may appear no less ambitious, nevertheless, the Handbook will attempt to examine the extent to which it is possible to interpret national variations in the sociology of work in relation to the changing nature of capitalism in specific national contexts in relation to certain questions. This is premised upon the argument, which we make at intervals in various chapters, that since sociology does not stand outside society, whatever the occasional professional conceits to the contrary, its theoretical and empirical agendas and methodologies will bear the hallmark of the interests of various and competing hegemonic (and occasionally counter hegemonic) classes and status groups. This is consistent with our view of sociology, following Therborn, as being "historically formed" (Therborn 1976, p. 37) and therefore necessarily tied to the spirit of the age (Therborn 1976, p. 37), and moreover can be interpreted as an important feature of an "ideological community" (Therborn 1976, p. 222). That is to say, the ways in which variant national sociologies of work frame questions, together with their methodological preferences, depend upon what is happening to the capitalist society, or actually existing socialism (until 1989), within which the sub-discipline is located. The concerns of hegemonic and counter hegemonic social forces enable or exclude the importance given to certain features of work and employment which means that the way in which research is conducted, what is thought of as a scientific agenda and perspective, is not

above society, standing outside social conflicts delivering ex-catherdra state-
ments in such a way as to presume social analyses are in some way class,
gender and ethnically neutral. These are matters framed by social interests
articulated by institutional power and various other agencies, as our project
will attempt to demonstrate.

The distinctive advantage of our Handbook is that a comparative project
of this kind has yet to be attempted and certainly not in terms of tracing
the impact of macro socio-economic and political changes on the way in
which the discipline goes about constructing its sense of intellectual prac-
tice. Aside from the excellent *Worlds of Work: Building an International
Sociology of Work* (2002) edited by Cornfield and Hodson, there have
been limited attempts to offer an international comparative analysis of the
sub-discipline beyond comparison of extant social phenomena such as,
work and labour regimes within particular sectors, and other key compara-
tive concerns including, for example, national variations in gender, ethnic-
ity, class and social inequality; comparative migration research; and labour
market studies. Therefore, while comparisons of particular features of social
life across countries abound, comparisons of the theoretical and empirical
agenda, historical trajectories and social character, that's to say, a *sociology
of the sociology of work*, has been insufficiently developed. While a range of
sociologists of work in many countries have addressed conceptual issues
associated with the sub-discipline, it is fair to pay our due to the call by
Juan Jose Castillo (1999) for a *sociology of the sociology of work*. His desire to
explore the importance of the influence of national histories, political influ-
ences, and the changing influence of different national social actors and
their demands is one that we seek to embrace in our project. Also, credit
also must go to the work of Claude Durand (1985) and the Groupe de
Sociologie du Travail in France which some years previously had begun to
question the sociology of work with respect to its reflexive capacity. They
posed the question: what does it mean to imagine self-criticism? Amongst
other themes, they were concerned with what they perceived to be the
problem of 'critical' distancing of the sociology of work from its object
of scrutiny. Their desire was to explore the importance of the influence of
national histories, political influences, and the changing ways in which dif-
ferent national social actors and their demands might be embraced by the
sub-disciplines.

In pursing this prospectus, our study will explore the way in which the
character of the sociology of work has evolved in relation to the changing
nature of post-war Europe. There are, as we noted, many studies of the

changing interests and perspectives within nationally specific sociologies of work but that is not the same as a comparative study, and certainly not equivalent to, the project attempted here which seeks to connect social interest, national research agenda, and social form (viz, capitalism or actually existing socialism). We proceed by weaving the trajectory of the sub-discipline into three historical periods in post-war Europe: (1) 1945–1975 (*The Golden Age or Trente Glorieuses in the West and actually existing socialism in the East*) the rise of a post-war social democratic compromise across Western Europe, or the period we commonly define as actually existing Socialism; (2) 1975–1990s (*The Accumulation crisis and the first solutions to the crisis: automation, the rise of globalization*), the supersession of the post-war social democratic consensus in the West and actually existing socialism in the East, by the variant forms of neo-liberalism in the West and also the East; (3) 1990s–to the present (*Globalisation, neo-liberalism and financialisation*), the rise of new dominant class strategies and patterns of subordination sometimes described as class struggle and, additionally, in the East, system transformation from above, in some countries leading to a debate on the origins and trajectories of a presumed new individualism. Needless to say, these are generalized as opposed to precisely delineated periods of time that might be read off from specific years and within exactly same time span in each country.

Finally, to preempt the inevitable question, "why use the term sociology of work" when there is no such common nomenclature? Our pragmatic answer reflects our shared finding: it highlights a feature of our argument throughout which is that there is in fact no common, or settled, term in the discipline internationally let alone nationally, for the sociological study of the activity of work. For instance, in all our exemplars the nomenclature used to describe the study of work has varied: sometimes "industrial sociology", or "labour sociology", or again, "sociology of organisations"; and most recently, "sociology of work and employment". Moreover, in some countries the study of work has not always been separated from the study of employment relations and, as in the instance of Romania, the sociology of work has never been clearly delineated as sub-discipline in its own right. We agreed in the workshops and other meetings that authors would stick to the nationally preferred term, or terms of reference, but that for the purposes of the common project we were convinced of the utility of the designation, Sociology of Work. What is common in all cases is that the SoW has been characterised not just by moments of fragmentation but that at root, the SoW is inherently fissiparous, that it reproduces by division and subsequent

association. Thus, while there is a lot of SoW it is frequently practiced in other social science departments, from Social Psychology to Economics, History and HRM. Moreover, this can be seen in the extent to which it is 'claimed' intellectually by other social sciences, whether as adjunct to social psychology and HRM or simply as the "study of work which anyone can do". We take this for granted for how could it be otherwise for a sub-discipline so routinely courted by the state and dominant social groups. The latter notwithstanding, whenever possible our chapters seek to highlight the importance of the trajectory of other, counter hegemonic, social agenda in the sub-discipline.

The Handbook will chart the trajectory of the Sociology of Work in 11 European countries: Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Sweden, Finland, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania. After mapping the current state of the theoretical background for the development of the sociology of work in each country, the authors explore the ways in which sociologies of work are socially congruent within the ambit of major socio-economic, historical and determinate political events. By socially congruent we mean that the sociology of work is limited in its study *to* historically specific, extant, social phenomena and that it is limited *by*, inter alia, its social class, ethnic and gendered milieu. And moreover, given what we said previously, one of the things we are particularly interested in deciphering is the degree of separation between cultural specificities and cross-cultural tendencies in each country.

Just as there are common features in Western Europe, so too Central and Eastern Countries (CEE) have distinctive markers and our thesis is that we will be able to explore, on a country-by-country basis, the dominant relationships between the state, macroeconomic trajectories and variant sociologies of work.

By focusing on the relationship between broad social changes and the trajectory of the sociology of work in each country we can connect the rise, for instance, of social-democratic and communist (or "actually existing socialist") regimes, or today, neo-liberal regimes, the more common trajectory of contemporary capitalism, to the fate of work in its articulation with notions of the "worker" and his/her concerns. Or, perhaps the concerns were not with the fate of the "worker", but rather the fate of the "worker" only in so far as the activity of the worker impacted upon national reconstruction (Britain and France, notably). Much more on this below!

Now to our studies of the development of the sociology of work in 11 European country cases.

Case 1

The Sociology of Work in Britain

Carol Stephenson, Paul Stewart and David Wray

The first chapter explores the period from 1945 to the early 1970s, takes us through to the era that witnesses the decline of the post-war social democratic consensus starting in the mid-1970s, and the rise and consolidation of neo-liberalism, beginning in the late 1980s to the current period characterized, by amongst other developments, a critical sociology of neo-liberalism from below. Stephenson, Stewart and Wray emphasize the importance of locating the character and form of the sub-discipline of the Sociology of Work (SoW) in early post-war institutional and disciplinary consolidation especially within universities. They argue that to understand the trajectory of the sub-discipline it is necessary to see that the SoW does not stand outside social influences, and moreover, that particular concerns shape and push (and pull!) the SoW according to the social interests of the class and social groups that dominate in particular historical moments.

For example, the term, sociology of work, has been historically contested and in the early post war period much work that we now consider the SoW was carried out under the auspices of "industrial sociology". More than a matter of fashion this reflected an overriding concern for the social relations of, principally, male blue collar factory workers. As blue collar industrial work became more febrile and then declined, beginning in the late 1970s early 1980s, a concern with the wider political economy began to impact on the kinds of phenomena that SoW specialists researched.

This was not because work beyond the factory gate had never existed prior to the decline of the post-war social settlement. On the contrary, unregulated, part time and temporary work had always been there but in the post-war years sociologists, concerned with national productivity and the interests of dominant social groups, remained largely unconcerned with a broad range of exclusions within and beyond what was seen as the archetypal job occupied by white, male indigenous workers.

Thus, in this regard, they follow Therborn's concern to locate sociology as a "historically formed" (Therborn 1976, p. 37) discipline that reflects the determinate, typically dominant, social class interests of a particular era. The concern with the fate of work, and workers, takes a number of forms which depend upon the way in which capitalism in Britain was reshaped by

the three key moments of social democracy-reconstruction (1945–1970s), decline (1970–1980s) and neo-liberal-reconstruction, crisis (1990–2000s).

The authors make two critical points about the SoW. The first is that a relatively recent concern with the soi-disant Golden Age and the worry about fragmentation, and perceived decline, overplays historical cohesion both institutionally (within sociology departments) and intellectually (SoW as the preserve of sociologists). They describe this as *institutional and disciplinary spread.* On the contrary, the SoW of work has never been carried out only within the university and moreover it has never been, and this is as true today, if not more so, the preserve of sociologists.

Moreover, to the extent that one might perceive what the authors describe as institutional fragmentation, far from being a weakness, this is in fact a strength. This is matched by the proliferation of sociologies of work by others untrained in sociology departments. While the latter form of fragmentation (intellectual diversity) can be problematical for sociology, this is not the concern addressed by Stephenson et al. Rather, they argue that the pattern of work and activity within what we understand as the SoW over the decades since 1945, can also be defined not just by whether it is carried out in sociology departments, or business schools, but by two quite different questions. Why, today, are there now other practitioners engaged in research from beyond the traditional university social milieu and why is it that research and theoretical concerns in the SoW display a synchronicity with the spirit of the age? This leads them to suggest that it is not just that the SoW changes as capitalism changes. In the 1950s, the sub-discipline was obsessed with worker productivity (famously Triste and Bamforth) while in the period since the 1990s a key concern has been the nature of workplace involvement and control and myriad patterns of work and work place exclusion (see the work on the individualism-collectivism debate), and increasingly today issues around migration and work. Why was there so little apparent concern with the fate of migrant workers after the war from the sub-discipline? After all, there was considerable migration, and relatively more so from Ireland and the Caribbean, in the 1940s and 1950s than since the 2000s from the EU yet there is no recorded research in the SoW on the work and labour conditions of immigrant workers during the post war years.

This emphasizes one of their points which is that the concerns of dominant social groups determine what deserves our attention. In the 1950s, working-class subordination was, while not always without concern, seen as having been cushioned by social democratic social and welfare reform, while the increasing breakup of the latter and the impact this had on class solidari-

ties created, supposedly, a working class that displayed various cultures of isolation and anti-collective dissonance. The assumption behind this narrative, derived from the notion of a Golden Age in the discipline that in turn mirrored a Golden Age in society, derived from a view of the post-war period as one of increasing class solidarity and social mobility. As elsewhere, sociologists in Britain, if not quite so directed as in France, were brought aboard the grand train of British post-war consensus for reconstruction. It is hardly surprising therefore that the work and employment concerns of black, Irish and Asian immigrants, amongst others including women working in atrocious conditions, were considered uninteresting, to the extent that they were considered at all.

By the same token, it should come as little surprise that as British capitalism embarked on a period of decline in the 1970s, and later neo-liberal reconstruction, that precisely those impacted by what the authors, borrowing from Ralph Miliband, term class struggle from above, should become increasingly important to the SoW. More than this, since the delicate class discretions of Britain's universities were also becoming subject to the cold winds of neo-liberalism, it was becoming more difficult to practice the SoW as if it were a subject looking in at workers from the high ground of objective academic science practiced in the simple virtues of value neutrality. Good, clear empirical research is essential but it is also now frequently being carried out by those who were, in our first two periods, the object of knowledge: now the peasants are (often) doing it for themselves. Just as institutional and disciplinary fragmentation bring certain difficulties, so does the fact of social location matter. For the authors, while social and spatial attenuation is good it doesn't mean that it is without consequence.

Thus, after focusing on the debate about the SoW and its institutional and disciplinary origins they take the unusual step of eschewing a full spectrum narrative account of the sub-discipline since 1945. Reminding us of a number of exemplary texts in the field, they propose an unashamed selection of what they take to be defining work in the each of the three periods. The work selected is seen as exemplary to the extent that it addresses issues, and challenges in various ways, socio-economic power from the standpoint of those excluded in late capitalist society. The chapter, in other words, argues that practitioners of the SoW today can be radical and committed to change by engaging with those subordinated in and by work while at the same time maintaining good research practice.

Case 2

The Sociology of Work in France

Jean-Pierre Durand and Guillaume Tiffon

This chapter connects France's socio-economic history to specific paradigm shifts characterising the sociology of work after 1945. (It is worth recalling that France was a pioneer in the sub-discipline). During its gestation phase (1945–1975), the sociology of work was nurtured by Georges Friedmann and Pierre Naville, operating in an environment defined by post-war national reconstruction. The French state at the time, influenced by the country's Gaullist and Communist parties, sought to increase the productivity of labour, inspired in part by the notion that work could be scientifically organized. This was an American import that had failed to take root in France before World War II. The newly reborn world of French academia was dominated by the precepts of social Catholicism, the hope being that this might lead to the re-emergence of peaceful professional relationships. It was an era when the sociology of work was asked to analyze the causes of obstacles to increases in worker productivity and was largely influenced by American psychological methods, often based on quantitative and empirical analysis. Notwithstanding the efforts of Pierre Naville, worker movements (and Marxism) had little effect on the discipline's renaissance.

The second phase (1975–1990) coincided with a major crisis of capitalism spelling the end of France's 30 years of post-war growth. For the sociology of work, this made the crisis of so-called 'simple' labour a prime topic for analysis, with focus now shifting to industrial and office worker absenteeism, the proliferation of strikes and quality problems. Even so, the sociological analyses marking this era remained very descriptive, with the French translation of Braverman's seminal text failing in its quest to embed paradigms offering a radical criticism of capitalism. The French Left's electoral success in 1981 did, however, revive the sociology of work by supporting initiatives associated with certain major social transformations occurring in the country's corporate sphere. This led to the emergence of a sociology of companies that tried to make business the key driver for all societal change relating to social development and individual fulfilment. Alongside of this, sociology began to professionalize (business experts, completion of research contracts, etc.), creating an environment in which it became difficult for sociologists criticising work to receive an airing.

The chapter argues a third phase (1990–2015) can be delineated which saw the rise of the lean production model. However, in contrast to research by US and UK academics and trade unionists, in France it took somewhat longer for the world of work (including in universities) to fully grasp the extent of the transformations taking place. According to Durand and Tiffon, this meant that the sociology of work ended up more as helpful companion, than analyst, to changes in capital-labour regimes. It was only after witnessing a wave of suicides, and other signs of distress at work, that sociologists began to develop more analyses, often funded by the health and safety commissions established in the 1980s. Many of these analyses were more concerned with an attempt to observe reality than to remedy the causes of myriad social problems. Sociologists divided between two paradigms: the shift of industrial activities towards service relationships (nurturing a sociology focused on individuals and interactionism), while sociologists linked to the Regulation School favoured more systemic analyses which were sometimes inspired by Marxist discourses. Discussions now were frequently concerned with productive reconfigurations; the erosion of Fordian employment norms and the tertiarisation of activities.

In parallel to these neo-Marxist studies addressing productive reconfigurations, a number of other analyses targeted the new management models. Amongst these studies, the conventionalist approach—which can be understood as an attempt to break free from structuralism (deemed an overly deterministic over-reach)—occupied a key, and even dominant, position within the sociology of work due to its institutional importance.

Faced with this phenomenon, sociologists of work began analyzing the effects of more precarious employment conditions, especially from the 1990s onwards. It may be difficult to determine a clear-cut paradigmatic shift across this corpus but what is evident is the existence of three paradigms that conflict with one another. The first is precarity versus integration, a debate that has been especially widespread since the 1990s, featuring authors such as Robert Castel and Serge Paugam. The second involves uncertainty, perceived as something ambivalent and potentially a source of autonomy and emancipation. This debate would develop in the 2000s based on the work of a range of authors, notable amongst them, Pierre-Michel Menger, whose work led to him being appointed to the Collège de France. Lastly, the 2010s saw debate about non-salaried subordination (and exploitation) of "false independents" ("own contract workers") and "invisible workers", (the hidden economy) mainly based on studies carried out by a new generation of researchers whose position in the overall field would turn out to be less central than the role played by tenants of the other two paradigms.

In sum, from the early 1990s onwards, the sociology of work diversified, fragmented and experienced several paradigmatic shifts. Irrespective of the objects of study, the dominant paradigms (uncertainty, conventionalism or interactionism, for example) would continue to have theoretical and political affinities with liberalism, even if they did not share this view. Developed in opposition to critical sociology—deemed to be overly deterministic, over-arching and politicized—they would be carried forward by socially and institutionally situated sociologists who, behind their expressed desire to renew theoretical frameworks, were working in reality against any movement seeking social transformation, thereby contributing to the maintenance of the existing social order.

Case 3

Sociology of Work in Germany

Holm-Detlev Köhler

The chapter outlines the main developments of industrial sociology as the particularly influential sub-discipline of Sociology in West Germany since the end of World War II, divided in three sub-periods: the Fordist (1949–1975), the transformation (1975–1990), and the globalization (1990–2015) periods, the latter marked by national (re-)unification. Industrial sociology in Germany implies a broader scope than Sociology of Work or Industrial Relations in Latin and Anglophone countries. The main focus is on how industrial work shapes modern industrial men and women and modern industrial society.

The first period (1949–1975) is characterized by the context of the re-foundation of sociology after the liberation of the country from Nazi-dictatorship at the end of World War II. The sociology of work was at the centre in terms of empirical studies on work organization, technological rationalization and workers' consciousness. Köhler argues that there were three key reasons for the priority accorded to industrial sociology in Germany:

1. West Germany experienced an accelerated process of industrialization that set the foundations for the 'economic miracle' of the 1950s and 1960s. Industrial work and organization thus occupied a central position.
2. In the context of political disenchantment and conservative restoration, engagement with the study of industrial workers, their working and living

conditions, class consciousness and interest organizations appeared as a privileged field of work for progressive social scientists.

Certain specific German traditions in social thought and philosophy such as the Historical School (Gustav von Schmoller, Lujo Brentano), a romantic criticism of modern industrialism (Oswald Spengler, Ernst Jünger), together with the subliminal influence of Weber and Marx, motivated an interest in the social consequences of industrial and technological development among German intellectuals.

3. In Germany, industrial sociology was conceived as an approach to understanding the complex interaction of industrial work and societal institutions in modern capitalism. In this view, the firm is perceived as a public affair, a constitutional social community, wherein workers receive their democratic rights and the owner has to fulfil a set of social duties. "One could also say that the US and Britain focused on 'private contracts' whereas Germany focused on a 'social contract' within a firm" (Frege 2008, p. 48).

The recovery of Marxist theory helped to overcome the traditional theoretical deficit of a phenomenological sociology which had developed its main concepts by inductive observation. Important studies on trade unions (Bergmann/Jacobi/Müller-Jentsch 1975) and workers' consciousness (Kern/Schumann 1970) attempted to nurture the thesis of a new militancy against capital with empirical findings. Marx's concept of real subsumption of labour under capital in advanced capitalist production was linked with Max Weber's concept of bureaucratic rationalisation and Joseph Schumpeter's idea of the self-destruction of capitalism through the substitution of entrepreneurs by large industry administrations.

The second period (1975–1990) is characterized by the sudden end of the "dream of everlasting prosperity" (Lutz 1984), the crisis of the Fordist accumulation model and the end of the 'normal' employment relationship. The fragmentation of work and employment is also addressed in industrial Sociology.

Three primary trends may be identified as shaping the sociology of work in Germany in the 1970s and 1980s. First, international and inter-sectoral comparative analyses led to an institutionalist shift focusing on the institutional settings and complementarities in the specific national and sectoral articulations of industrial order. The second trend was more focussed on the organization of firms and production, using concepts such as "new production concepts" or "lean production" in form of a "second industrial divide" (Piore/Sabel 1984). The third trend referred to the retreat of traditional manufacturing replaced by growing service sectors and activities.

The third period (1990–2015) of an accelerated globalization under neoliberal dominance coincided in Germany with the (re-)unification process. Increased international competition, flexibilization and deregulation of financial and labour markets and the TIC revolution (Technologies of Information and Communication) met with the specific German model of organized capitalism, or coordinated market economy.

After many years of diverse empirical research in post-Fordist heterogeneity without clear concepts of society and production models, the worldwide crisis of global capitalism 2008 and its ongoing consequences, provoked a kind of wake-up among German industrial sociologists. "Bringing capitalism back in!" was the programmatic title of a conference organized by several leading industrial research institutes in 2009 (Dörre et al. 2012). The lost connection between workplace analysis and capitalist critique should be recovered in a situation where the contradictions and damages of the global capitalist system again became evident.

Under the label "integrated production systems", the current debate in Germany tries to bundle a wide range of organizational concepts. Heil and Kuhlmann (2013) distinguished four dimensions in the Integrated Production System approach, that sometimes also appears under the labels of "operational", "manufacturing" or "business excellence": If there is a general trend in the huge variety of empirical studies and theoretical efforts to make sense of the current volatility and variety in working life: it is the extended conquest of the whole person for economic value production. The central idea of real subsumption of work under capital (Marx), widely abandoned in the 1980s in German industrial sociology, might be more relevant than ever.

Case 4

Labour Sociology in Italy: Resisting Erosion Through Transformation and Dynamism

Valeria Pulignano

Valeria Pulignano argues that the sociology of work in Italy has, since its foundation, developed an interesting process of internal transformation (the so-called 'open' approach) as a way to respond to the challenges of globalization and change within the context of historical institutional and political constraints. This process consisted of incorporating the micro (workplace), the meso (organization), and the macro (labour market, welfare state, employment, and industrial

relations) (sub) disciplines of work in order to retain the theoretical and empirical nature of studies in the sociology of work. She illustrates this while also charting the foundations and subsequent historical developments of the sociology of work in Italy since its origins in the post-war period. The chapter suggests that this process reflects the specific features of the historical evolution of the sociology of work, which are nationally embedded. She reminds us of Castillo's (1997) argument that the phases, the progress, or even the decline, in the evolution of the sociology of work reflects the influence of national histories, political influences, and the changing sway of different national social actors and demands.

Pulignano argues that methods of enquiry and topic areas covering diverse levels of analysis have contributed significantly to keeping the sociology of work together as a coherent intellectual field in Italy over the years. In so doing, sociology of work in Italy has been able to survive contemporary global challenges. On the one hand, using methodologies which allow for the study of process (e.g. process tracing) approaches helps overcome some of the difficulties associated with cross-sectional investigation. On the other hand, theoretically, the social understanding of work has required the inclusion of social phenomena which are external to immediate work settings. As a result, she argues that internal borderlines have had to be crossed within the sub-discipline.

Thus, the chapter outlines the main socio-political transformations which occurred in Italy from the end of the Second World War and their impact on the sociology of work as part of labour sociology and/or industrial sociology, or more generally, economic sociology. The chapter sheds light on the historical foundations and the evolution of the sociology of work, identifying its main themes and disciplinary specificity while addressing the question of cross-disciplinary fertilization with other disciplines in social sciences and notably with gender studies and labour relations. This has resulted in a sociology of labour which has evolved as dynamic and distinctive in its methods and research agenda. Moreover, this occurred in an historical period in Italy characterized by profound institutional and political changes.

Case 5

The Politics of Sociology and the Challenge of Fragmentation: The Study of Work and Employment in Spain

Miguel Martínez Lucio and Carlos J. Fernández Rodríguez

When dealing with the history of the study of work in any one national context from a broadly sociological and critical perspective Martinez Lucio

and Fernández Rodríguez argue it is important to cast one's analytical net as widely as possible without losing sight of the need to look at underlying currents and dynamics. They argue that the desire to uncover specific characteristics, foci, and trends must be done with an eye to the political and institutional frameworks of any one context. They point out that a critical perspective must be able to look at how ideas and thoughts within the process of academic study are shaped not just by ideational factors but by the way the academy is organisationally framed, the role of other public and private actors such as foundations (as in private and public agencies), and the political position and context of the country in question. The question of power and the question of how the 'problems' and 'dynamics' of work are determined and become terrains of struggle are what constitutes a critical approach. The chapter highlights the importance of looking at the underlying political, institutional, and economic drivers that constitute a tradition of study and analysis.

Spain which has experienced a series of profound political and social changes during, and since, the 1940s. It is a country where the right-wing authoritarian Francoist regime (from the late-thirties to the mid-seventies) framed the nature of formal study in terms of work and employment broadly speaking. The chapter begins by focusing on the way this period framed social enquiries of work and, in addition, limited the sociological approach to work and employment preferring to focus on more legalistic—and constrained—approaches to the subject. The authors consider the ways in which a more independent study of work emerged and how counterpoints within the academy, left networks and overseas universities, contributed materials and approaches. Foreign institutions, such as the ILO were also important in this regard. However, within the regime and amongst its institutional allies, there were curious developments in terms of how certain managerialist and psychological perspectives were developed. Spaces were opened up within various areas of study around so called more "progressive" management theories and in the realm of labour law. In terms of the study of employment however, there remained a weak empirical tradition and an ongoing set of socio-political constraints.

It is only in the late fifties, with the beginning of military and economic cooperation with the USA when the modernization of universities began to take place through collaboration with some US universities. This helped to establish more research-oriented institutions although they remained politically constrained. Functionalism and empirical sociology (with Merton and Lazarsfeld as key references) were to be hegemonic, but with little interest for the world of work and issues of representation. However, some of those

scholars turned their attention to industrial sociology, focusing on debates between scientific management and human relations from a functionalist perspective. A number of researchers engaged with Dahrendorf's and Coser's theories of conflict, researched the role of industrial conflict and the political participation of workers. These researchers represented the first serious effort to study empirically uncomfortable issues for the regime such as strikes and workplace conflict (while remaining to some degree close to functionalism).

There was also a selection of Marxist analyses which were published in Spain by the beginning of the seventies, when Franco's regime faced its last years in a context of growing political unrest and the perspective of a political transition was in sight. Martínez Lucio and Fernández Rodríguez then consider the development of the sociology of work in the post Franco period taking us up to the 1980s with what they see as the "uneven emergence" of a "democratic sociology". The transition to the new democratic system in the 1970s sees various observers emerge and a new generation of labour sociologists. This generation established the agenda of the sociology of work in Spain. It attempted to set the conditions for a new approach that would take into account the new conditions of labour in post-authoritarian Spain as one of the main challenges for a democratic society. The chapter highlights the extent to which, when they began, these sociologists drew their influences mostly from Regulation Theory. Authors such as Aglietta, Boyer, Freyssinet, and particularly Benjamin Coriat had an enormous influence and were invited often to workshops and seminars. A number of British sociologists were also important, particularly in Barcelona-based networks. This sociology of work's emergence had to address the context of de-industrialization and a shift in sociology where the attraction of post-industrial values seemed to imply a weakening of organized labour as the main source of identity for the working class. While in most of the 'Western World' this shift towards post-industrialism was evident in one form or another, in Spain the change was particularly dramatic, with the restructuring and collapse of key parts of industry and an exceptionally high level of unemployment since the beginning of the 1980s. This changed radically both Spanish economy and society, spreading a model of "bad jobs" in the service sector associated with high levels of vulnerability and precariousness, even before the term became academically fashionable. This led to a growing interest in working conditions, fragmenting labour markets and the quality of working life: much supported by a range of European Union funding and support.

This political reality and series of narratives was met with a variety of responses that had a curious set of political agendas. First, the period saw the emergence of studies within a range of private research institutes and

foundations normally funded by financial institutions. This more formal and institutionalised approach—which normally used surveys or expert focus groups and "roundtables"—was concerned with pointing to the contradictory nature of the worker mobilizations and actions of the period, as well as the more instrumental attitudes of workers. Second, German social democratic research centres (the Foundation Friedrich Ebert and others), with their focus on corporatism/social dialogue, opened offices in Madrid to assist the Spanish Socialist Workers Party and the allied General Workers Union (the UGT), and forged a more social dialogue and moderate 'collective bargaining' view of work and its regulation. The authors then focus on the way in which a number of sociologists of work began to focus on labour regulation during the 1980s and 1990s. The chapter then moves on to considering the importance of what Martínez Lucio and Fernández Rodríguez describe as the "Outsiders": gender, youth, and race in the study of work since 2000. They conclude with a consideration of a range of work on new independent networks, forms of representation and new forms of conflict that have been important in highlighting new dynamics and themes in labour relations and the social relations at work. The emergence of *Podemos* in Spain which is linked to a radical and innovative new political generation has also galvanized alternative forms of research. Whilst alternative forms of research have been used in various sociological circles it is rare to see participant observation and more direct forms of researcher involvement in mainstream academic research. Once more it tends to fall on more radical and politically networked researchers to develop these forms of research.

Case 6

Swedish Sociology of Work

Bengt Furåker

Furåker argues that the sociology of work has been a central subfield of Swedish sociology ever since the subject became an independent university discipline almost 70 years ago. It was a time with huge economic growth, peaceful industrial relations and increasing living standards. By international comparison, sociology arrived late, but from the beginning it had a preoccupation with work-related research. Furåker begins with an assessment of what he describes as "The early sociology of work" which stretches from the opening of sociology departments in Sweden in the late 1940s

and early 1950s up to the mid-1960s. Research in this period was, for the most part, concerned with the individual's adjustment to work and a consensus perspective on workplace relations stood out. Theoretical inspiration came above all from American sociology and social psychology, not least the Human Relations perspective. Also, with regard to conducting empirical investigations, models were taken from American studies. Swedish sociology of work was from the beginning very much focused on empirical research, although the number of researchers was limited. Typical topics were: attitudes to work, worker adjustment, job satisfaction, formal and informal work groups, and workplace communication. Furåker makes the point that while there has been much more research conducted by sociologists of work in recent decades, he observes that many of the studies in the early period, mainly dealing with industrial work, received a lot of attention in Sweden.

Furåker draws attention to the fact that interest in sociology accelerated among students as well as more generally in society in the 1960s and early 1970s. With larger numbers of students, the departments also expanded by recruiting more teachers and researchers. "New currents—and reassessments" is the heading he uses to cover the period beginning in the mid-1960s during which time the dominant paradigm of sociology of work began to be questioned. During the most intense phase, everything that could be re-evaluated was re-evaluated. New theoretical perspectives—especially conflict- and power-oriented approaches such as various versions of Marxism—made their way into the field. In the course of questioning and re-evaluation, the discipline itself became more conflict-ridden. Another development was that many sociologists now approached trade unions with the effect of distancing them from employers, to some extent. Sociology became more oriented toward class struggle issues: improving physical working environments, fighting job monotony, increasing employment security, developing codetermination in the workplace, etc. The 1970s was also a time when the labour movement in Sweden carried out several important labour market reforms and made funding available for evaluations and research. It is unclear when the radical wave ebbed but it was no doubt over by the mid or perhaps late 1980s.

For many years, the period of reorientation left its imprint on the sociology of work, but the atmosphere calmed down and things gradually began to change. The period that followed is by far the longest, including most of the research in the current overview. Academic criteria were strengthened. Reaching out to an international audience and readership—through international peer review journals and publishing houses—became imperative. In the mid-1980s neoliberal ideology began to win considerable terrain in Swedish

society. Some sociologists may have become less eager in their ambitions to contribute to improvements in working life than during the foregoing phase, but most of them kept much of their older orientations and attachments. They hardly became neoliberals, although they lived in a neoliberal epoch. It was common to remain within the paradigms one had taken on board during one's academic training. The same can be said for the years after the turn of the millennium. Now there is a more relaxed relationship to Marxism; it merely became one theory among others that could provide inspiration. Still, with the liberalization of society and economy in Sweden sociologists have faced certain new topics concerning, for example, flexibility, temporary work agencies and large inflows of immigrants into the labour market. There has also been a renewed interest in attitudes to work and job satisfaction. That said, the chapter emphasizes that this is by no means a step back to the research in the 1950s, although the similarities are obvious when it comes to the gathering of empirical data. Newer inquiries are usually not based on implicit assumptions about harmonious relations in the workplace but have a more open perspective regarding orientations to work.

A characteristic of the more recent sociology of work is a growing differentiation and specialization. Furåker uses a number of subheadings to grasp this diversity. Areas of work include: (a) Workplace studies; (b) The future of work and commitment to work; (c) Flexibility issues; (d) Gender and ethnicity; (e) Educational levels and demands for skills; (f) Trade unionism. One problem that those interested in work-related issues has been confronted with in recent decades is funding. Financial stringencies notwithstanding, the sociology of work continues to be robust in Sweden as can be seen in the impact it has, and has had, internationally.

Case 7

The Sociology of Work in Finland

Markku Sippola and Tuomo Alasoini

Mainstream sociology in Finland in the decades following the World War II was liberal and consensual in approach and influenced by modern American sociology. Sippola and Alasoini argue that the discipline accepted social change as a historical necessity and tried to describe and explain it. In the 1950s and 1960s, the sociology of work constituted only a small portion of the overall development of sociology in Finland. In the 1970s and 1980s,

an increasing division between positivist, reformist, and critical approaches in the Finnish sociology of work, all affected by maturing Fordist patterns of economic growth and work organization, became more apparent. The 1970s marked a broadening of conceptual and methodological approaches within the Finnish sociology of work. Increased funding resources by the Academy of Finland and different ministries opened improved opportunities for studies that took a critical stance towards existing (capitalist) modes of production, many of which were influenced by Marxist thinking. During the 1980s, the male industrial worker also started to lose his self-evident and prominent position as a target of working-life studies. The chapter highlights the fact that an increasing attention was now paid to emerging problems that were characteristic of jobs in the rising welfare sector and other services, white-collar occupations, and work typically performed by women. This also signified a growing interest in the concept of gender as reflected by the increasing number of studies on gender and work.

The scope of the studies in the sociology of work in Finland further widened in the 1990s and 2000s, as new research areas were taken on-board. The rise of the precarisation/deterioration theme in the Finnish sociology of work can be linked to the current ongoing debate in other Western countries, and in which many Finnish labour intellectuals are also engaged. In this debate, one can clearly perceive a tension between the logics of mainstream sociology tagged to well-established sociological concepts and worldviews, and contemporary analyses on work trends that operate with concepts outside the sub-discipline. Gender analyses of work continued to gain a stronger foothold in the sociology of work. Special streams within gender studies include care-work and research on work-family balance. A long-standing stream in the Finnish sociology of work addresses the consequences of technological and organizational change, flexible forms of labour deployment, and the adoption of post-Fordist forms of work organization. Knowledge work, information society, and innovation are new themes within the Finnish sociology of work that have emerged with the rise of the competition-state discourse since the 1990s.

Sippola and Alasoini emphasize the fact that critical paradigms challenging the social order have never assumed a central role in the Finnish sociology of work; most paradigmatic approaches have been rather consensual by nature. Rather, there appears to be a considerable 'reformist' tendency in the Finnish sociology of work, aiming at producing solutions to societal problems, and in many cases in the form of action-oriented research and developmental projects. This reflects the overall pragmatic nature of Finnish

policy-making and close social distance between the government, labour market organizations and the academia.

An overall development in Finland since the 1990s has been towards both the diversification between 'basic' sociological studies on work and action research type of approaches to work. The action research approaches have drawn upon numerous development projects, often initiated by the government or other public sector organisations, and carried out in cooperation between employers and worker representatives in work organisations. Themes of such development projects have embraced employment issues, IT, training, work organization, work environment, etc. The authors observe that one interesting feature in Finland is the shortage of sociological studies on industrial relations since the 1990s; in recent years, this area has been dominated by contributions from social historians.

Case 8

Sociology of Work in Poland

Adam Mrozowicki

Adam Mrozowicki explores the main phases of the sociology of work development in Poland which can be tentatively divided into three phases: (1) the state socialist phase (1945–1980); (2) the transformation phase (1981–early 2000s); (3) the internationalisation/globalization period (mid 2000s–until now). The main methods which he used to collect the data for the purpose of writing the chapter include an extensive literature review and oral history, narrative interviews carried out by the members of the research team of the Sociology of Work Section of the Polish Sociological Association with 15 doyens of the discipline (in 2014–2017).[2]

---

[2] The chapter is a revised version of articles: Mrozowicki, Adam (2015) "Socjologia pracy—perspektywy odbudowy subdyscypliny", Humanizacja pracy 1(279): 13–2, Mrozowicki, Adam, Stewart, Paul, Zentai, Violetta (2015) "Critical Labour Studies in Hungary, Poland and the UK: Between crisis and revitalisation", Forum Socjologiczne, Special Issue (Number One): Social boundaries and meanings of work in the 21st century capitalism, red. Mrozowicki, Adam, Kolasińska, Elżbieta, Róg-Ilnicka, Joanna, Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, pp. 19–34; Czarzasty, Jan, Mrozowicki, Adam (2017) "Industrial relations in Poland: institutional evolution and research trends", Employee Relations (forthcoming); Giermanowska, Ewa, Kolasińska, Elżbieta, Mrozowicki, Adam, Róg-Ilnicka, Joanna (2017) "Tradition, present and future of the sociology of work in Poland: reflections on the project *Doyens of sociology of work*", Warsaw Forum of Economic Sociology (forthcoming).

Phase I (1945–1980): Sociology in Poland had rather rich traditions before the Second World War and quickly re-emerged after 1945. However, academic sociology was practically eliminated from the Universities by the Stalinist authorities before 1956. The sociology of work was institutionalised in the 1960s and 1970s within the framework of the Sociology of Work Section of the Polish Sociological Association. In the first phase, the dominant approaches included: (1) the creatively adopted and developed systems approaches from the American tradition (managerial strands, human relations); (2) the humanistic school of thought which focused on the study of values and norms at the workplace level. Other important features of the sub-discipline included: (3) a rather limited role for Marxism and labour process analysis in particular as compared to stratification research; (4) the relevance of relationships between academic sociology, industry and the state within the project of "socialist industrialisation" (the teams of J. Szczepański, J. Kulpińska and others); (5) the importance of international contacts both with Moscow-based academia and with the West (in particular, the USA thanks to scholarships); (6) the role of censorship in blocking the publication of critical research; (7) the relatively limited cooperation with (non-autonomous) trade unions despite some emergent research on socialist trade unionism and self-government; (8) the dominance of quantitative approaches (surveys). The special role in the sociology of work in Poland was occupied by approximately 400 plant sociologists employed in the largest socialist enterprises who performed both bureaucratic and expert roles as well as the roles of professionals implementing the humanization of work principles in their workplaces.

Phase II (1981–early 2000s): The second phase is marked by the institutional and academic crisis of the sociology of work which overlapped with the political collapse of the state socialist project, deindustrialization, the emergence of embedded neoliberalism after 1989 and the growing relevance of management studies which took over the field abandoned by sociologists of work. Mrozowicki argues that the crisis of the late 1970s and the emergence of the first independent trade union, NSZZ Solidarność (Solidarity) in 1980, led to (1) the marginalization of the plant-level sociologists (accused of collaboration with either the anti-communist movement, or the authorities) and (2) the gradual shift in the focus from the workplace to the macro-systemic level. Despite cooperation of many sociologists with Solidarity and growing methodological pluralism, critical research methodologies, such as participatory action research carried out by the Touraine team, have been considered by a part of the Polish sociological milieu as non-scientific and overly political. In the 1990s, regardless of the impor-

tance of practically oriented studies of work in the new socio-political reality, the crisis of the sub-discipline continued.

Phase III (mid 2000s–until today): The starting point of the third phase of the development of the sociology of work cannot be precisely determined, but given its important features, such as the globalization and internationalization of research, Mrozowicki relates it to Poland's accession to the European Union which opened new cooperation and funding possibilities. Other sources of the revived interest in the sociology of work include: (1) the growing disenchantment with the market economy both within Polish society and the sociological milieu and in particular since the economic crisis in the late 2000s; (2) a generational change and the inflow of young, often precarious cohorts of young sociologists; (3) closer connections with critical labour scholars in the West; (4) the gradual re-institutionalization of the sociology of work (e.g. the revival of the Sociology of Work Section of the PSA, more conferences, bringing back the sociology of work to academic curricula); (5) closer relations of sociologists of work to both mainstream and radical trade unions, as well as emergent social movements and political parties; (6) the return of work (and in particular: precarious work) as a hot political and literary topic—for example, unions' and the left-wing. Due to the growing interdisciplinarity of research it is increasingly difficult to define the identity of the sociology of work. However, its current theoretical orientations are pluralist and encompass: (1) system approaches and humanistic strands; (2) symbolic interactionist perspectives; (3) neo-institutional approaches; (4) emergent critical labour studies—CLS—(not labelled as such in Poland!). Mrozowicki highlights the fact that CLS strands are marked by the combination of feminist, intersectional and neo-Marxist approaches by a range of activist researchers.

Case 9

Sociology of Work in Hungary

Violetta Zentai

In this chapter, Violetta Zentai discusses two stages in the development of sociology of labour in Hungary. The first stage emerged along with the reestablishment of sociology in Hungarian academia in the 1960s. Labour-related inquiries examined labour relations in existing socialism against the ideological tenets of an empowered and homogenous working class. Leading

scholars investigated the composition and living conditions of industrial work-ers, socio-economic inequalities and stratification among them, and explored the bargaining power and practices of workers in relation to management within state socialist plants. These inquiries unveiled the often hierarchical, exploitative, and unequal relations within state socialist industrial structures. A related field of economic sociology examined the peculiar Hungarian eco-nomic system of late socialism experimenting with marketization and subse-quent changes in organizing production and labour reproduction.

In the second stage of sociological scholarship on labour, following 1989, the meaning of *critical* has become quite diverse. A group of scholars began to monitor the post-socialist capitalist transition in Hungary and CEE according to the standards of democratic capitalist models. Another current has critiqued global capitalism and its direct and indirect impact on the sta-tus of labour in post-socialist settings. A distinctive chapter in Hungarian labour literature explores the transformations of labour relations through the renewed concept of class, adding to the analytical framework 'identity formation' and the politics of voice and representation. Finally, a notewor-thy approach has also emerged which examines formations of vulnerabilities across, and within, wage labour together with ethnicity, migration, gender, and the urban and rural divide. In order to address labour and labour rela-tions in post-socialist Hungary, Zentai discusses these major currents in the sociology of labour by revealing the wider intellectual and scholarly encoun-ters, transnational theoretical discussions, and the local social and political conditions. Her chapter assesses two determinate phases beginning with scholarship during state socialism (1945–1989). This reveals similarities with many other Central and East European countries.

Across CEE countries, sociology and critical social sciences were seriously constrained until the 1980s, or in some places until the fall of the Berlin wall. In Hungary, after a short-lived institutionalized presence in 1945–1948, sociology became re-established only in the 1960s. The consolidation of the Kadar-regime saw the potential for sociology as means for pacifying critical intellectual voices. It gained some international legitimation, and also used modern science to renovate socialism.

The post-1945 take-off of sociology in Hungary interestingly was tied to a tangible interest in labour studies. The leading scholars around the founda-tion of the sociological institute in the Hungarian Academy of Sciences con-ceived sociology as a self-reflexive account of socialism imbued with critical potentialities for Marxist renewal. Thus, topics of alienation in work and the idea of humanization of work were discussed in the second half of 1960s.

The bargaining power of workers in the socialist industrial firms, the differentiation within the industrial working class, and the divide between management and workers emerged as major topics for inquiries in the 1970s. Few empirical investigations became known to the wider public in the Cold War divide. A notable exception was Miklos Haraszti's slim monograph, *Unit Wage: A Worker in the Workers' State* written in 1972 but published only in Germany in 1975. The book revealed the extent to which socialist Fordist production was saturated by exploitation. Zentai argues that with limited connections to wider international scholarship at that time, intriguingly, sociologists of work in the 1960s and 1970s resonated with Western labour sociology approaches by capturing the labour process through studies of micro-practices of job controls, wage-effort bargains, individual and informal, collective and organized resistance.

In the subsequent decade, micro-practices of labour, hidden forms, of exploitation, and inequalities sharply contradicted dominant ideological tenets. These issues received remarkable attention from critical intellectuals many of whom were affiliated to oppositional movements in Hungary and Central Europe. Zentai emphasizes that it is essential to acknowledge that this attention did not centre exclusively on industrial workers. The genre of *sociography* re-emerged (harking back to pre-1945 critical traditions) in the late 1970s and the 1980s combining thick ethnographic description with literary instruments. The genre was built on an explicit interest in inequalities, injustices, and marginalities and the common subject of these social disparities became blue-collar workers (miners, railway operators, steel factory workers, etc.) in especially tough labour conditions, women and Roma at the bottom of the labour market, groups entrapped in under developed areas, and the poor.

Economic sociology, emerging in the 1970s and 1980s, was pertinent to the formation of labour studies in Hungary. Zentai, reflects on the import of the account of economic sociology by Rona-Tas who argued that before 1989, "economics, political science (then known as science of state and the law) and sociology were busy separating themselves from their Marxist cousins of political economy, scientific socialism and dialectical and historical materialism". The key element of this story was that Hungarian economic sociology, especially its critical traditions, had no dispute with economics. Quite the opposite in fact: the two fields cooperated in critiquing Marxism and really existing socialism.

Zentai's chapter then assesses post-socialist sociology of work making the point that early endeavours to research labour relations in the 1990s were

largely influenced by comprehensive theories of post-socialist transformations. These theories, even if motivated by analytical interest, were saturated by normative and visionary components concerning the benign and poisonous effects of the market, the significance of inequalities and social justice, and the prospects of European models of capitalism. In addition, critical social science was dominated by intellectual and political struggles between Marxist, anti-Marxist, and post-Marxist streams of thought. Moreover, wider changes in the global political economy and their impact on CEE transformations have also challenged those embarking on understanding labour relations in post-socialist capitalisms in Europe.

A distinctive chapter in the literature, lead by historians and sociologists, stems from the conviction that in the transformation for labour relations one should pursue a *renewed concept of class*. One of the master ideas is that the industrial workers are the major losers or victims of post-socialist transition, or in a more refined scheme, these workers tend to feel so. Research within this tradition explores the fragmentation of workers' identity, subjectivity, and class formation. In Hungary, the left-wing monthly, *Eszmélet*, serves as the intellectual home for these inquiries.

Case 10

Sociology of Work in Bulgaria

Vassil Kirov

In this chapter, Vassil Kirov analyzes the development of the sociology of work in Bulgaria. The first part of this chapter examines the sociology of work in the communist period (1945–1989) and its dependence upon the party-state, political control and ideological orientation. The second part focuses on post 1989 developments and work-related sociological research in the context of paradigmatic openness, resource scarcity, and continuous integration in international research traditions and networks.

Sociology in Bulgaria emerged at the end of the nineteenth century, but until the Second World War most of its manifestations were rather sporadic, especially with regard to the world of work. After the Second World War, the communist regime declared that sociology was a 'bourgeois' science and that all teaching and research activities were to be forbidden—this lasted throughout the 1940s and 1950s. In the 1960s sociology was 'rehabilitated' and work-related research started to develop.

The sociology of work (SoW) was defined by a number of researchers in the pre-1989 period, focusing both on fundamental and applied aspects of research. Since the end of the 1960s the sociology of work was institutionalized. This was epitomized by the creation of research institutes including a new chair of sociology at the University of Sofia, at the beginning of the 1980s. This period also saw the development of research by factory-based sociologists of work. The role of the state was crucial in the socialist period since the state was the only actor that could validate/prohibit the development of scientific disciplines and mobilize institutional resources.

Kirov argues that after the fall of communism interest in the sociology of work declined while other areas of research took off including research on the new political system, the emerging civil society, entrepreneurship, minorities, research on poverty, and so on. After 1989 the role of the state was reduced as a multitude of other actors entered the field. However, the state still had an important function: accrediting sociological programmes, providing subsidies (even if limited) for university training and scientific research. Since 1989, the professional group of the sociologists of work remained relatively small. Some researchers are more or less integrated into a range of different international networks. Very often, researchers conduct studies within the SoW, but in parallel with other sub-disciplines such as economic sociology, industrial relations, HRM, gender studies, and the sociology of professions. Beginning in the 1990s, and especially since entry into the EU, the European Union has become a powerful actor in the development of scientific disciplines in Bulgaria, through the financial mechanism for research funding—large projects, networks, individual grants, university curricula development and last, but not least, research agendas and priorities. The role of the USA directly is limited, but indirectly the development of the discipline has been stimulated by theoretical contributions and bilateral exchanges. Work-related research has been developed mainly in the context of foreign donors (EU, bilateral co-operation) who impose their research agenda. The main focus of the research in the last two decades has been on privatization, new forms of organization and human resource management, the informal economy and post-communist industrial relations. In terms of methods used, the period since 1989 has also witnessed a heterogeneity of approaches. In parallel to the use of representative sociological surveys, now many other, mainly qualitative methods, are used by the sociologists of work including interviews and case study research. Kirov concludes with a focus on the role of the profound historical disruptions for the development of the sociology of work and on the fact that the very small professional community is becoming better integrated into a range of European and other international networks.

Case 11

Sociological Approaches to Work in Romania Since 1945

Norbert Petrovici and Florin Faje

Petrovici and Faje argue in their chapter that due to the character of economic development, nation-building and political repression in the post-war period it is all but impossible to identify a sub-discipline of sociology of work at any moment after 1945. Nonetheless, they argue that questions of work were significant for sociologists planning the reconstruction of Romania's economy and society after the end of actually existing socialism. Issues and methodologies pertaining to the sociology of work were researched and discussed in the broader fields of urban and industrial sociology.

Over the seven decades since the end of the war, the discipline of sociology found recognition and institutional support for only half the time. Departments and institutes of sociology functioned in the country from 1965 to 1977 and were re-established in the early 1990s. The exclusion of sociology in early and late socialism, and the distinctive anti-communist key in which it was refashioned during post-socialism, undoubtedly contributed to making opaque much sociological work. That said, Petrovici and Faje illustrate the extent to which sociology was a key discipline in producing relevant knowledge for managing and reimagining socialist economic development in Romania, both before and after 1989. The authors propose what they term a "recontextualization" of work in socialist Romania, showing how it acquired meaning and produced value in regional spaces emerging at the intersection of the urban and the rural.

Petrovici and Faje make the point that foreign researchers would be hard pressed to identify sociological research as distinctively sociological, since domestic sociologists were rarely identifying themselves as such and were often holding offices in the hierarchy of the party-state system.

The authors argue that when critically assessing the literature on work, stratification, urbanization, or industrialization as well as the reconfiguration of the social sciences in post-war Eastern Europe, a sense of retrospection lingers in many contributions. The spectacular collapse of socialism in 1989, made it imperative to answer the questions of what was socialism and what comes next? Two strands of literature have tended to emphasize the former or the latter, largely a function of their privileged scale of analysis: the national economy treated as a whole or the paradoxes of socialist management gripping production at the level of factories.

During the 1970s and 1980s there was a boom in literature dedicated to "the science of leadership". During this period sociologists fostered organizational innovation by devising techniques for improved economic coordination and leadership and how their various attempts led to a severe de-professionalization of the discipline. In a post-socialist history of sociology in Romania, Ştefan Costea and his colleagues noted that sociology as a discipline fell into disgrace after 1977 following Elena Ceauşescu's observation that "sociologists are more interested in power than in science". Petrovici and Faje argue that Elena Ceauşescu's alleged observation does not seem imprecise. Both Stahl and Constantinescu were acutely aware that any attempt to build a "science of the nation" on a sociological base required research tools for evidence-based policies. In their turn, such instruments required state institutions and experts capable of gathering and ordering complex data.

The authors argue that the 1990s saw a a period of de-professionalization, coupled with aspects of changes to particular contours of work, favoured informal organization and silent negotiation among workers. This proved a fertile ground for the post-socialist re-institutionalization of sociology without the 'burden' of referencing or engaging the 'communist' sociological tradition.

Petrovici and Faje emphasize the fact that in central and east European countries, the critique of Fordism, bureaucracy, and autocratic management was often conflated with a critique of actually-existing-socialism. In Romania, there is a focus on research exploring the following concerns:

The denouncement of Fordist loyalties and rigid factory bureaucracies played out as a critique of 'communism'.

Ethics of popular entrepreneurship, strivings towards independence and the desire for freedom, have been adapted to organizational ends to produce an entrepreneurial self in the confines of the capitalist firm.

Critical appraisals have been opening new ways to question the complex relations that employees participate in while contributing to the firm. Employability does not suspend the conflict-ridden character of the social division of work, but most of the struggles between labour and capital are deflected as tensions within the working class.

Contemporary developments have witnessed particular pressures on sociology faculties and departments including calls to improve efficiency combined with cost-cutting policies geared towards the needs of the labour market. Faculties of Sociology across Romania have been insisting on their applied approach, purportedly developing skills that could immediately be put to use on the labour market. Over the last decade, specializations in Human Resources have become a mainstay of sociology departments, usually in an alliance with psychologists and economists.

References

Bergmann, J., Jacobi, O., & Müller-Jentsch, W. (1975). *Gewerkschaften in der Bundesrepublik*. Frankfurt/Köln: EVA.

Castillo, J. J. (1997). Looking for the Meaning of Work. *Work and Occupations*, November, Research Article. https://doi.org/10.1177/0730888497024004002.

Castillo, J. J. (1999) "Which Way Forward for the Sociology of Work?" *Special Issue of Current Sociology*, 47(2).

Dörre, K., Sauer, D., & Wittke, V. (Eds.). (2012). *Kapitalismustheorie und Arbeit*. Frankfurt, NY: Campus.

Durand, C. (Ed.). (1985). *Le travail et sa sociologie. Essais critiques*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Frege, C. (2008). The History of Industrial Relations as a Field of Study. In P. Blyton, N. Bacon, J. Fiorito, & E. Heery (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Industrial Relations* (pp. 35–50). Los Angeles et al.: Sage.

Heil, B., & Kuhlmann, M. (2013). *Produktionssysteme sind gestaltbar. SOFI-Mitteilungen*, *7*(18), 1–5.

Kern, H., & Schumann, M. (1970). *Industriearbeit und Arbeiterbewußtsein*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

Lutz, B. (1984). *Der kurze Traum Immerwährender Prosperität*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.

Piore, M., & Sabel, C. (1984). *The Second Industrial Divide. Possibilities for Prosperity*. New York: Basic Books.

Therborn, T. (1976). *Science, Class and Society. On the Historical Formation of Sociology and Historical Materialism* (pp. 37, 222). London: Verso.

1

Towards a Sociology of the Sociology of Work in the UK Since 1945: The Myth of the Golden Age

Carol Stephenson, Paul Stewart and David Wray

Introduction: Scope and Limitations

> It is the denial of class that I find most problematic […] people are continually identifying how the working class is being stigmatised, and how class itself in being eradicated from our thinking. (Jackson 2017, p. 36)

While there are now a range of exemplary interpretations of the development of the Sociology of Work (SoW) in the UK since 1945 their preference, for the most part, has been to identify the sequential nature of this compelling story. Significant narratives include accounts by Watson (five editions from 1980 to 2008), Grint (2000), addressing the subject thematically

C. Stephenson (✉)
University of Northumbria, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK
e-mail: carol.stephenson@northumbria.ac.uk

P. Stewart
Sociology of Work and Employment, Département Homme Organisation et Société (DFR HOS), Grenoble Ecole de Management, ComUE Universite de Rhone-Alps, Grenoble, France
e-mail: paul.stewart@grenoble-em.com

D. Wray
University of Hertfordshire, Hatfield, UK
e-mail: d.wray@herts.ac.uk

with insightful overviews of the subject delineated in five themes, and more exploratory and important analytical work by, for example, Parry et al. (2006) and Halford and Strangleman (2009). Strangleman in Edgell et al. (2016) can be understood as a key text problematizing the canon to date and follows the development of an oeuvre which explores the origins, nature (ontology) and status of the sub-discipline. Most narratives begin with the post-war labour productivity studies that include the work of Trist and Bamforth, continue with an exploration of the *embourgeoisement* thesis including the Affluent Worker Studies, leading to the workplace studies of the 1960s and 1970s, then through to the late 1990s and early 2000s with consideration of the importance of the diversity of the sub-discipline. Some of this has occasioned debate, most prominently between Parker and Strangleman, which we reflect upon below.

In the settled narrative, the grand precursor in the development of an identity for the SoW is the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century sociological canon comprising Durkheim, Marx and Weber which form the bedrock of the wider discipline. This provided the early contours to the framing of debates in the post-war period and has been taken by some as critical to the continuing identity of the SoW. While the founding canon comprises more than the 'great trio', this reference to the founding tenets of sociology and the SoW is a necessary means of distinguishing it from economics, economic history and psychology. While not always manifest in debates in the 1950s, the canon remerged in the discussion around the Affluent Worker studies only to be (sometimes too) conveniently ignored in the last quarter century or so.

Taking the latter as the period in which the trio began to be seen by some as having less relevance in defining the bedrock of the SoW, many identify the years, beginning in the late 1970s, as a sign of SoW's conceptual fragmentation, dissipation, maturation, and, occasionally, a combination of all three. Depending upon the conceptual and historical point of departure of the writer, the latter state of affairs has positive or negative virtues and sometimes a mix of both (see, inter alia, Parker 2015; Strangleman 2005; Halford and Strangleman 2009; Beynon 2011; Edwards 2014a; Strangleman 2016; Warren 2016). Adding to this concern is the deeply worrying existential threat to the SoW posed by the institutional fissiparous character of the sub-discipline, beginning in the mid-to-late 1980s. This too is seen by some to have pros and cons. The location of the SoW in spaces beyond sociology departments, specifically in management and business schools (we use the designation interchangeably), is taken to pose a threat since the institutional context in which the sub-discipline is practiced is vital in affirming its DNA. We could describe these, the intellectual-disciplinary coherence and

institutional location of the sub-genre, as its intellectual and institutional *spread* and this is a significant concern for Halford and Strangleman (inter alia Scott 2005): it represents a weakness for them. It is a common feature of many narratives of the formation of the SoW since the Second World War to find the mid-seventies period described as the end of its Golden Age.[1]

Although these two features (intellectual and disciplinary) which we have defined as *spread* are related, it is important to make the point that while both persist today they have somewhat different origins and, despite overlap, are nevertheless irreducible. The 'where', the 'how' and the 'why' of the SoW certainly matter, but one feature of our argument is that the SoW has always been institutionally and disciplinarily contested. A reasonable challenge to those who want to 'take it back' from its dalliance with other disciplines (and the supposed dilution of the genre) is to point out that while its institutional origins may have consolidated in Sociology departments, the SoW was never *only* practiced there, and probably never will be.

To put it bluntly, there has never been an agreed common view, a doxa, when it comes to defining the SoW as '…the meaning of work is contested' (Warren 2016, p. 46). We can take Warren's point as the beginning of our injunction which is that in charting the changing nature of work the sub-discipline not only mapped the evolution of work in capitalist society but has, by necessity, changed in respect of its character, form and methods of enquiry. The implications of this cannot be ignored easily: those looking back at the Golden Age will be disheartened to learn that it will never return. Our view challenges the assumption that the sub-disciplined ever enjoyed a Golden Age characterised by a range of factors including institutional and ontological coherence. This would be to misread the trajectory of the subject within a reflexive account, which is what sociology is, of late capitalism (Jameson 2011). Given how the Golden Age is typically defined, we argue first that the SoW was never practiced only in sociology departments, by 'sociologists', and, second, that the meaning of the SoW and its contours have never been settled. This is a critical feature of its strength: the ability

---

[1]The role of the early Thatcher Conservative government on directly impacting the development of the wider discipline was evident with the shift from the SSRC to the ESRC during Thatcher's first government (the Social Science Research Council founded in 1965 became the Economic and Social Research Council in 1983). The reason for the shift was to commit social science funding to projects that were deemed more 'empirical' and of 'public concern'. What was critical was that the ideological nostrum then became the rationale for future government support more broadly and was adumbrated by New Labour neoliberal agendas committed to business-centred research activity. See Holmwood (2010, 2011, 2013) and Durand and Stewart (2014) comparing the process of neoliberal formation in its impact on the SoW in France and the UK.

to mutate along three dimensions: institutional, ontological and, hence, methodological.

Thus, this chapter will consider the changing nature of the SoW in Britain, not only in respect of changing subject matter, but in relation to how these three dimensions have evolved. The narrative will consider these in terms of what we take to be exemplary published research during the course of the evolution of post-war British capitalism. Some of our readings can be placed readily in the canon of the so-called Golden Age. The fact that what might be termed 'the unoffical register', the periodic review of work published in the British Sociological Association's journal *Work, Employment and Society*, beginning in 1987 with Richard Brown's editorial, indicates the global reach and disciplinary openness of work, that we would describe as sociological, makes a full account of the SoW unlikely. Moreover, the fact that describing this work as sociological is contested could be taken as illustrating our point about *spread*. A good example of *spread* could include developments drawing on areas of study previously laying outside a SoW agenda, for example, radical geography, as exemplified in the work of Herod et al. (2007). There is also an important theme of work and time explored by Hassard (1996) which we cannot address here though we do so in our forthcoming monograph on the SoW in the UK. [Readers can check developments in the field of the SOW and related areas of the sub-discipline in what we have termed the unofficial register by consulting the following editorials: Stewart (2004), Rainbird and Rose (2008), Stuart et al. (2011), Stuart et al. (2013) and Beck et al. (2016)]. And of course, as many have noted, many pieces addressing the SoW appear elsewhere and notably in the BSA's flagship journal, Sociology, an exemplary of this being the special issue from 2009 (volume 43: 5) edited by Susan Halford and Tim Strangleman, a number of papers with which we engage here. Even this does not encompass the full spectrum since SoW is published in myriad other journals including, amongst many others, *Organisations*, *Human Relations* and *Human Resource Management Journal.*

Given that the use of the term 'the sociology of work' is as fraught in the UK as elsewhere, it is incumbent that we specify the phenomenon we think it analyses. Indeed, it was well into the 1990s before the descriptor Sociology of Industry fell out of fashion and this is especially interesting when we note its use by Eldridge et al. (1991). Eldridge et al. are of particular interest precisely because the subject matter discussed in their book addresses the relationship between the crisis in the political economy and the crisis they perceive in the study of the political economy by sociologists under the guise of sociologists of industry. In short, industrial sociology was

in crisis specifically due to the fact that industrial work was itself in decline. We should state that we pay due homage to their critique which we are more than happy to embrace and in many ways echo. This is the view that the type of SoW (industry) practiced in any given era is reflective of the nature and form of capitalist work and employment. Their response to the disciplinary crisis was to reject what they recognised as Hyman's otherwise fruitful call for the displacement of bourgeois social science by a Marxist critique of the political economy. (We explore the finer texture of this debate in our forthcoming book on the SoW in the UK.) For Eldridge et al., disciplinary renewal would be better served by beginning with an appreciation of sociology's broader recognition of crisis as set out in the work of, inter alia, Durkheim and Weber. For us, we take both Eldridge et al. and Hyman's perceptions to hold specific virtues. Our concern is to flag up their place in the sub-discipline's evolution in the 1990s. Especially, we see Eldridge et al. (1991) as illustrative of our claim that while the sub-discipline evolves it has always done so with a certain indeterminate focus.

In fact, as the debate about the nature of the SoW demonstrates, following Warren (2016), the concept is contested precisely because the nature of work itself is contested. While we indicate some pitfalls in the use of the concept by others, our usage is not an imperative. With apologies to purists who might prefer a core ontology, our starting point is that while the SoW is disputed since the nature of work is disputed, the SoW in late capitalist Britain will change as the political economy evolves, methods change in our research of its form, character and trajectory, and thus the discipline will spread, and deepen, in its impact and influence across a range of disciplinary boundaries (for an exemplary account, see Parry et al. 2006). 'Taking it back' to the heartland of sociology departments would be a retreat: for us, what we term *spread* is a strength, not a weakness.

To explore the evolution of the history of the SoW in the context of postwar Britain is a major undertaking and can only reasonably be achieved through a carefully considered strategic approach in which what we consider to be key textual material is cited. We accept that this is inevitably skewed given our variously different individual formations. Neither can we address specific and otherwise vital debates and new departures in detail, such as explorations of the relationship between the SoW and history, memory-nostalgia, or debates on legacy, occupational identity or sex work (see, respectively, inter alia, Abrams 1982; Brown 1987; Strangleman 2007; Dawson et al. 2015; MacKenzie et al. 2017; Brewis and Linstead 2003). Thus, rather than providing a comprehensive annotated bibliography of Britain's

contribution to the SoW, we offer for the first time a *sociological* account of the evolution of the sub-discipline through an exploration rooted it in the social, political and economic structures and contexts which have prompted the most significant contributions to its twists and turns over the period since the end of the Second World War.

We divide our exemplars into three eras in the development of post-war capitalism. We intend to achieve this through an examination of what we see as the seminal work exemplifying the significant trends in the sub-discipline. While we note above that the definition of the SoW is not 'settled', in order to identify seminal studies, we clarify our political position by drawing reference to what we take to be exemplary studies of work and employment, paid and unpaid, its nature and its absence *in relation to class struggle and conflict* and the implications of this for the lives of working people and their class situation. Thus, from within a bourgeois social science, we seek to ask questions about the predicament of labour in a conflicted society. Our view is close to Therborn's (1976) conjecture on the origins, formation and *social* orientation of the discipline. For Therborn, since sociology is historically formed, it must be located within the spirit of the age (1976, p. 37).

Where and What Is the Sociology of Work: The Notion of *Spread*

It is not obvious why the SoW outside sociology departments, let alone universities, should be seen as any more problematic than when the sociology of culture or deviance becomes located in literature and criminology departments. One claim might be that dissipation and fragmentation undermines disciplinary coherence and the long-term survival of the sub-discipline: Can management and business schools be left to provide the training for sociologists studying work?

This is a reasonable concern, animating many including Halford and Strangleman (2009, p. 819), and while it matters to us as sociologists it is not the central concern of our thesis. Moreover, from one vantage point their handling of the issue might be interpreted as pessimistic and contradictory. On one hand, they argue that the practice of the SoW in management schools has not confirmed earlier pessimism (p. 818). For example, they write that labour process analysis and critical management studies sit 'alongside human resource management and mainstream management perspectives' (ibid.). Then, on the other hand, they cast into doubt the possibility that

anything of critical importance might be gleaned from working in business schools.

Thus,

> Nonetheless, sociologists should ask what knowledge is produced under these conditions and what type of sociologist is produced in such circumstances? In business schools what comes to stand for the sociology of work is largely a mix of human resource management, labour process theory and critical management studies, alongside empirical studies of labour market and employment conditions. (Ibid., p. 818)

At least these authors concede that this is a sociology of sorts, though not a proper one, but one we will have to live with until we can bring it back in-house since sociology is recognisably a product of its societal context. We would interpret this as somewhat myopic, considering the range of critical SoW practiced by sociologists working outside sociology departments, including the great bête noir, the business school. In fairness, others, such as Elger (2009) in the special issue edited by Halford and Strangleman, have also raised concerns at what they view as the problem of re-institutionalisation beyond the sociology department. Yet, it would be interesting to see exactly what kind of critical SoW is practised in sociology departments. Aside from a handful of institutions, the study of the SoW is honoured more in the breach than the observance. The answer, if we take the practice of the sub-discipline more broadly, is evident: being in a sociology department does not confer the status of disciplinary radicalism, and sometimes quite the contrary. Alternatively, 'What might be critical in business schools might not be critical in a sociology department, and what might be critical in the US might not be critical in the UK' (Parker 1999, p. 7). This notion of the social relativism of radicalism is important, 'In order to understand dissent, we need to understand the dominant' (ibid.).

Suggesting that the study of work outside of sociology departments will have long-term negative consequences is misplaced (Halford and Strangleman 2009, p. 820) because, and here we make a contentious point, it was the lack of sustenance of the SoW in sociology departments that created difficulties for the discipline, rather than its reposition in management schools. Thinking counterfactually, we have rarely met SoW migrants who would not have happily remained in sociology departments had the environment, both in terms of temper and purpose, been politically conducive. This is a broad statement since it was not as if the sub-discipline ceased to be practiced in departments of sociology. That said, we need to understand

the reasons for this migration of approaches within the sub-discipline and why it led, contrary to the pessimists, to its invigoration (Parker 2015, p. 7). Business schools, after all, did not concoct the so-called cultural turn but they did allow, as a response to the changing character of capitalism and its impact on working-class society and labour organisation, space for the focussed study of labour and capital. This became possible for the explicable reason that Business Schools are where management cadre are trained. (See Rowlinson and Hassard 2011 for an intriguing take on the debate.) Put this way, it could be argued that business schools are the best place for sociologists of work to reside.

Yet this is only the first part of the story, though an important aspect of the development of the SoW, since its re-institutionalisation clearly impacted on its evolution. It was important in that it allowed those working within the SoW to address more immediately the agenda of capital and variant management strategies. Moreover, for those interested in the sociology of sociology, it should come as no surprise that as the secular composition of the working class changed, that social scientists and those practicing variant forms of the SoW should reflect these patterns and concerns, perceiving, misperceiving or simply not seeing the development of the new ideologies central to new management practices. Some sociologists, ersatz or otherwise, according to one's prejudice and purity, took these changes as signs of wondrous new forms of social life, viewing the demise of determinate forms of collectivism through the variously coloured spectacles of capital. This was to be witnessed with the confusion generated by an obsession with the ideology, as opposed to the political economy, of individualism and subjectivity derived from the extraordinary discovery that at one moment (historical) people were collectivistic, and at another moment (contemporary) people were individualistic.

Interpreting individual material concerns and subjective fears as having been invented by late capitalism led to the curious notion that collectivism was the antithesis of individual needs, and the obstacle to personal fulfilment.[2] Others, some from radical sociological traditions including those with Marxist and socialist feminist formations, saw the space provided by the business

---

[2]Space does not allow a fuller discussion of this aspect in the development of the SoW but the debate about the relationship between individualism and collectivism was to be witnessed in a range of registers. This debate, addressing as it does social change resulting from the structural evolution of late capitalism, comprises a considerable portfolio. See, inter alia, Alvesson and Willmott (2002), Knights and Willmott (1989), Martinez Lucio and Stewart (1997), Parker (1999), Ackroyd and Thompson (1999), Kunda (1992) and Linstead (1997).

school as a precious opportunity to study capital in its re-foundation after the era of Fordist closure. In other words, and seemingly paradoxically, had it not been for the rise of the business school the SoW—and certainly a radical SoW—might have been eclipsed.

A less generous perspective might be one that harks back to a period of disciplinary closure, dispensing from on high ex cathedra truths about the purity of the discipline, whilst nevertheless recognising that the SoW is 'a contextually produced body of knowledge' (Halford and Strangleman, op. cit., p. 818). Alas, full entry into the pantheon is to be denied, because the products of this 'contextually produced knowledge' are despised simply because of their location. Here we fear this contradiction reaches its limits. We can see the inherent bias in this view—sociology departments, source of true sociological radicalism good; business-school-sociology, bad sociology—very easily by turning the question around. If mainstream sociology[3] and sociologists in sociology departments were so radical and committed to a critical sociology of *capitalism*, why was the subject allowed to either atrophy or disappear from so many environments (Beynon 2011, p. 19)? Given that this impure SoW (inter alia, labour process studies, management and organisation research) was still a form of sociology, why was a critical sociology of *work* not so evident in more than a handful of sociology departments?

While this highlights the point about the difficulty of tying the SoW to a determinate institutional space, we are not so much concerned with the professional implications of this issue, so much as with the impact of the changing character of British capitalism on the ontology of the SoW. While the issue of institutional and disciplinary *spread* forms the crux of the debate between Parker and Strangleman, we are interested in the inevitable reasons for this spread. While recognising their concerns—pessimistic for Strangleman, more sanguine for Parker—we interpret *spread* in structural as opposed to normative terms. Considering the implications of *spread* for the kind of research conducted in the area of work (and employment), they dispute the outcomes of fragmentation for prospective sociological understandings of the workplace and wider social change.

For us, the issue is neither whether a fissiparous state—*spread*—is good or bad but rather, in what ways has this been a response to the changing character of capitalism, and to what extent is the SoW itself over-determined by

---

[3]Whatever 'mainstream sociology' is, people often use this phrase without defining it.

societal change. That is to say, against the idea of a core to the SoW, how is the SoW itself defined by the period of capitalism in which it is practiced?

Spread is important, and the fact that today it is different from past *spread* is related neither to loss of disciplinary—sub-disciplinary identity, nor the apparently relentless loss of institutional rootedness in sociology departments. It is more related to the changing relationships between the trajectory of contemporary capitalism, and the ways in which this is interpreted by sociologists of work. This is another way of saying that it is completely possible to be relaxed about the nature of the *spread* of the SoW. By understanding this, we can make better sense of the ways in which the sub-discipline has changed in the post-war period. Arguing that *spread* has been axiomatic to the SoW allows us to chart what we take to be key moments of change by reference to what we take to be significant and in some instances iconic work. From this perspective, institutional coherence is less significant than is supposed. Furthermore, disciplinary coherence is not reducible to institutional recognition following the subject's consolidation in the academy between the late 1950s and early 1960s (Eldridge 2009; Elger 1975; Beynon 2011, following Savage 2010).

Inevitably, since there is a vast quantity of published and unpublished work in the area, we agree with others, in particular Watson (2008, pp. xv, 1–3), who suggests that to attempt a full-spectrum account of the twists and turns since the Second World War presents a nearly impossible task. In any case, a listing, a dictionary of the SoW, cannot be our intent. Since our chosen exemplars will necessarily miss other notable work, we offer pre-emptory apologies. An apologia also highlights the difficulty with definition and the import of *conceptual spread*. Specifically, there can be no consensus, either about what it is that sociologists working in the sub-discipline mean by the SoW, for the very reason that there is limited agreement on what it is that we mean by work (Komlosy 2018; Watson, ibid.; Warren 2016; Edwards 2014a; Halford and Strangleman 2009).

For example, while many would concur with Watson's view that the subject-phenomenon line must be drawn somewhere, we would demur that drawing it at the interface between paid work and unremunerated work easily sorts out the problem of 'object of study' and 'means of study' (Komlosy 2018). Watson's presentation of the dilemma is particularly apposite and clear, but for us it does not sufficiently resolve the problem. Advanced as a sympathetic critique of Glucksman's concept of the total social organisation of labour (TSOL) (1995), his argument is that TSOL too readily blurs the boundary between work and what he sees as activity per se, those aspects of work not directly part of the sphere of labour market activity. Recognising

Glucksman does this in order to link work and non-work activity, and specifically consumption as a means of redefining the agenda of the SOW, Watson feels this casts the net too wide,

> If we include in the scope of the sociology of work all task-oriented activity in which effort is expended, then we risk extending our study to such activities as walking across a room to switch on a television set or packing a bag to take to the beach. We need a compromise that gives sufficient focus to our studies without limiting them to activities with a formal economic outcome.

Yet, it remains unclear why this could not constitute the object of study for the SoW. What is more, even if his 'object of study' does not include 'packing a bag' for the beach as part of our object of study, why can this not be included as a fruitful field for research? A number of others he cites, including feminist researchers[4] and, in a different register, Marxists, emphasise the link between work and non-work activities, as we shall see. For Marxists working in the field, it is precisely the importance of what are conventionally considered to be non-work activities that constitute the terrain of the social reproduction of labour. Inseparability does not mean work and non-work are the same but, on the contrary, the meaning of each cannot be understood as being mutually exclusive, as separation occurs within the same domain. Watson counsels compromise to limit the object of study. Rather than study paid work only, and in order to draw in perspectives such as the TSOL, he argues that,

> There are two main aspects of work that a sociological concept of work needs to recognise. The first is the task-related aspect of work and the second the part played by work in the way people 'make a living'.

Will this allow us to include aspects from another agenda but in such a way that they might also be subordinated: the TSOL is fine, but not too much of it please? Leave out the bag packing.

Our perspective links societal shifts not only, as we have emphasised, to changes in focus, but more with the way in which the ontology of the sub-discipline evolved as capitalism in the UK, and more widely, changed after 1945. There is no reason why practitioners should not proceed as prompted by Watson, or that they should not adopt an agenda following

---

[4]See Pettinger et al. (2006, p. 2).

the ontological commitment of the TSOL, nor a Marxist perspective, such as our own. What variant understandings serve to highlight, therefore, is the scope of the SoW and what the SoW should address and, second, that the *object* of study is determined by the *perspective* of study. The latter will always constitute the meaning we attribute to human activity and its significance for the way in which we go about our work in the sub-discipline. Again, our view is that this emphasises the importance of doxa to the perception (and practice) of the sub-discipline.

While disputing consensus around a disciplinary doxa, nevertheless we can be sure that something known as the sociological imagination is necessarily central to the SoW, even though, aside from citing Wright Mills (1959), it is difficult to find a clear explanation of what is meant by this. It is as if the term, Sociological Imagination, itself offers an incantation of protection against common sense and the other social sciences and this is understandable since it is not only ourselves, sociologists of work who study work, as can be seen in the WES periodic register.

Specifically, our thesis challenges the perception of the SoW as a trans-historical discipline standing outside the historical formation in which it seeks to make sense of the world. A note of caution is important for our argument. Some practitioners have indeed seen the SoW as relatively unchanged, as an implement which can be used to make sense of changes in the development of work (and employment) and sometimes in work beyond the labour market. It is not so much that changes in approach fail to register, rather, that for those seeking the core, the SoW should be understood as remaining stable since the war whatever the inquiry into societal change. This is not to deny that changes in methodology, epistemology and broader research agenda are not recognised, rather that despite societal shifts including the rise in the importance of research on gender and ethnicity, some commentators stick fast to an unchanging sociological ethos informing the way in which we go about constructing our research activity. Furthermore, to the extent that it can be demonstrated that this ethos is weak or absent, some writers feel it is vital that we return to the one-true sociological way. While, as we have argued, the concern with sociological ethos is important in the constitution of the Strangleman (2005, pp. 6–9) and Parker (1999, 2015) debate on what we describe as the concern with *spread*, it also constitutes an element in the sensibility of more radical writers such as Beynon (2011, p. 21) who argues that despite the pros associated with what he terms 'weak professional control' promoting 'collaboration and involvement with other disciplines' (2011, p. 21) that,

openness […] also contributed to the ease with which sociology was practiced outside of sociology departments. This has been most debilitating for the study of work and labour which has been increasingly practiced within Business Schools. (p. 21)

While the second sentence certainly does not echo Strangleman's locational reductionism, whereby management schools undermine the kind of SoW practiced there by dint of department or faculty ethos, orientation and curriculum, nevertheless it insufficiently recognises the role of political economy in the practice and location of the sub-discipline. Sociologists working in these tainted places, whatever their needs for employment, are participating in 'arguably a dilution of its critical edge' (Strangleman 2005, p. 6). Writing with Halford in the 2009 keynote piece this adverse judgment, while less audible, persists nonetheless. Along with Parker we are less gloomy. While Beynon is certainly not arguing that we are witnessing an ersatz SoW in Business Schools (nor applauding by condescension its occasional virtues as does Strangleman 2005), it is nevertheless tinged with regret that 'the study of work and labour' often takes place elsewhere. We understand this anxiety and of course more research on work and employment would be welcome in sociology departments. But it has to be remarked that the lack of a required radical political economy understanding of disciplinary *spread* is disappointing.

Accounts of developments in the sub-discipline for the most part treat the actual changes in the SoW in a relatively unproblematic way, which is to say that while there is recognition of a relationship between what the SoW *does* and the *way* capitalism changes, there is less consideration of way in which the changing nature of capitalism frames the 'what', 'why' and 'how' of the SoW itself. That is to say that the actual practice of the SoW is itself a product of the society of which it is a part. In this respect, we argue the need for greater attention to Castillo's quest, echoed by Strangleman (2005), for a sociology of the SoW. We argue that a sociology of the SoW allows us to detect phases in the evolution of the SoW, delineated by three periods in the development of post-war British capitalism.

Three Periods in the Development of Post-war Capitalism and the Sociology of Work

For our purposes, these periods can be described as Fordism (1945–1975), followed by the rise of a period that witnessed the slow unravelling of the Fordist period of regulation (1975–1990s). Often this is described as the

period of post-Fordism and while we do not think it an entirely adequate descriptor we find it useful, bearing in mind that it is the problematical counterpoint to everything Fordist. The third began in the late 1990s taking us into the 2000s and is the period described as the neoliberal moment of global financialised capitalism, or following Wilder (2015) 'neoliberal imperialism'. The latter is taken to represent the current period determining the way in which the SoW is practiced, both conceptually and methodologically. It is important to understand that these three periods can also be seen as illustrative of the kinds of agenda and research practices that defined the SoW historically. Recognising that describing what comprises the scope of the SoW is often a contested matter (Watson 2009), our view is that this can be taken as a measure of the concerns of the current period. Accepting that temporal categorisation is not straightforward, as some texts overlap what might be seen as neat period boundaries, we see these nevertheless as exemplifying the zeitgeist of the social and political periods within which they were researched and written.

Given the importance of delineating the central characteristics of the SoW, it is hardly unusual that the sub-discipline's biographers should seek to identify the developing characteristics of the SoW in a linear way. This is not to say that these accounts (above) straightforwardly describe the sequence of new areas of research together with, for some commentators, new departures in capitalism. It is necessary to understand the ways in which various patterns of work, together with the changing *forms* of research practice in the genre, impact on the focus given to research in the area.

It may have been more obvious in the post-war period that the SoW could be described as having had an agenda defined by a focus on issues of perceived national importance, above all as reflected in a concern with the social character of labour productivity (Eldridge 2009; Watson 2008). By contrast, it is less evident that writers are concerned to make a pitch for similar approaches to understanding the practice(s) of the SoW today. Yet, wider societal changes must be central in accounts of the development of the sub-discipline since the 1960s. As stated, the SoW was a discipline forged by, inter alia, the needs of national reconstruction (Nichols 1986; Eldridge 2009), and while less obviously driven by state *dirigisme* as was the case of the SoW in France (see Chapter 2 in this volume on France; Durand and Stewart 2014), arguably the trajectory of the discipline in the UK can be understood in a similar way. Eldridge (2009) reminds us of importance of the USA in the sub-discipline's development:

The US served as a positive reference point. Between 1949 and 1952 […] some 66 investigative teams went from the UK to the US under the auspices of the Anglo-American Productivity Council, funded by the Marshall Plan, looking for solutions to what was perceived as Britain's productivity "problem"'. (p. 832)

We argue that the need to interpret the relationship between extant ontologies and methodologies of the SoW, and societal change, is less evident in contemporary surveys and accounts of its development.

It is less than surprising that the SoW should have developed as a response to issues concerning the social character of labour productivity by exploring the nature of workplace cohesion and social solidarity. The SoW is, after all, defined by its variant interpretations of change, sometimes transformation. Moreover, it always seeks to address the social nature of the forces of cohesion and dissonance at the centre of the social processes of work, and this forms part of our leitmotif. The concern is with the ways in which the SoW has explored order and conflict in relation to work, and its impact on working-class lives.

1945–1975

While there are a range of texts such as *The Management of Innovation*, by Burns and Stalker (1961) and Woodward *Management and Technology* (HMSO 1958), the exemplary pieces chosen from this period are those by Trist and Bamforth's *Some Social and Psychological Consequences of the Longwall Method of Coal-Getting* (1951); Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter's *Coal is our Life* (1956); Lockwood's *The Blackcoated Worker* (1958) and Beynon's *Working For Ford* (1973).

Immediately following the Second World War, both the UK government and the academy became concerned with issues of productivity, and the impact of shopfloor culture on levels of productivity. Prior to the Second World War, the British coal industry was consistently falling short of its international competitors in the USA and Europe. After the war, these problems were exacerbated by labour shortages and a significant reduction in output (Page Arnott 1979; Supple 1987). Following the nationalisation of the coal industry in 1947, the newly formed National Coal Board (NCB) was tasked with significantly increasing production to power the industrial reconstruction that was desperately needed. Despite gaining their long-term aim of a nationalised industry, miners did not respond positively to the

newly introduced mechanised mining techniques, based on the 'long wall' system of production which, consequently, made little impact on levels of productivity (Trist and Bamforth 1951).

Before the introduction of the 'long wall' method, coal extraction had been undertaken through a 'bord and pillar' system of short faces or 'stalls' worked by at most two miners, hewing coal by hand. Under this system, the degree of job control enjoyed by the miner was almost complete. Autonomous in the organization of their own work tasks, responsible for all aspects of coal extraction, and with little external supervision, production workers were controlled only through a payment system based on piecework. Importantly, this system of production created an occupational culture that was embedded within the workforce (Douglass 1972).

The introduction of 'long wall' mechanised mining completely changed the production process to one based on 'task segmentation, differential status and payment systems, and extrinsic hierarchical control', all based on a cyclical process of coal getting (Herbst 1962, p. 1). This system was problematic, in that the work teams on each cycle of the production process were paid differential piece rates and were dependent upon the preceding team completing their task. Failure to do so caused conflict between miners themselves, as the wages of all were reduced.

The introduction of new technologies, alongside changed working patterns, brought with them a more controlling technocratic bureaucracy, with the consequence that the new production system was working *against* attempts to increase productivity. The new system was also antithetical to the strong occupational culture defined by previous working practices. The solution to these problems was identified by the miners themselves, when they were given the autonomy to organise their own system of working, thus providing internal rather than external control over the work process. In order to solve the problem of productivity, capitalism, in the form of a nationalised industry, had given way to the agency of labour in order to solve the problem of low productivity. The research into the introduction of these new working systems brought a reaffirmation (or perhaps a realisation) that people were a major part of the production process (Trist and Bamforth 1951). The socio-technological system brought with it the concept of responsible autonomy—and proof that there was an alternative to Taylorism, as the miners had demonstrated they could find their own 'one best way'.

This seminal publication clearly demonstrated that to achieve success with any complex technical production system, a symbiotic relationship between the workforce and the means of production could be productive. Giving

agency to workers, placing her/his knowledge at the heart of the production process is essential in achieving the required increase in output. Regarding the claims made about *spread*, it is useful to note that this work was undertaken by psychologists. These findings were central in directing mainstream sociology toward the workplace, beginning the process of developing a SoW, which focused on the agency of the worker, rather than the structure of the workplace. This tells us that the work itself cannot be divorced from the intellectual temper of the times, overdetermined in the case of sociology with the interests of dominant social actors and their agenda of social compromise. Coming in the period that saw the development of the post-war social settlement, this work was indelibly part of the constitution of the latter's search to link national economic success to a labour-management paradigm of productivity growth.

Coal is Our Life (1956) by Dennis et al. represented a shift of focus from the mine to the mining community, offering insights into the interrelationship between work, family and place in a single industry community. Notably, the research was undertaken by a sociologist and two anthropologists. The early chapters provided insights into the community, the people and trade unionism and also the differential tasks required to draw coal from the earth. The chapter on the miner at work provided the reader with a view of the production process from a Marxist perspective, while the chapter on trade unionism demonstrated why, in the mining industry, production workers always controlled the union.

Of particular interest for those seeking an understanding of the social structures of the mining communities outside of the mine was the role of women within the family. Dennis et al. argued that the nuclear family was created by the coal industry as women were required to meet the needs of both fathers and sons working in the mine, a view echoed later by Beynon and Austrin (1994). As Hall (1981) later commented, 'The male world of the mine was the beating economic heart of the community upon which female life was dependant'. This research demonstrated that the relationship between work, family and community created and sustained a culture that was as defining of the community, as was the relationship between miners and the organisation of their work underground.

The book provided a shift in sociological emphasis, from individual and isolated social problems, towards more holistic approaches to the sociological study of the interconnections between 'work', 'culture' and 'place'. Taken together with the work of Trist and Bamforth (1951), and despite the fact that they are individual studies based upon social psychology and social anthropology, their combined research provided valuable insights into

the importance of occupational culture and the inter-relationships between work, family and community in the period of the development of the post-war social settlement. In this way, both made significant contributions to the SoW and provided evidence that industrial sociology had much to offer outside of the workplace and moreover that its authors did not have to be sociologists.

In the introduction to the second edition (1969), the authors stated that 'this community, without the mine and mineworkers, is in danger of becoming merely an aggregate of socially isolated and culturally condemned human beings'. Given the situation in many of the post-industrial mining communities found in the now redundant coalfields in the UK, this can be seen as a prescient comment (Dennis et al. 1969, p. 10). The influence of this research can be seen in the fact that, after its publication, the symbiotic relationship between mining and mining communities was seen as self-evident.

From the outset, a case is made for the SoW reaching beyond the narrow parameters of the workplace. Our concern is not only with what occurs 'at work' but with the relationship between work and social inequality in all its manifestations and contexts. This implies a concern with the fragility of people's lives occasioned by the absence of work and employment. Given this scope, Lockwood's *The Blackcoated Worker: A Study in Class Consciousness* (1958 and 1989) demands our attention as it addresses how the structure of occupation in the shape of the growing importance of clerical work influences class consciousness and solidarity: an important question for a sub-discipline occupied by Marxist agendas of control, resistance and class. While still located within a canon addressing work primarily, nevertheless we can begin to see an additional concern with issues broader than those of work and productivity that are both less instrumental and more concerned with the changing and historical character of employment. We are still in the era of the post-war consensus where sociologists primarily addressed the interests and agenda of dominant social elites and these included the concern with the fate of male occupational change.

Using a framework aligned to Marxism (with reference to trade unionism, work and market situation), overlaid with a Weberian interest in social status, Lockwood concluded that the market situation of the clerk differed from that of the blue collar worker and consequently so too did their social values: clerks aligned themselves to the middle class. He dismissed the Marxist idea of clerks experiencing false consciousness: these workers had a class consciousness, but just not the one Marxists were hoping for, or had predicted.

The Blackcoated Worker was reprinted in 1989, with a substantial post script which sought to examine the impact of change on white-collar work

as a result of feminization and mechanization. Here, Lockwood dismissed the American Marxist, Braverman's (1974) white-collar proletarianisation thesis (for the deskilling of white-collar workers through the adoption of scientific management and the subsequent deskilling and cheapening of white-collar labour) as poorly substantiated, arguing that in the 1980s white-collar workers continued to experience advantages in wages and conditions over their blue-collar counterparts (1989, p. 221). He did however concede to the deterioration of white-collar work on two specific points: the feminisation of white-collar employment and the associated limited opportunity for women workers to climb the career ladder, combined with the fact that the distinction between male white-collar and blue-collar work suggested a significant deterioration in the power, status and condition of white-collar workers overall (pp. 221–223). Both editions of Lockwood's text provided a social history of work and the rapid nature of change, and his updated 1980s account referred to roles long since swept away by functional and numerical flexibility, and the rapid progress of information technology and its implementation under neoliberalism. In our view, it would be fair to say that critical features of Braverman's prospectus have been borne out by advances in capitalist planning and managerial agenda.

Working for Ford (Beynon 1973), an extended ethnographic study (1963–71) of shop stewards and workers in the Ford Motor Company plant in Halewood, Liverpool, provided an unambiguous insight into the reality of managerial control, and the consequences of scientific management for the workforce (Taylor 1911). The book takes the reader into the heart of a car plant and provides an unequivocal insight into the drudgery and monotony of working on a moving production line. The research findings can be seen as a study in social anthropology as much as a study in industrial sociology.

Beynon's work was significant to the extent that it was the first major account of working-class discontent by workers in a key industry in relation to the Fordist compromise (wages as compensation for the 'death' experienced within mass production). While industrial conflict was endemic in the post-war period, the 1960s and early 1970s were to mark the beginnings of the slow break-up of the post-1945 settlement and one of the reasons why we exemplify *Working for Ford* is because it was the first major record of the workings of the social compromise within the workplace together with its various internal and external social and political insecurities. This was a register of the contradictions, the strengths and weaknesses of Fordism that were approached from a perspective otherwise ignored in the sociological canon, the beginnings of a SoW from below.

The book is written in an easily readable style making it accessible to all readers and most importantly gives a voice to Ford workers. The most significant chapters of the book are 'On the Line' and 'Controlling the Line', in which the reader is introduced to the working conditions on the production line, and the shop stewards who stand between the workforce and management. Work on the line is described graphically by those enduring it as a series of dull, boring tasks, repeated every few seconds, leaving them with a deep sense of alienation. Beynon reported that workers took no satisfaction in their work, with the employment relationship simply an exchange of effort for a wage: workers talk of 'working with blanked out minds' (p. 117).

Beynon identified an emergent shopfloor militancy and the increasing influence of the shop stewards in the constant struggle to control the speed of the production line. He described this struggle in terms of a 'factory consciousness' as it was rooted in the workplace,

> [...] it understands class relationships in terms of their direct manifestation in conflict between the bosses and the workers within the factory. In as much as it concerns itself with exploitation and power, it contains definite political elements. But it is a 'politics of the factory'. (p. 98)

In contrast to the miners referred to above, the socio-technical systems Ford workers experienced denied them any form of job control which was seen as a direct threat to the profitability of the organization. For those on the line, the struggles were often with the trade union organisation itself, as its leadership (TGWU) was frequently at odds with the rank and file worker. This was graphically outlined in the chapter on the 1969 strike, when senior trade union leaders were replaced by the membership.

Working for Ford provided a clear and unambiguous insight into the everyday working experiences of workers in a car plant, and the efforts made by them to gain some form of control over the production processes. It also identified an emerging shopfloor militancy and a shift to the left that was mirrored in the wider trade union movement in the UK as the post-war compromise became increasingly febrile. Importantly, the book encompassed the emergence of multi-national capital alongside the development of a wider class struggle, and Beynon placed the workers in the car industry at the centre of that:

> If you stand on the catwalk at the end of the plant you can look down over the whole assembly floor. Few people do, for to stand there and look at the endless, perpetual, tedium of it all is to be threatened by the overwhelming insanity of it. The sheer audacious madness of a system based upon men like those wishing their lives away. (p. 109)

The book offered a different, more inclusive, way of researching the world of work and set the standard for a longitudinal research methodology that fully involved workers by giving them a voice to tell their own stories. For Edwards (2014b), Beynon's book represented a 'foundational study' in the SoW, an appropriate work that for us bookended the decline of the long post-war settlement where a social democratic consensus had seen the institutional bolstering of working-class solidarity, and the beginnings of its reconstruction under very different conditions once characterised by Ralph Miliband as 'class struggle from above' (1989).

Increasingly, the SoW saw the development of a range of different approaches that would parallel the older, conventional mainstream, accounts of class and occupational change. As older social certainties and political compromises began to slowly fragment, sociology and the SoW reflected socio-political change in research that both revealed and encouraged a range of dominant social interests, as it had done in the immediate post years. At the same time, some of this effort, reflecting the wider social zeitgeist, sought to dig into the structural and phenomenal character of various changes to class, occupation and wider social solidarities.

This time however, greater attention would be given to the impact of change on those now subordinated by the new certainties of a developing neoliberalism. When *Coal is our life* and *Some Social and Psychological Consequences of the Longwall Method of Coal-Getting* were published, they addressed a confident and, from the standpoint of a Gramscian conception of the national-popular, a socially integrated industrial and political order. It mattered little, as we will argue later, that Irish and Caribbean immigrants, women, the unemployed and others barely registered in the dominant canon but new cultural insurgencies, including class conflict and struggles around reproduction and sexual orientation, would eventually change settled certainties in the study of society, work and employment.[5]

1975–1990s

Oakley's *Housewife* (1974); Pollert's *Girls, Wives, Factory Lives* (1981); Cavendish's *Women on the Line* (1982); and Westwood's, *All Day Everyday: Factory and Family in the Making of Women's Lives* (1984).

---

[5]Perhaps the most important work exploring the origins and character of working-class exclusion in this era, *Poverty the Forgotten Englishmen* by Coates and Silburn (1970), stands as a challenge to the post-war ideological construction, by both social democracy and the Conservative Party, that everyone benefited from the post-1945 settlement.

Oakley published *Housewife* in 1974 in response to the absence of any sociological analysis, or indeed interest in women's domestic work and its impact on their paid employment. The discipline, dominated by men, colluded with the ideology of a feminine domesticity, and as the innate is not the concern of sociology, women's domestic work became 'not the concern' of sociology. Consequently, millions of hours of unpaid work which directly benefited both men and capital, to the detriment of women, were erased magically from the sociological agenda. So all-consuming was this ideology of female domesticity, the very validity of women hinged upon their acceptance of the domestic role and their abilities within it.

Oakley challenged this dominant narrative through a socio-historical analysis which saw the emergence of the housewife role during the industrial revolution as a consequence of the struggle over women's labour power in the context of the separation of work and home/family life. Housewife, she concluded, is fundamentally a political term, embedded with power, which both defines and controls women.

While firing a full-throttle missile at the neglect of women by male-dominated sociology, Oakley used the concerns and vocabulary of the SoW to examine the conditions of work and labour processes of the housewife. Women's work in the home, she concludes, is the poorest of poor work—unpaid, unregulated, routine, unsafe, isolated, never-ending, unrecognised (it comes naturally, after-all) and unrepresented (by trade unions). The work was a consciousness-expanding read which represented a reconfiguration of the SoW. Oakley wrote about the nature of the 'workplace' in the domestic environment, tasks and 'tools' in a way no other British sociologist had before: the availability of tools (vacuum cleaners, washing machines) and their impact on the burden of work; work tasks (getting a child to sleep, to eat) and meeting the expectations of 'superiors' (making something 'interesting for him to eat').

Through a series of case studies, in which women from differing class backgrounds provided verbatim accounts of their work, we gain insight into the weight of the work, their emotions and anxieties, the human cost of this type of labour and the ambivalence with which women approached it—none truly hated their work, many felt conflicted, emotionally confused and colluded with the expectations of others. Indeed, ambivalence was one of the central themes explored. Women are bound and defined by this work and yet struggle within it—expectations are passed on from mother to daughter, from mother to son: one woman claimed that she could not meet the expectations of her husband as his mother was 'an amazing woman', that is, 'a gifted housewife'.

Oakley's work was genuinely seminal, no longer could work legitimately be considered something that happened in the realm only of paid employment. The connection between ascribed roles in the home and outcomes in the paid workplace was firmly established. This is a fundamentally feminist work, not simply because of its focus on women's inequality but also because it offers a cry to arms—don't pass on the doctrine of housework to your daughters! Consequently, it became critical to the development of a SoW from below, driven as it was by the energy and anger of the second wave of feminism. As such, it reflected another feature of the idea of the developing *spread* we described above with respect to the importance of extra institutional social science ideas and research practices on the trajectory of our work. *Spread*, in other words, from beyond the academy.

It is impossible to think about Cavendish's *Women on the Line* (1982) without also thinking of Pollert's *Girls, Wives, Factory Lives* (1981). Published within a year of each other, both sought to fill a gap in understanding the nature of mass production work experienced by working-class women. These are socialist feminist accounts of the workplace, and unconcerned with dispassion, 'validity' or the potential for the reproduction of the research. Both writers were explicit from the outset about their own socialist and feminist politics. It was feminist curiosity and anger that broadened the focus of attention beyond the workplace—the personal as political—which links the ideology of femininity to domestic work and in turn to the workplace.

Through differing research methodologies, both books produced compelling accounts of the hardship of repetitive manual work, the injustice of what were then understood as married women's wages, and the negligence of managers, men and unions to the labelling of 'unskilled' or low skilled work associated, unjustly, with what women actually did. These accounts are intimate, angry and sympathetic and display a curiosity about the lives of women which extended beyond the workplace.

Cavendish did not set out to do research, but rather to experience working class work and to understand working-class women and their lives better. Disillusioned by her own political staleness and in teaching 'the theory of theory' (1982, p. 2), in 1978 she took a job on the line at a factory which made car parts. The account which resulted from that research provides a moving and visceral insight into the labour of working-class women over a seven-month period. With working days running from 7.30 a.m. until 4.15 p.m., she could not physically, economically or mentally sustain the work long-term, despite an initial intention to stay in the job and contribute to the community. This is a deeply affecting account of alienation under

capitalism (the physical divisions created by the line, the lack of control, the physical exhaustion) and of the political and human impact of the multiple and interwoven structures of gender, class and race inequality.

Cavendish's work is remarkable for its first-hand and explicit insight into three important aspects of working-class women's work: the enormous challenge of the work itself; the all-encompassing nature of women's inequality, how that was reproduced and legitimated; how women 'got by' in spite of almost impossible circumstances. The vast majority of Cavendish's colleagues on the line were migrant women from Ireland, the Caribbean or Asia. Also in Cavendish we begin to see the long walk out of the sub-discipline's myopia where the latter for too long remained unseen. The women carried out complex work in a time scale neither set, nor controlled by them:

> most days I worked so hard I could not look up at all, or had to work extra specially fast to unwrap a piece of chewing gum, or take a sip of tea (1982, p. 19).… We could not do the things you would normally not think twice about like blowing your nose or flicking hair out of your eyes; that lost valuable seconds—it wasn't included in the layout so no time was allowed for it…if you really couldn't keep up you were out. (1982, p. 41)

Much of the time away from work was spent recovering, sleeping and eating.

Discrimination against women workers was embedded in every aspect of the work process. In the week before the implementation of the Sex Discrimination Act (1975), men were removed from the line and assigned new roles so that their protected status and superior wage could be 'legitimately' preserved. Only long-standing women workers were afforded staff status (in-work benefits), while all men and office workers were granted this from the outset. Boys of 16 were provided with training, while women learned their 'unskilled work' by sitting next to another who was neither credited, nor paid, for that training. Men had career structures, women had jobs. Women's work, no matter how challenging, no matter how long it took to perfect, was always considered unskilled or semi-skilled,

> Men were not a homogeneous group but from where we were on the line, anyone with any skill or any training was a man, anyone in any authority was a man and any man had authority. (1982, p. 79)

Cavendish's work explores in detail the intersection of class, race, age and gender in a way few books have done, before or since. Her work illuminated the racist marginalisation and casual discrimination faced by migrant and black British women—black women rarely made it to supervisory levels and never to white-collar work.

Pollert's (1981) ethnographic account of women workers in a tobacco factory provides insight into the narratives that women form about their own lives and work. Pollert notes that younger women dreamed of marriage, children and domesticity as a route to escaping the monotony and of their workplace, while older women bemoaned the hardship of the double burden. It is therefore a powerful account of the realities of working class, female manual work and the ideologies women contend with and sometimes embrace.

There are, in these two accounts, common themes in terms of class and feminist politics. They sprang from the 'second wave' of feminism and specifically from a socialist agenda which engaged directly with class politics and one which sought to 'get back' to the point of production. Specifically, they graphically illustrate how the unpaid and paid work of women is interconnected, forged in the ideologically driven notion of the inferiority of their gender. Each has a common feminist connection with the earlier work of Oakley.

Though we have only limited space, a tour of this period must surely include reference to Westwood's political economy of life within and beyond the labour market and specifically a workplace occupied by Asian women garment workers. If the setting of *All Day Every Day* is a Leicester textile factory in the early 1980s, the site of exploration is broader, taking us to the women's families and their communities in order to show how we cannot explain workplace behaviour, and vice versa, community and home life, without understanding their mutual interpenetration, one with the other. *Avant la lettre*, Westwood provides what some today would describe as an account of the intersectionality of labour, ethnicity and gender in and beyond work. However, she saw these not as separate interacting identities but rather as *the mutually reinforcing identities* of *class, patriarchy and ethnicity constituted by the historically specific dialectics of a post-colonial society.*

These four exemplars provide powerful narratives of survival, aspiration and of the ways in which explicit and implicit sexism and racism work against women in the workplace (from employers and male-dominated trade unions), the realities of the hardship of paid and unpaid work, and of life outside of work. While Beynon wrote of the ability of male Ford workers, through solidarity, to secure wages in compensation for the 'death' that occurs within work, Cavendish and Pollert's women were not able to do so. Much of this can be understood through reference to Oakley's women being seen by employers, male colleagues, trade unionists and often themselves as 'pin money workers', supplementing the male wage, drawing upon 'innate skills' which were undervalued even where the work was highly challenging.

More broadly, the work we exemplify in this period reflected, as both examination and tribute, the developing break-up of the post-war social democratic consensus within the workplace. The body of work developed by MacDonald and colleagues (1991, 2005, 2014), which we explore later, burrowed into this disintegration in relation to the absence of paid employment, and the impact on community relations. Far from the halcyon days of a newly vibrant SoW studying the dialectic of strongly unionised workers and bosses pulling together-pulling apart, this period required an explanation of the character of variant forms of social fermentation. With Fordist industry in decline, the growing eclipse of the certainties of post-war labour regulation, and the consequences of this for work beyond work, a number of work sociologists whose formation had included not only the classic tradition began to exert an alternative influence. Feminists, socialist-feminists, Marxists and others whose formation lay in a range of political and social science perspectives within and outside clearly defined sociological, not to say SoW traditions, produced work that became part of the canon of the SoW. Thus, the notion of *spread* can be seen to have another dimension.

We defined institutional and intellectual *spread* with the latter referring to the impact of mainstream academic influences, from economics, and anthropology to history and psychology, but now we witness in this second period the growing impact of extra academic ideas from new left Marxism to socialist feminism. In the third period, which sees the rise of neoliberalism, the impact of class struggle from above can be seen to exert its influence both within the class structure and the working class and the academy and notably the SoW. The work we now exemplify, in various registers, began to examine the nature of class hegemony, community fragmentation and the relationships between the extant decline of collectivist practices and the management ideologies that nourished decline. The latter would prove to be the beating heart of workplace subordinations and eventually more widely of neoliberalism. Both agent and beneficiary of social democratic decline, the new management practices would prove crucial in providing the narrative for the formation of contemporary working-class practices. This would be crucial in the debate over the so-called rise of individualism and the eclipse of collectivism throughout the late 1980s until today.

1990s–2000s

Beynon and Austrin's *Masters and Servants: Class and Patronage in the Making of a Labour Organisation* (1994); Garrahan and Stewart's *The Nissan Enigma* (1992) (NE); Bradley, Erickson, Stephenson and Williams's

Myths at Work (2000); MacDonald and Coffield's *Risky Business; Youth and the Enterprise Culture* (1991); MacDonald et al.'s *Growing up in Poor Neighbourhoods* (2005); MacDonald et al.'s *In Search of 'Intergenerational Cultures of Worklessness': Hunting the Yeti and Shooting Zombies* (2014).

Beynon and Austrin's *Masters and Servants: Class and Patronage in the Making of a Labour Organisation* (1994) took us back to a focus on mining, in particular the history of the Durham coalfield from the beginning of the eighteenth century, until the inter-war years of the twentieth century. While the book offered a comprehensive view of the development of the coal industry in Durham, the central theme of the book was the struggles of miners to overcome the so-called Durham System. This involved the use of bonded labour and tied housing, a system that the authors describe as a form of pre-capitalist contract labour that created a 'paternalistic-aristocratic form of domination' (p. 363).

The attitudes of the employers towards the miners of Durham was summed up in the following quote taken from a letter from a colliery manager to Lord Londonderry, a major landowner in Durham, regarding an enquiry into the coal industry in 1842.

> What we have to guard against is any legislative interference in the established customs of our particular race of pitmen. The stock can only be kept up by breeding, it never could be invented from an adult population. (pp. 27–28)

It was the Durham System of paternalistic practices, such as tied housing, and the ongoing controls of bonded labour, that the miners were fighting against. They saw trade unionism as the only way of freeing themselves from a paternalist system that was based upon aristocratic elitism and the established religion of the Church of England. By contrast,

> Primitive Methodist preachers appeared as a democratic, progressive form of religion, and one through which the ubiquitous power of the masters could be opposed. (p. 36)

Following a number of failed strikes during the nineteenth century, the Durham Miners Association (DMA) was finally established in 1869, and the hated 'bond' was ended. While the DMA was forthright in maintaining centralised control of its own coalfield, it went to great lengths to resist equal centralisation at a national level.

While the authors provided clear insights into all aspects of life in the mining communities of Durham, including evidence of life underground

and, particularly, the constricted lives of women, the main strength of the work was its account of the formation and development of the trade union that, at its height, represented the largest coalfield in the world. While the fight for trade union recognition by the Durham miners was achieved through radical methods, as it developed organisationally it became part of the Co. Durham establishment and, to a great extent, excluded radicalism within in its own fiefdom. Finally, Beynon and Austrin's work highlighted the extent to which this narrative of working-class occupational formation and hegemony rested upon the compelling combination of sociology and history, cultural analysis and acute understanding of the political economy of temporal class formation. For us, *Masters and Servants* was a crucial study in the development of a radical SoW in the tradition that challenged developing nostrums about class as merely one form of identity amongst others. It was an analysis of social structure that allowed for the re-emergence of research linking change to class structure and class antimonies. In an era when the zeitgeist was to focus on claims of the end of class, in terms of intellectual affiliation and political temper, *Masters and Servants* paved the way for a range of work challenging the new orthodoxies abandoning a focus on class and social inequality.

An example of such was *The Nissan Enigma* (1992) (NE) by Garrahan and Stewart which confronted the new management agenda which determined to break worker and union collectivism. Recognising the salience and power of management's social techniques of subordination, the NE placed these within the wider political economy of embedded neoliberalism at both local and national levels. Nissan's internal factory regime required new techniques of control precisely because management was so invasive within and beyond the workplace. The labour process, the so-called 'Nissan Way' (Wickens 1987), would inevitably create resistance that might be either collective or individual and would, in either event, result from struggles against class subordination (Stephenson and Stewart 2001).

Similarly, *Myths at Work* (2000) by Bradley, Erickson, Stephenson and Williams was described by Grint as a 'welcome return' to one of sociology's fundamental tasks, a critical study of work practices and processes. *Myths* challenged dominant narratives that suggested not only was the neoliberal reconstruction of work inevitable, it was good for us. The fundamental building blocks of neoliberal mythology were demolished, chapter by chapter: the 'death of class'; the 'economic worker'; the benefits to workers of 'flexibility and lean production'; the 'female take over' and the 'death of trade unionism'.

Conversely, at around the same time a new kind of research became manifest that focussed on the character and form of what was interpreted by its advocates as the demise of workplace collectivism. In tune with the zeitgeist in the academy and in harmony with the increasing embeddedness of neoliberalism, a new current of thought working within the sub-discipline, or allied to it philosophically, became entranced by the revolution in management ideologies. The latter extolled the virtues of individualism wrapped up in a cosy blanket of employee involvement signalled by the arrival, not just of firms such as Nissan and Toyota, but also the new consumerism. Some sociologists, and those working within, or wedded to, its intellectual milieu, took management and broader neoliberal nostrums as valid accounts of the genesis and trajectory of changing workplace agency. Believing what was portrayed in a range of management ideologies, the end of worker collectivism was announced. This would have been news to many workers who, in the absence of trade unions, had never given up on collectivism but in any event the issue should have never been about public collectivism including its behavioural referents as Martinez Lucio and Stewart (1998) argued. This group, whom we would define as pessimistic individualists, would not only ignore the radicals but also those digging carefully into the interstices of management attempts to undermine collectivism. Rich research such as that by Collinson (1994) considered various strategies for resisting management control and demonstrated in case studies both that the absence of collective action did not herald the end of collectivism, and that individual agency can establish collective norms to the benefit of everyone. Ramsay's (1977) writing about what he termed 'Cycles of Control' was highly apposite but the new era of neoliberalism was different from previous periods in post-war Britain insofar as the geometry of the employment relationship was being strategically reconfigured by the state, and by working-class political representatives in ways that encouraged ideologies that undermined collective action, if not the collective worker (Martinez Lucio and Stewart 1997; Stewart and Martinez Lucio 2011).

In the neoliberal period, those social groups driving subordination have been able to eschew social alliances with trade unions. Furthermore, both because of this, and as an essential means of re-establishing a different, unitarist collectivism, in contrast to past management practices (including management in universities, naturally), a diet of ideological and labour organising devices has been vital to ensure the success of management performance targets (see the role of impact factors in university research). These are supposed to work at the level of subjective agency and ideology acting to integrate, while disciplining, variance from the norm. Intriguingly, the wider

discipline has developed a sound critique of the impact of neoliberalism on the profession (see notably, Holmwood 2010, 2011, 2013).

Ironically, the work of some sociologists within our field frequently takes for granted the verities of the social form as enunciated by everyday neoliberal culture, when challenging the taken-for-granted is supposedly a critical feature of the sociology of late capitalism. Sometimes acting as a servant of power is not without its stresses, its ambiguities, especially when interpreting the trends, interests and concerns of developing neoliberal cultural tropes. Concerns with Foucauldian notions of power, post-structuralism and post-modernism were for a period the prevailing trends in the SoW as reflected in the obsession with the rise of individualism as opposed to persistence of collectivism. It could be argued that sociology began to reflect some of that neoliberal agenda. This led to an agenda of pessimism, a narrowing of expectations for working-class people; sociology bought it, often taking popular images of society as the only 'real' representations of society. It took for granted that which had to be explained. The problem of the 'demise of collectivism' was resolved through a formalist zero sum juxtaposition of the relationship between individualism and collectivism. While a particular notion of individualism and subjectivity, as espoused by Knights and Willmott (1989) and others, aspiring to what became known as the Foucauldian tradition was rejected, nevertheless, a different and what we see as a conventionalist version of the end of collectivism trope was used as the motor of research (in particular, Ackroyd and Thompson 1999). (See Martinez Lucio and Stewart 1997 for a left radical critique of both approaches.) These two approaches either misinterpreted or forgot much of what we thought we had understood of the complexity of class and agency established in the sub-discipline in the post-war period. We were now at a point where the various approaches were talking past one another, dispersal, if not dissipation.

Radical, non-institutional influences on the SoW can provide examples of *spread* beyond the traditional confines of the academy. An important exemplar is the highly acclaimed book, *Willing Slaves: How the Overwork Culture Is Ruling Our Lives*, by journalist Madelaine Bunting. This work we comfortably place in the field since it linked to the genealogy of critical writing and research based on a radical political economy interpreting work defined in and outside the workplace.

Similalry, Rob MacDonald and his collaborators might be dismissed by purists as being outside of the traditional realm of the SoW since he does not focus on the workplace but rather on the tenuous and fragile nature of the relationship between poor working-class people, their communities and their work. Over a 20-year period, using a variety of methodologies, MacDonald and his collaborators (only some of their work is examined here) developed longitudinal insight into how those living in post-industrial

communities navigated the end of their industry, the pains of unemployment, the challenges of growing up poor and the indignity of their work ethic being questioned. The common denominator in these investigations has been the fragility and poverty of available paid work.

Economists and social scientists now recognise that, as a result of the dual pressures of neoliberalism and globalisation, a section of the working class can now better be described as a 'Precariat', a group whose work is poor in every way and whose employment is fragile to the point that their very survival hangs by a thread (Standing 2011, 2014, 2017). As this precariousness results from the insecure and exploitative nature of work and employment, it would be remiss for this chapter to exclude studies which focus on those lives and struggles. We cannot, as sociologists of work, see the lives of these people as no longer relevant, simply because employment is no longer available to them. In our view, that would be to forget that the longue durée of neoliberalism is neither acceptable nor inevitable.

MacDonald and his colleagues provided a blow-by-blow account of the impact of globalisation and the privatisation of once-nationalised industries on the lives of the unemployed, and how young people faced the challenge of attaining adulthood in regions where pride in work and self-reliance had been strong. MacDonald and Coffield (1991) charted the meteoric rise of industrial Teesside and its equally dramatic decline in the 1980s. State-instigated self-employment schemes were revealed as attempts to reduce employment rates and remodel Britain as an economy of the 'self-employed'. Risky Business (1991) was a visceral account of the human cost of this 'adventure'. The collapse of employment opportunities and the emergence of workfare-style employment schemes lead one young worker to bemoan, now famously, that all that was left was 'shit jobs and govvy [Government] schemes'. 'Restart' programmes heralded the shape of things to come as the working class was redefined in Government policy as 'lacking' in all ways (skill, adaptability, endeavour, and work ethic).

MacDonald et al.'s (2005) longitudinal work on Teesside following deindustrialisation examines how young working-class people 'got by' with poor quality and intermittent paid employment. Set against the context of a shrinking and hostile state, employment, housing, and physical and emotional security are facilitated only by those who share the same plight and consequently the poor are inextricably tied for survival to an environment within which only poverty is available. While the neoliberal expectation is that each individual pursues their own economic imperative, here we see the reality—mutuality and co-operation are essential strategies for survival in poor communities: geographic mobility presents real dangers.

Against the mantra of individualism and competition, the explanation for the decline of once-vibrant industrial communities came in the shape of an underclass thesis which placed the blame for poverty at the door of the working class themselves (Murray 1990). Politicians have insisted on the existence of families where 3 or 4 or more generations had known no work in order to evidence a widespread intergenerational culture of work-lessness (Duncan-Smith 2010; Grayling 2011). MacDonald et al.'s (2014) critical case study of Teesside and Glasgow, two of the most deprived areas in Europe, sought to find that culture, with the view that if such a culture existed it would be found in these urban spaces. Their findings confound the 'worker' vs 'shirker' narrative so popular in the British press, suggesting that a strong commitment to work remained, and, despite the poor availability of paid work, voluntary and community work engagement was high. Work is done and is valued even in the absence of pay, a point supported by McKenzie, in her excellent ethnography, *Getting By* (2015). Families with three generations of worklessness could not be found.

Shooting Zombies and Hunting Yetis (2014) did that rare thing of crossing the divide between the worlds of academia, media and popular understanding. The purported 'death of the work ethic' among the poor was a 'Zombie idea'—without substance it walked among us, undead, serving an ideological purpose, after this work even the popular media had to take note.

This brings us to one of the intellectually enfeebling nostrums of our time from which, inevitably, as the science of society, sociology and the SoW, cannot be immune. From the latter perspective, it can be taken as read that by this we mean rather more than the notion that the SoW will reflect what is happening in the world of work it describes. For us, the SoW not only offers accounts of change but will also shape, define and prosecute social change in and at work. If this was characteristic of leading research in the 1950s, as we have argued, when so many sociologists sought to drive home the importance of national reconstruction, it is reasonable to argue that, *pace* Althusser, the ideology in which they lived was contested even while it was subordinating. And if we wonder who was subordinated, not just by the state and respectable society more widely, a helpful experiment might be to seek out all those studies of WBI workers—women, black and Irish. Typically, WBI workers were marginalised in myriad ways in society and by our discipline during the halcyon days of the Golden Age. Stick with the main players of post-war delight: the gilded, mostly white, blue-collar workers and those beneficiaries of post-war reconstruction.

Our period, beginning in the late 1990s, of supposed social fragmentation characterised by the rise of individualism and the concomitant demise

of collectivism, can be the story of the success of neoliberalism. Yet, it is surely too generous to the conceit of this ideology that today, in contrast to the past, everyone loves himself/herself, mostly, and others, much less. Surveying research that takes as wonders the contempt by dominant social groups for those defeated, it is depressing to read in so much work that the reason why individualism is the new big thing is because collectivism is dead. This new narrative is from a story that, as with older versions (Therborn 1976) extoling the virtues of bourgeois individualism, and with it, implicit notions of individual liberty and choice, takes for granted that the weakness of working-class collectivism is due to the demise of the working class and, or, its forms of collective action. It is uncommon to see arguments which problematize, by historicising, determinate contemporary forms of working-class activity. What is more, this view of class and solidarity makes sense if one has a view of class conflict as only and everywhere taking the shape of the kinds of class conflict redolent of the Fordist era. Certainly, it will be obvious that a 1950s or 1960s understanding of ideological class formation and activities will be at a loss to explain the actions and successes of workers struggling against the instituted patterns of exploitation and subordination characteristic of the early twenty-first-century platform economy. Collectivism is not reducible to workers (usually male) marching behind trade union banners or mass strikes even when these still persist (Martinez Lucio and Stewart 1998; Stephenson and Stewart 2001).

Discussion

In seeking to provide a different narrative on the trajectory of the SoW since the Second World War, we have argued that the way in which the sub-discipline evolved necessarily has to be placed within the context of the social concerns of the dominant social alliances of the period. The post-war settlement saw an emphasis on the origins and problems surrounding the preoccupation with labour productivity and in so doing produced a sociology reflecting the interests of dominant social groups. Yet, the fact that this is never addressed as part of an internal critique, a sociology of sociology, is itself a matter of interest. This period, from the early 1950s through to the late 1960s and early 1970s, is typically described as a period heralding a Golden Age for the SoW and the wider discipline of Sociology. For us, however, it is the thing—the idea of a Golden Age—that must be explained, because as sociologists writing in the twenty-first century given the insights about both newer and older forms of subordination provided by a range of

approaches from our own and other disciplines, the myopia of 1950s and early 1960s published research stands like the proverbial elephant in the room. Otherwise, we would have to assume that the great sociologists typically cited in the Golden Age literature simply ignored the plight of the newly arrived Irish, Asian and Caribbean workers of whatever gender, deeming them unimportant.

In some respects that was true, the discipline did see them as less deserving of study because the SoW was attuned almost entirely to the concerns of the leading beneficiaries of the post-war settlement—strongly unionised blue-collar workers often with significant workplace control. Today, obsession with the spirit of individualism and consequent paeans to individual freedom are the hallmark of much contemporary SoW, as many recognise. This is because attempting to understand the spirit of the age, and those who promote it at work and in employment, is what animates the SoW.

That said, our wider point is to argue that it is also more complicated than this. To get a tighter grasp of the nature of the SoW and its formation, it may be helpful to take on board Therborn's view that Sociology, as an 'historical product' (1976, p. 37), has to be understood in the context of the spirit of the age. Concerned with making sense of a newly developing industrial capitalism, sociology was an important part of a 'type of ideological community' (p. 222) that it both reflected and articulated (p. 224). Moreover, it was central to an ideological community that was terrified of the masses and especially as the nineteenth century progressed, the latter's organisation in the form of labour unions and on occasion their revolutionary practices—and sometimes revolutionary organisations. While much of this conservatism was recognised by Wright Mills (see his use of the trope of 'Cow Sociology' and its significance after the First World War), unfortunately it may be insufficient to let SoW itself off the hook. Our point is that it is not just those Cow sociologists who are at fault for this is not a question of 'fault'. The point of the story is to show that historically, and more recently, the SoW principally has reflected the concerns of the dominant social actors and their discourses.

This is also a tale of the changing character of the narrators themselves. Therborn tells a very interesting story of the opening up of American sociology in the 1960s and 1970s to 'a militant opposition […] the Sociology Liberation Movement […] Sociologists for Women in Society' (p. 13). This process of institutionalisation–deinstitutionalisation could be seen to provide a helpful framing for our own time. One way to develop this is to go somewhat further than Strangleman's intriguing socio-historical agenda, after the inspiration of EP Thompson, to restore the lost history of workers

in their various attitudes as one of the objects of the sub-discipline. More than this, for it is not about restoring the lost innocence of the SoW, of telling the story of the heroic Golden Age, but rather that those telling the stories can be reflective of those who were previously (and contemporarily) socially, subordinated and culturally and intellectually excluded. The diversity, the lack of institutional rootedness in departments of sociology, is a testimony to the fact that the SoW might now be seen to speak for a range of 'ideological communities' now that class solidarities have been redefined in the period of neoliberal subordination. This matters, for it is visible in the sociologies challenging subordination, that the SoW is no longer the intellectual property of mostly white, originally mostly middle class, mostly male, academics from hegemonic ethic communities. This opposition, this contrast between the SoW in the 1950s and the 2000s in itself goes some way to explaining why the great sociologists from the LSE and Liverpool in the 1950s did not think immigrants and their work, or women and their work, constituted the most important object of study for the SoW. (In a retrospective on his early formation in the sub-discipline in the 1960s, Eldridge refers to his work on Thurley's project on supervisors which took him to an engineering plant in the English Midlands. While he highlights the fact that all the shopfloor works were women, it is an observation that does not, even at this distance, bear (re)consideration.)

Today's *spread* of the SoW within and beyond the academy is a positive turn, representing as such an encouraging assault upon the genesis, and the motor, of contemporary patterns of subordination in the discipline and in wider society. Thus, not only was the Golden Age not immune from cultural and ideological pressures. It is not just a question of recognising that the SoW considered different themes and topics as capitalism evolved, but that the way in which it considered different concerns was reflective of the zeitgeist of the era. Today's zeitgeist reflects a very different set of obsessions as reflected and reproduced in the SoW. As Dardot and Laval (2013) point out, neoliberal ideologies are not just about economics, but are in the very air we breathe. For the authors, 'neo-liberalism, far from being an ideology or economic policy, is firstly and fundamentally a *rationality*, and as such tends to structure and organize not only the action of rulers, but also the conduct of the ruled' (p. 4): it is the '*rationality of contemporary capitalism*'. Finally, 'An historic construct and general norms of existence, neoliberalism can be defined as a set of discourses, practices, and apparatuses' (p. 7).

It is in this sense that we can begin to understand the absences in the evolution of the SoW. Precisely, from the early post-war period until the late 60s, myopia, or plain non-appearance, was especially evident when it came to

understanding gender and other social inequalities, migrant workers and, until more recently, the persistence of class-in-conflict. For sure, there was much discussion of inequality, but this was not the same as discussing the dynamics of class divisions. This period of hegemony, of dominant power narratives of social structure with consequent assumptions about how and what were legitimate fields of study, persisted until the slow breakdown of the post-war social settlement in the 1970s. It is to a more recent critical SoW *and employment* that we need to reach for in contemporary understandings of work.

Conclusion

The notion that during the 1950s the SoW acted in the service of power should not be taken to imply that the sub-discipline benefited capital in some straightforward, instrumental, fashion. On the contrary, this was a social science in the service of a dominant power coalition constituted by social democratic norms and value systems, an ideological community no less, in which sociology played its part. It was a period of ambiguity that resulted from the post-war settlement founded as it was on working-class strength. As such, while the labour movement may have been complicit as a servant of power, engagement and outcomes were more ambiguous and reflected competing class interests. It was a hegemony that depended upon a vibrant class struggle from below, and while incorporation was its vital characteristic, dominant working-class communities were its significant beneficiaries. It was not that the excluded, women workers, migrant workers and others were without significance. For a sociology of the SoW however, it is important that we try to understand the way in which sociologists of work wrote about (or more usually did not) the various social, economic and political exclusions during the Golden Age.

Neoliberal rule, characteristic of the current period, is revealing of a different kind of hegemony. Now, inclusion is not through incorporation via collective class institutions. On the contrary, a different type of class struggle, class struggle from above, depends upon incorporation via collective exclusion. The fragmentation of working-class institutions has encouraged, while at the same time it has depended upon, an ideology of individualism, an essential ingredient of Dardod and Lavel's (p. 4) 'rationality of contemporary capitalism'. If the Fordist era can be characterised as one whereby the working class was subordinated by *collective* incorporation, the so-called post-Fordist era can be seen as one in which the working class is subordinated by *individual* incorporation even when, ironically, as with group and

team building measures, these take pseudo-collectivist forms. Among a range of other things sociologists of work could be expected to unpack are the various conceits lying at the heart of neoliberal ideologies of victory. One such is that broadcasting the peculiar notion that individualism is now more salient than collectivism. Despite empirical work illustrating the shaky ground on which this dogma is constructed, it is argued that people today are more individualistic than they were when they voted to go on strike in the 1950s and 1960s. As if, that is to say, it can be argued that the idea of instrumental collectivism had nothing to do with a self-serving individualism in the past.

Thus, the notion of a Golden Age in the SoW is problematic because it assumes that the period of sub-disciplinary consolidation between 1945 and 1975, during which major research was seen to form the basis for the development of what was the SoW genre, was superseded by a period of stasis and then fragmentation, if not dissipation. In short, the Golden Age was followed by the fall. A major drawback with reading the story using this now common narrative (the first part of it at any rate) is that it looks at developments in the SoW in terms of its supposed fragmentation. However, we see fragmentation in two ways which, though related in temporal terms, are actually different in kind. One refers to institutional fragmentation, while the other addresses the perceived concern of disciplinary fragmentation. Looking at this from the standpoint of a sociology of the sociology of work (Castillo 1999), we can define the concern in two ways, internal and external.

It is precisely this fear of a loss of disciplinary control over the practice of the SoW that has led some to evoke the idea of the 'Golden Age'. That not everyone constructs a 'Golden Age' and uses it in this way goes without saying. It has different purposes according to circumstance, but from our perspective it is problematic for the following reasons.

Firstly, the notion of a Golden Age is typically associated with the 1950s and the perception of its import, a retrospective invention obviously that cannot be divorced from time and context. This was a period of high growth, working-class organisation and a managed economy. Confidence in, and access to, research in industry and working-class communities was possible because of this. The discipline seemed to be coherent and focussed because this was the period of its consolidation in the bourgeois academy, committed to, in this instance, exploring issues around conflict and insubordination (order and disorder) and in a world in which labour, and specifically the organised working class, was presumed to be committed to the great phase of national reconstruction. In other words, this was not so much a Golden

Age so much as a context which was relatively fertile in terms of access and opportunity. Had other periods offered such opportunities then they might well have been lauded as 'golden' since they also address contexts and structures, prompting disciplinary opportunities, imaginings, new questions and methodologies of engagement.

Second, in relation to the question of social class and inequality, as well as lauding what was produced, we emphasised the question of what was *not produced—what was absent*? It is difficult in the sociological canon of the post-war period to find accounts of the working lives of non-white workers, migrant workers and almost impossible to find any account of the work of women before the influence of second-wave feminism.

Thus, the post-war period while important was not the only period in which the 'best' sociology was practiced. Migrants, notably those from the Caribbean and Ireland during the early post-war period, were central to the nationalised industries and the private building sector. This is germane to our argument concerning the relationship between dominant social discourse, the trajectory of what are perceived to be dominant social groups in society, and the study of these *as they were constituted by the SoW*. Irish immigrants, especially alongside migrants from the Caribbean, while increasingly important to the organised working class, were nevertheless culturally and ideationally excluded from its concerns. (See O'Grady 1997, for an extraordinary narrative of the travails of post-war Irish-speaking migrant workers in London's building industry unable to communicate in English.) Of course, it was the latter, the organised working class in all its colour-blind ways, that was of such interest to post-war studies of labour productivity, solidarity, order and control. During that so-called Golden Age, unpaid work and the absence of paid work were not considered worthy of reflection.

The mantra of the Golden Age fails to acknowledge how that context presented opportunities for research but at the same time legitimated and facilitated the narrowness of the gaze of that work (typically *within* the workplace). It elevates an era as though it were the endeavour of the 'greats' to produce 'pure sociology' without recognising both the limitations of that body of work and the socio-political context that made it possible. This was temporary, and when circumstances changed, access to workplaces would be considerably circumscribed. Future researchers would necessarily explore the absence of work, unregulated work and work in the home. Both the gaze and the access were to be challenged by a range of factors in the 1970s and 1980s; the feminist focus on the nature and meaning of work; the growing acknowledgement of racism; economic decline and the assault of neoliberalism on work practices and trade unions. If the 1950s in some respects

reflected the supersession of equality struggles over class struggles, the late 1990s saw the beginnings of a new focus on class: class from below, as articulated in a series of research agendas whose lineage we trace back to Beynon and then, as feminists trained in the profession, women in paid and unpaid work.

If we are to take as given the notion of the Golden Age as something to emulate or return to, we challenge the legitimacy of the latter. Feminist SoW explores non-paid contexts and the relationships between the paid/unpaid contexts. The research by those exploring marginalised, migrant and BME workers, and work exploring the fragmentation and fragility of the gig, hyphenated experience (MacDonald et al. 1991, 2005, 2014; McBride et al. 2018), is vital to our understanding of the new terrain of the developing SoW in the UK. Lastly, the pursuit of the so-called Golden Age leads to a neglect of the importance and meaning of work for those who find that their work 'is done' (Waddington 2017; Stephenson and Wray 2017). To this extent, we might say that the Golden Age fostered myopia and neglect, particularly of the vulnerable and marginalised. For the continued renewal of the SoW, we might conclude with a new mantra: its muck and brass, not gold that matters and our own, admittedly partial, take on aspects of the SoW points to thematic areas that can be taken further in the continuously *spreading* sub-discipline. Perhaps we should forget the concern with disciplinary *spread* since the 1960s. To do so means that we might be better placed to develop a sociology of the sociology of work that can address the issues of disciplinary struggles beyond sociology departments. We can begin to better position the sub-discipline as an 'historical product', (just as important in our time, as it has always been), as a crucial feature of a 'type of ideological community' contested in myriad ways according to social class, power, status and orientation.

Bibliography

Abrams, P. (1982). *Historical Sociology*. Shepton Mallet: Open Books.

Ackroyd, S., & Thompson, P. (1999). *Organisational Misbehaviour*. London: Sage.

Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (2002). Identity Regulation as Organizational Control: Producing the Appropriate Individual. *Journal of Management Studies, 39*(5), 619–644.

Beck, V., Brook, P., Carter, B., Clark, I., Danford, A., Hammer, N., et al. (2016). Work, Employment and Society Sans Frontières: Extending and Deepening Our Reach. *Work, Employment and Society, 30*(2), 211–219.

Beynon, H. (1973). *Working for Ford*. London: Penguin.

Beynon, H. (2011). Engaging Labour: British Sociology 1945–2010. *Global Labour Journal, 2*(1), 5–26.

Beynon, H., & Austrin, T. (1994). *Masters and Servants: Class and Patronage in the Making of a Labour Organisation*. London: Rivers Oram Press.

Braverman, H. (1974). *Labour and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. London: Monthly Review Press.

Brewis, J., & Linstead, S. (2003). *Sex, Work and Sex Work: Eroticizing Organization*. London: Routledge.

Brown, R. (1987). Editorial Introduction. *Work, Employment and Society, 1*(1), 1–6.

Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The Management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock.

Castillo, J. J. (1999). Sociology of Work at the Crossroads. *Current Sociology, 49*(2), 21–46.

Cavendish, R. (1982). *Women On the Line*. London: Routledge.

Coates, K., & Silburn, R. (1970). *Poverty the Forgotten Englishmen*. London: Penguin.

Collinson, D. (1994). Strategies of Resistance: Power, Knowledge, Subjectivity in the Workplace. In J. Jermier, D. Knights, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Resistance and Power in Organisations (ITBP)* (pp. 25–68). London: Routledge.

Dardot, P., & Laval, C. (2013). *The New Way of the World: On Neo-Liberal Society*. London: Verso.

Dawson, M., Fowler, B., Miller, D., Rampton, D., & Smith, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Stretching the Sociological Imagination. Essays in Honour of John Eldridge*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Dennis, N., Henriques, F., & Slaughter, C. (1969 [1956]). *Coal Is Our Life: An Analysis of a Yorkshire Mining Community.* London: Tavistock.

Douglass, D. (1972). *Pit Life in County Durham.* History Workshop Pamphlet, Ruskin College, Oxford.

Duncan-Smith, I. (2009). *Broken Britain Can Be Fixed by Its Army of Social Entrepreneurs*. London: Centre for Social Justice (CSJ).

Duncan-Smith, I. (2010). *Centre for Social Justice*. https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/welfare-for-the-21st-century.

Durand, J. P., & Stewart, P. (2014). The Birth of French Labour Sociology After the War: Some Reflections on the Nature of the Corporate State and Intellectual Engagement for the Sociology of Work in the UK Today. *Work, Employment and Society, 28*(6), 1003–1015.

Edwards, P. (2014a). The Sociology of Work: From Industrial Sociology to Work, Employment and Society. In J. Holmwood & J. Scott (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Sociology in Britain*. London: Palgrave.

Edwards, P. (2014b, June). *Were the 40 Years of 'Radical Pluralism' a Waste of Time. A Response to Peter Ackers and Patrick McGovern* (Warwick Papers in Industrial Relations 99).

Eldridge, J. (2009). Industrial Sociology in the UK: Reminiscences and Reflections. *Sociology, 43*(5), 829–845.

Eldridge, J. E. T., Cressey, P., & MacInnes, J. (1991). *Industrial Sociology and Economic Crisis*. Hemel Hempstead: Wheatsheaf.

Elger, A. J. (1975). Industrial Organisations: A Processual Perspective. In J. B. McKinlay (Ed.), *Processing People: Cases in Organisational Behaviour* (pp. 91–149). London: Holt-Blond.

Elger, T. (2009). Teaching the Sociology of Work and Employment: Texts and Reflections. *Sociology, 43*(5), 997–1006.

Glucksmann, M. (1995). Why "Work"? Gender and the "Total Social Organization of Labour". *Gender, Work and Organization, 2*(2), 63–75.

Grayling, C. (2011, May 17). *Minister for Work and Pensions: How to Tackle Unemployment*. https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/how-to-tackle-unemployment.

Grint, K. (Ed.). (2000 [1991]). *Work and Society: A Reader*. Cambridge: Polity.

Halford, S., & Strangleman, T. (2009). In Search of the Sociology of Work: Past, Present and Future. *Sociology, 43*(5), 811–828.

Hall, T. (1981). *King Coal: Miners, Coal and Britain's Industrial Future*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Hassard, J. (1996). Images of Time in Work Organisation. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of Organisation Studies*. London: Sage.

Herbst, P. G. (1962). *Autonomous Group Functioning: An Exploration in Behaviour and Measurement*. London: Tavistock.

Herod, A., Rainnie, A., & McGrath-Champ, S. (2007). Working Space: Why Incorporating the Geographical Is Central to Theorizing Work and Employment Practices. *Work, Employment and Society, 21*(2), 247–264.

Holmwood, J. (2010). Sociology's Misfortune: Disciplinarity, Interdisciplinarity and the Impact of Audit Culture. *British Journal of Sociology, 61*(4), 639–658.

Holmwood, J. (2011). Sociology After Fordism: Prospects and Problems. *European Journal of Social Theory, 14*(4), 537–556.

Holmwood, J. (2013). *Markets, Democracy and Public Higher Education.* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pIcjTopShSg.

Jackson, B. (2017). I Am Woman, I Am Strong. In D. Allsop, C. Stephenson, & D. Wray (Eds.), *Justice Denied: Friends, Foes, and the Miners' Strike*. London: Merlin Press.

Jameson, F. (2011). *Presenting Capital. A Reading of Volume One*. London: Verso.

Knights, D., & Willmott, H. (1989). Power and Subjectivity at Work: From Degradation to Subjugation in Social Relations. *Sociology, 23,* 535–558.

Komlosy, A. (2018). *Work, the Last 1000 Years*. London: Verso.

Kunda, G. (1992). *Tech Culture*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Linstead, S. (1997). The Social Anthropology of Management. *British Journal of Management, 8*(1), 85–98.

Lockwood, D. (1989). *The Blackcoated Worker: A Study in Class Consciousness* (2nd ed.). London: George Allen and Unwin.

MacDonald, R., & Coffield, F. (1991). *Risky Business? Youth and the Enterprise Culture*. Basingstoke: Falmer Press.

MacDonald, R., Shildrick, T., & Furlong, A. (2014). In Search of 'Intergenerational Cultures of Worklessness': Hunting the Yeti and Shooting Zombies. *Critical Social Policy, 34*(2), 199–220.

MacDonald, R., Shidrick, T., Webster, C., & Simpson, D. (2005). Growing Up in Poor Neighbourhoods: The Significance of Class and Place in the Extended Transitions of 'Socially Excluded' Young Adults. *Sociology, 39*(5), 873–891.

MacKenzie, R., Marks, A., & Morgan, K. (2017). Technology, Affordances and Occupational Identity Amongst Older Telecommunications Engineers: From Living Machines to Black-Boxes. *Sociology, 51*(4), 732–748.

Martinez Lucio, M., & Stewart, P. (1997). The Paradox of Contemporary Labour Process Theory: The Rediscovery of Labour and the Disappearance of Collectivism. *Capital and Class, 21*(2), 49–77.

Martinez Lucio, M., & Stewart, P. (1998). Renewal and Tradition in the New Politics of Production. In P. Thompson & C. Warhurst (Eds.), *Workplaces of the Future*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

McBride, J., Smith, A., & Mbala, M. (2018). "You End Up with Nothing" The Experience of Being a Statistic of "In Work Poverty" in the UK. *Work Employment and Society, 32*(1), 210–218.

McKenzie, L. (2015). *Getting by*. London: Policy Press.

Miliband, R. (1989). *Divided Societies: Class Struggle in Contemporary Capitalism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Murray, C. (1990). *The Emerging British Underclass*. London: IEA Health and Welfare Unit.

Nichols, T. (1986). *The British Worker Question: A New Look at Workers and Productivity in Manufacturing*. London: RKP.

O'Grady, T. (1997). *I Could Read the Sky*. London: Harvill Press.

Oakley, A. (1974). *Housewife*. London: Penguin.

Page Arnott, R. (1979). *The Miners, One Union, One Industry: A History of the National Union of Mineworkers 1939–47*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Parker, M. (1999). Capitalism, Subjectivity and Ethics: Debating Labour Process Analysis. *Organization Studies, 20*(1), 25–45.

Parker, M. (2015). Between Sociology and the Business School Critical Studies of Work, Employment and Organization in the UK. *Sociological Review, 63*(1), 162–180.

Parry, J., Taylor, R., Pettigrew, L., & Glucksmann, M. (2006). Confronting the Challenges of Work Today: New Horizons and Perspectives. In L. Pettinger, J. Parry, R. Taylor, & M. Glucksmann (Eds.), *A New Sociology of Work*. Oxford: Blackwell/Sociological Review.

Pettinger, L., Parry, J., Taylor, R., & Glucksman, M. (Eds.). (2006). *A New Sociology of Work*? Oxford: Blackwell and Sociological Review.

Pollert, A. (1981). *Girls, Wives, Factory Lives*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rainbird, H., & Rose, M. (2008). Work, Employment and Society, 1997–2007. Becoming a Sociologically Oriented, International, Multi-disciplinary Journal. *Work, Employment and Society, 22*(2), 203–220.

Ramsay, H. (1977). Cycles of Control: Worker Participation in Sociological and Historical Perspective. *Sociology, 11*(3), 481–506.

Rowlinson, M., & Hassard, J. (2011). How Come the Critters Came to Be Teaching in Business Schools? Contradictions in the Institutionalisation of Critical Management Studies. *Organization, 18*(5), 673–689.

Savage, M. (2010). *Identities and Social Change in Britain Since 1940: The Politics of Method*. Oxford: Open University Press.

Scott, J. (2005). Sociology and Its Others: Reflections on Disciplinary Specialisation and Fragmentation. *Sociological Research Online, 10*(1), 1–8.

Searle-Barnes, R. G. (1969). *Pay and Productivity: Study of the Effect of National Wage Agreements in the Nottinghamshire Coalfield*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Standing, G. (2014). *A Precariat Charter: From Denizens to Citizens*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic.

Standing, G. (2017). *Basic Income: And How We Can Make It Happen*. London: Penguin.

Stephenson, C., & Stewart, P. (2001). The Whispering Shadow: Collectivism and Individualism at Ikeda-Hoover and Nissan UK. *Sociological Research Online, 6*(3), 1–11.

Stephenson, C., & Wray, D. (2009). Now That the Work Is Done: Community Unionism in a Post Industrial Context. In I. Greenwood & J. McBride (Eds.), *Complexities of Community Unionism: A Comparative Analysis of Concepts and Contexts*. London: Palgrave.

Stephenson, C., & Wray, D. (2017). The Gala That Would Not Die: Memory and Heritage in the Post-industrial Mining Communities of County Durham. In A. Allsop, C. Stephenson, & D. Wray (Eds.), *Justice Denied: Friends, Foes & the Miners' Strike*. Exeter: Merlin Press.

Stewart, P. (2004). Work, Employment and Society Today. *Work, Employment and Society, 18*(4), 653–662.

Stewart, P. Martinez, & Lucio, M. (2011). Collective Narratives and Politics in the Contemporary Study of Work: The New Management Practices Debate. *Work, Employment and Society, 25*(2), 327–341. https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017011398890.

Strangleman, T. (2005). Sociological Futures and the Sociology of Work. *Sociological Research Online, 10*(4), 1–12.

Strangleman, T. (2007). The Nostalgia for Permanence at Work? The End of Work and Its Commentators. *The Sociological Review, 55*(1), 81–100.

Strangleman, T. (2016). The Disciplinary Career of the Sociology of Work. In S. Edgell, H. Gottfried, & E. Granter (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of the Sociology of Work and Employment*. London: Sage.

Stuart, M., Grugulis, I., Forde, C., Kirkpatrick, I., Mackenzie, R., & Tomlinson, J. (2011). The More Things Change…Towards 25 Years of the Work, Employment and Society. *Work, Employment and Society, 25*(2), 197–201.

Stuart, M., Grugulis, I., Tomlinson, J., Forde, C., & Mackenzie, R. (2013). Reflections on Work and Employment into the 21st Century: Between Equal Rights, Force Decides. *Work, Employment and Society, 27*(3), 379–395.

Supple, B. (1987). *The History of the British Coal Industry, Vol 4. 1913–1946. The Political Economy of Decline*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Taylor, F. (1911). *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Therborn, T. (1976). *Science, Class and Society. On the Historical Formation of Sociology and Historical Materialism*. London: Verso.

Trist, E. L., & Bamforth, K. W. (1951). Some Social and Psychological Consequences of the Longwall Method of Coal-Getting: An Examination of the Psychological Situation and Defences of a Work Group in Relation to the Social Structure and Technological Content of the Work System. *Human Relations, 4*(3), 3–38.

Waddington, D. (2017). 'Iron Hand': Representations and Ramifications of the "Battle of Orgreave". In A. Allsop, C. Stephenson, & D. Wray (Eds.), *Justice Denied: Friends, Foes & the Miners' Strike*. Exeter: Merlin Press.

Warren, T. (2016). Work and Social Theory. In S. Edgell, H. Gottfried, & E. Granter (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of the Sociology of Work and Employment*. London: Sage.

Watson, T. (2008). *Sociology, Work and Industry*. London: Routledge.

Watson, T. (2009). Work and the Sociological Imagination: The Need for Continuity and Change in the Study of Continuity and Change. *Sociology, 43*(5), 861–877.

Westwood, S. (1984). *All Day Everyday: Factory and Family in the Making of Women's Lives*. London: Pluto.

Wickens, P. (1987). *The Road to Nissan: Flexibility, Quality, Teamwork*. Basingstoke. Palgrave Macmillan.

Wilder, G. (2015). *Freedom Time: Negritude, Decolonisation and the Future of the World*. Durham-NC: Duke University Press.

Wright Mills, C. (1959). *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

2

The Sociology of Work in France

Guillaume Tiffon and Jean-Pierre Durand

Emergence and Maturation of the Sociology of Work (1945–1975)

In the aftermath of the Second World War, France was exhausted and suffering from the material and psychological devastation caused by Allied bombardments and above all the Nazi occupation (including the theft of nation treasures and deporting of countless workers to Germany). The period was characterised by a dual movement: national reconstruction unifying the country's vital forces and the political divisions between, on one hand, employers seeking to revive capitalism and, on the other, the PCF *Parti communiste francais* (the country's largest political party representing 26% of all voters), supported by the powerful CGT *Confédération_Générale_du_Travail* labour union.

It was during this era of national reconstruction that work began to be seen as something central to the kinds of social and political issues that would shortly give birth to the sociology of work, being a discipline that arose in response to the difficult questions researchers faced regarding productivity gains and the effects of increased automation. Other questions were also being asked at the same time about what role work might be expected to play in humanity's future, and more specifically how this might help further social emancipation.

G. Tiffon (✉) · J.-P. Durand
University d'Évry Paris-Saclay, Évry, France

45

The Founders of the Sociology of Work

The sociology of work was born in France as a result of the work of two individuals with very different approaches to life: Georges Friedmann (1902–1977) and Pierre Naville (1904–1993). Friedmann, who had read chemistry before studying philosophy at the *Ecole Normale Supérieure*, published two texts in 1934 and 1935 after visiting the Soviet Union and the United States, followed by a third one based on his dissertation (*Problèmes humains du machinisme industriel*, 1947). Familiar with American sociology and having visited the US twice, he also worked as Academic Director at the *Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes* CNRS lab, where he was responsible for running seminars and supervised the first dissertations and research projects to focus on work as a topic. Through these efforts, he began to be seen as a seminal figure in work and labour-related studies (Pillon 2009), explaining his subsequent introduction into political circles by his brother-in-law, who in 1946 had become France's Minister for National Education. This led to Friedmann being attributed a crucial role in the creation and management of one of the key sites where the sociology of work would ultimately take off, namely the Paris *Institut des Sciences Sociales du Travail* (ISST) think tank that was founded in 1951.

Enjoying support from luminaries such as Georges Gurvitch, Naville joined the CE *Centre d'Etudes Sociologiques* right from the start, regularly meeting with André Breton and his Surrealists, on one hand, and many international Trotskyists, on the other. Naville's analyses of work were always tinged with Marxist overtones and over time he put together a group of researchers that would include William Grossin and Dominique Lahalle (PCF members who had been part of a team constituted by Ambroise Croizat, Minister for Labour until 1947 when the Ramadier government got rid of all Communist ministers) as well as Pierre Rolle, whose vision was closer to the one that Claude Lefort and Cornelius Castoriadis had expressed in their text *Socialisme et Barbarie*. Having become aware of a research programme focusing on the topic of "*automation*" (a popular field of analysis in the United States at the time), "Naville subscribed to this vision, and using his great organisational qualities and capacity for creating fresh ideas requested substantial resources from the CNRS research lab, which granted his wishes. Because the CNRS Human Sciences section always had a small budget, it was also necessary for its General Management to commit to Naville's ambitious programme. In turn, this is what allowed him to fund researchers and establish an Office for Automation Studies located on Avenue Marceau in Paris's 16th arrondissement" (P. Rolle).

Friedmann and the Institut Des Sciences Sociales Du Travail

France's Christian Democrat Party had been trying since 1947 to extend its influence over government policy through the creation of ISST think tanks. Always focused on training union members and employee representatives, the Paris ISST benefited from 1954 onwards from its own Research Section. As noted by Lucie Tanguy (2008), "The body carried the signs of its instigators: top civil servants marked by their work in the Resistance, favourable to change, capable of entrepreneurship in a favourable economic and political situation and enjoying the time required to carry out their plans." The people involved were all linked with France's CFTC *Confédération française des travailleurs chrétiens* trade union and Social Catholicism movement. Friedmann, as an 'activist' for the sociology of work, would also join the ISST Board and by so doing become a central figure in this chosen discipline, developing relationships with a range of relevant institutions including the CNAM, EPHE, CES, Paris *Institut d'Etudes Politiques* (where Friedmann taught) and, of course, the CNRS research lab.[1]

Noting that France lagged far behind the United States—especially in applying research findings in a business environment—the ISST's founders wanted to turn social science into something that could be more immediately instrumental. Their goal was to make sociology a science of action, thereby ensuring its utility within the particular context of a national reconstruction effort. The Social Catholicism concerns that dominated at this level spawned two major (and largely convergent) lines of thinking: employee and worker participation in day-to-day business activities (similar to the industrial democracy project that the Americans were studying at the time) and the transformation of industrial relations to improve knowledge of worker attitudes and behaviour while achieving more harmonious professional relations.

The ISST worked closely together with trade unions and the Ministry of Labour, which paid it a substantial subsidy. ISST researchers also received significant funding from the CGP *Commissariat Général de la Productivité*, the CNP *Comité National de Productivité*, the AFAP *Association Française pour l'Accroissement de la Productivité* and the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). The think tank was broadly associated with missions that periodically visited the United States on behalf of France's Ministry of

---

[1]He also became president of the International Association of Sociology in 1956.

Labour. These teams were composed of university figures and representatives from "free trade unions",[2] employer organisations and government ministries (Education or Labour). The goal was to modernise industrial relations in France by accumulating knowledge "of the place, functioning and doctrines defended by American trade unions" (Tanguy 2008). The ISST, an organisation that broadly applied Friedmannian principles, employed directly or indirectly almost all the authors who would make a name for themselves throughout the late twentieth century, benefiting both from research funding and from an intellectual milieu that encouraged scientific innovation. The end result is that it became a breeding ground for an empirical sociology of work, materialising in Friedmann's allocation of the sociology of work sub-topic[3] to young sociologists requesting his advice or support. Examples included Alain Touraine, sent to Renault to interact with the workers there (Touraine 1955); Michel Crozier, meetings with office employees (Crozier 1956, 1963); Rene Tréanton, focusing on engineers; Jean-Daniel Reynaud, studying industrial relations. Henri Mendras, returning from the United States shortly after this initial period, would not be allocated any of these main research topics, with Friedmann instead giving him advice to return to his native Perigord region in Southwest France to study how local farmers were reacting to a whole set of radical transformations.

ISST research such as, for example, the study of the steel industry in Lorraine, would try to answer the big questions of the day by "determining working class motivation in light of development demands largely driven by technological progress and modernisation. Studies should be guided by existing socio-economic conditions" (Durand 2000). Hence, analyses addressed issues of worker slowdowns or proposals that wages be based on incentivising work norms. Research was also very empirical and quantitative, "directly influenced by American experimental psychology and meant to guarantee a study's scientificity" (authors' interview with Claude Durand).

From the mid-1950s, ISST researchers were looking for ways to publicise their programme. Reports were relatively poorly disseminated at the time and book publishing could be a long and arduous process without any guarantee that output would reach its target audience (HR managers, business executives, union leaders, etc.). Hence, the "meticulous plans made in

---

[2]Regarding who was chosen to join these missions, see L. Tanguy's aforementioned article that the only participants allowed were trade union representatives "who were overtly independent from—or hostile—to the Communist Party."

[3]The sub-topics constituting the sociology of work were organised by categories or sectors of activity. The French term for "sub-topic" (*comté* or county) had been invented by Pierre Rolle.

1957–1958 to launch a review called *Sociologie du travail*. The ISST Board discussed and assessed the format, frequency, target audience, cost and publisher. The review first appeared in 1958, sponsored by Friedmann and with an editorial board where ISST members were directly (Crozier, Tréanton and Reynaud) or indirectly (Touraine) involved" (Tanguy 2008; Borzeix and Rot 2010, 128–149).

Friedmann came to be seen as a formidable critic of Taylorism and Fordism, which he treated from three perspectives: technology, work physiology and social psychology. His excellent knowledge of the Hawthorne experiments also allowed him to scrutinise industrial relations and his perspective would ultimately transcend the status quo in his field. In *Où va le travail humain?* he started questioning "the general march towards subconscious actions, accompanied by the incomplete automation of an increasing number of "repetitive and fragmented" tasks. The question then became whether this trend will continue and how far it will go. Similarly, from a social psychological perspective, he considered how we should be viewing recent developments in assembly line work. How will these increasingly widespread forms of activity affect operatives' outlook? "Should they be feared because in the absence of reforms and appropriate counter-measures they undermine and potentially kill off critical thinking, and/or limit people's personalities?" (1963, 16). Friedmann would highlight workers' lesser efficiency where team members were 'disagreeable' or if workers did not see why they were working or had no chance to talk about what they were doing. Similarly, in *Le travail en miettes*, he showed that for fragmented and repetitive tasks specialist workers could be much more productive than workers who had received "polyvalent training," and that the depletion (impoverishment) of work causes greater absenteeism and a higher defect rate (1964)—an observation that would be repeated and further elaborated during the decades that followed.

Friedmann had very little to say about data compilation methods, although he would stress his own experience as a worker (and training in handling digital machinery). Jean-Michel Chapoulie (1991, 338) later noted that "some of [Friedmann's] books, notably *Où va le travail humain?* suggested that his observations were journalist-like, taking maximum advantage from his necessarily brief previous "visits" and extracting value from interviews with different witnesses (significantly, Friedmann almost never doubted the accuracy of the things that he would learn)."

Pierre Naville and the Centre d'Etudes Sociologiques

France's postwar re-industrialisation witnessed a rapid and massive introduction of automation to the country's factories, along with a generalisation of the scientific organisation of work. Highly influenced by American social psychology as applied to work—with Naville and Rolle having both studied psychology—Naville's teams generally used a range of methods involving work observations, questionnaires and interviews, often supplemented with quantitative data supplied by the companies they were visiting. Measurement became dogma, an approach discussed in the methodology chapter of the *Traité de Sociologie du Travail*, the treatise that Naville co-edited with Friedmann: "Everything relating to work should be measurable, as long as this term is used correctly. (…) Since the purpose and end of all work is production initially destined for the subsistence and perpetuation of the species, experience dictates that social groups must make positive efforts to organise work's modalities and then measure the outputs. Work as a form of activity is specific to a given society, i.e. it is anything but a natural phenomenon. In other words, the measurement of work is the essential trait of any organisation. (…) meaning that its intrinsic requirements fit easily with the specific methodological requirements of science, which is always based on measurement" (Friedmann and Naville 1962, 45–46).

All of the field research undertaken by Pierre Naville and his team during the 1950s–1960s attested to this preoccupation with measurement as a means of comparison and classification. Such research was based on criteria borrowed from natural science. Naville's famous automation survey tried to create an objective measurement of the level, degree and scope of production unit automation by applying a range of American and European tools such as the Bright scale (Naville 1961a, b, 158). Mobilising an extremely sophisticated panoply of criteria and indicators, the entire text tried to measure and compare automation levels across several branches of activities based on a "progressive transfer from people to machines, as witnessed by the number of orders given in a context defined by rising variety and quality" (Naville 1962, 94; Bright 1958). The issue of technological autonomy permeated the text's theoretical developments, which were characteristic of an era associated with great innovations in production technology.

Naville focused heavily on the factory floor, machines and techniques but he was also interested in society and its general transformations. In general, he was always looking for new forms of production, without ever spending much time on older methods and forms. Naville's team was one of the first,

for instance, to work on digital command machines and computers. This predisposition explains his creation, in the late 1950s, of the *Cahiers d'études de l'automation et des sociétés industrielles* review. Having said that, his main focus remained the idea of transcending work as an object, as witnessed by several of his texts including the seminal *Vers l'automatisme social?* which was published in 1963. The book offered detailed analysis of automation-driven changes in work, including instances where direct connection between workers and materials was absent, the greater fluidification characterising all industrial production, the febrile nature of productive systems, and the emergence of new production functions. His most unexpected insight related to "social automatism," based on the concept of a "limited society" being able to function without constraint and using the same freedom, regularity and reproduction as capitalism. This limited society—a different kind of socialism—would be organic, i.e. it would materialise and reproduce via its own movements and the spontaneity of non-state actors. In Rolle's words, "People usually ask questions where they already have the answers, but with Naville, it is the other way around. Just like the negation thesis in *Sociologie et logique*, his reflections cover things that he is not really in a position to control."

Interpreting the Conditions That Gave Birth to the Sociology of Work

During the postwar years, the French sociology of work featured two branches managed by two teams that spent very little time together. As Alain Touraine described it, "People were either with Friedmann or with Naville." Pierre Rolle analysed this similarly, based on the way that Navillians would typically refer to Friedmannians as "reformists." Neither side had any structural relationship with the Communist Party[4] or the CGT, the end result being that the sociology of work—mainly focused on workers themselves[5]—materialised largely outside organised labour movements. One

---

[4]Pierre Naville's team included a few PCF members but they did their research independently of the Party.

[5]But not exclusively, as people tend to think today. Researchers supported by Friedmann were allocated different sub-topics, focusing for instance on employees, farmers or pensioners. This period also saw the first studies on female work (Madeleine Guilbert and Viviane Isambert - Jamati, 1956), immigrant workers (Dominique Lahalle), pensions, company work councils (a 1963 study by Maurice Montuclard, who was a Dominican and had previously served as an organiser in a priest-worker movement) and ageing (Rene Tréanton).

explanation was that the workerism that dominated in the PCF placed little faith in intellectuals' scientific output and preferred full-time members' internal analyses. Another explanation might highlight the primacy of philosophers as PCF intellectuals—a significant factor given their wholesale condemnation of the empiricism being imported from the United States (a country that many viewed as their foe in an era largely defined by the raging Cold War). This was a hypothesis developed by Jean-Michel Chapoulie (1991), one substantiated by the PCF's dependency on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which viewed sociology and psychoanalysis as "bourgeois sciences," with philosophy alone possessing emancipating virtues.

These divergences also resonated in the opposition between Naville and Friedmann's texts, without any real debate occurring due to the absence in this period of seminars and conferences where research findings or contrasting ideas might be scrutinised (a vacuum filled when the *Sociologie du Travail* was launched in 1959).

- For Friedmann, a technical civilisation in which machines play a special role was supposed to enable worker autonomy and creativity so they could be fulfilled as individuals. Hence, the idea of a "future defragmentation of work, based on machines helping to re-unite gestures disaggregated through automation, with future factory workshops accommodating workers who would be the 'equals' of company directors, thereby creating a new contract between workers and capitalists" (authors' interview with Pierre Rolle). This vision was redolent of the industrial democracy theories that the socialist André Philip developed in 1955, which underpinned much postwar thinking.
- For Naville, automation "is not and never will be the antithesis of the fragmentation of tasks nor a possibility for recovering people's lost control. It is a historical form of production that must be recognised and understood so as to comprehend the society that uses it. (…) The differences and hierarchies observed in the field of work are therefore less and less explainable by technological data. In other words, work is increasingly becoming a social product that requires understanding. This is more important than simply measuring levels of human fulfilment. For Naville, such fulfilment was inconceivable in a regime characterised by the preservation of wage-earners' current status. In this sense, automation has been highly revolutionary and contains the possibility for human communities, for the first time in history, to organise themselves without regard

for production constraints—in which case, individual capabilities could be fulfilled in socially under historically unprecedented conditions."[6]

Given the conditions of these scientific divergences, the question is why Friedmann and Naville joined Rene Tréanton in the mid-1950s to write *Traité de Sociologie du Travail*. Clearly, this was an attempt to institutionalise the new discipline and bolster its chances given the intellectual competition it faced from more embedded disciplines such as general sociology, philosophy and psychology. Above all, the aim was to service the growing number of students with an interest in work but who lacked the necessary scientific tools (theories and methodologies) to develop as sociologists of work. Nearly 25 years after the publication of *Traité de Sociologie du Travail*, Dominique Monjardet would speak harshly about this project (Monjardet 1985), criticising the fact that without his having developed any real definition of the sociology of work, Friedmann was still prepared to consider that "in its broadest extension, it involves the study, in all of its various forms, of how all human communities create themselves through work" (Friedmann 1961, 26). Monjardet would subsequently write about how Friedmann used to shift from addressing the relevance of his object of study to a simple enumeration of themes, concrete objects and/or study programmes (machinery, workers, workstations, worker communities, joblessness, etc.). The question became whether the focus would be work as it was being treated in (general) sociology or if a specific sociology of work had emerged through Naville's treatise. In any event, and regardless of the answer and the field's limitations, there is no doubt that Naville's *Traité de Sociologie du Travail*—together with the *Traité de Sociologie du Travail* that ISST sociologists published in 1958— would end up playing a seminal and structuring role in the new discipline.

In the end, the sociology of work that grew in France following WWII came under two main influences: social psychology, with empirical and quantitative methods imported from the United States; and philosophy, under the strong influence of Marxism. As part of the social consensus that marked France's reconstruction efforts, sociology wanted to be seen to be useful by focusing on objects of study that sociologist-researchers shared with the country's Ministry of Labour. Specifically, the focus was on:

---

[6]Sylvie Celerier, "Georges Friedmann et Pierre Naville. Aux débuts de la sociologie du travail en France" in J. P. Durand and R. Weil, *Sociologie contemporaine*, Editions Vigot, Paris, 2006.

- Changes in factory work (the fragmentation of work),
- Automation and its effects on the organisation of work (including skills) and, beyond this, on societal developments,
- Worker attitudes and behaviour in the face of technical and organisational change.

The more or less dominant paradigm of the time held that technological progress leads to social progress. Beyond this scientific convergence, a tense social and political situation (Cold War, colonial wars, corporatist or political strikes) opened up theoretical gaps that were not always manifest in a sub-discipline of sociology that was undergoing profound restructuring (the creation of research labs, the launch of new reviews, CNRS network researcher recruitment, etc.).

<p style="text-align:center">***</p>

Naville's ideas never really turned into a fully fledged school of thought. They did, however, have a greater or lesser influence on subsequent sociologists of work. On the other hand, Friedman—largely because he held strategic positions in the state apparatus responsible for the production and diffusion of ideas—did train a number of heirs (including Michel Crozier, Alain Touraine, Jean-Daniel Reynaud, Claude Durand, Henri Mendras, Michelle Durand, Philippe Bernoux and Jean-René Tréanton) who would perpetuate his reformist orientations, with each renewing them in their own way. Michel Crozier, for instance, would famously study workers (1956, 1965), specifically making a name for himself in a text that looked at postal, banking, and tobacco manufacturing workers (the *Phénomène bureaucratique*, published in 1963, in which Crozier formulated his paradigm asserting agents' autonomy vis-à-vis systems, culminating in a 1977 book co-written with Erhard Friedberg entitled *L'acteur et le système*). The thesis here was that everyone in a work situation will construct a zone of autonomy when interacting with counterparts (also supervisors and experts). Moreover, as zones of uncertainty people are able to improve their position within power relationships. The theoretical innovation at this level involved the construction of a new object—the actor—for the French sociology of work which had previously tended to focus more on structures, groups, conflicts and communities.

Alain Touraine remained close to Friedmann and the work-related issues that he had been addressing in the 1960s–1970s. His theory—*actionnalisme*—saw work as the starting point for humanity's historical condition (1965). He would pursue this idea in later texts (1973, 1974) that tried to build a general theory of post-industrial society based on a historical principle borrowed from Hegel and Kojève, and on a social class construct first

modelled by Marx before being applied along very different lines. It was only later that Touraine moved away from work to focus on social movements and the role that individual actors play, to the extent that he would ultimately start calling the latter "subjects" (1984). His theses about postindustrial society ended up influencing large swathes of the French Left during the 1960s, with topics such as work and integration techniques and skills permeating the book that Serge Mallet wrote in 1969 called the *La nouvelle classe ouvrière* ("The new working class") forecasting the emergence of a new revolutionary class.

Following the 20-year period when the sociology of work took off and during which time Friedmannian empiricism was dominant, the following era would feature a host of social movements, including the monumental student and worker strikes of 1968, which would begin to lay the basis, if only tentatively, for a counter narrative for the study of work. This would include a debate about the monotonous nature of much manual labour and office work, the proposition that work might be self-managed, and the aspiration for another kind of society. Yet, despite the intensity of constant political debate on the streets and in the media, there was no immediate effect on the sociology of work. Furthermore, the period 1971–1974 also saw skilled workers and office employees organise long strikes based on a refusal to carry on with repetitive and monotonous work while at the same time demanding career progression. It took a while, however, for researchers and sociologists to develop theses capable of interpreting these facts. Despite impassioned debates between intellectuals in the wake of 1968, sophisticated scientific output was fairly limited between 1968 and 1975. After that, however, things began to heat up once more.

From a Crisis of Simple Work to a "Corporation Sociology" (1975–1990)

The end of the postwar boom years was characterised by a crisis of overaccumulation of capital. A team including PCF economist Paul Boccara published several theses on state monopoly capitalism (Collectif 1971; Boccara 1974) demonstrating that it was this crisis of accumulation that lay behind the end of the economic cycle in 1967. Michel Aglietta's 1976 text (*Régulations et crises du capitalisme*) then brought together other economists—Robert Boyer, André Orléan, Benjamin Coriat and Alain Lipietz—who founded the *École de la Régulation* (Regulation School), which built up a global audience in the 1990s and 2000s.

A Crisis of Simple Work

These theses, together with sociological fieldwork, converged to raise questions about Taylorism and Fordism. The latter were seen to be significant in laying the foundations for miserable, routine and monotonous work causing high absenteeism and poor quality while generally discouraging workers and employees. Attesting to this malaise were long and strenuous strikes by less skilled industrial workers (in the automotive, electronics and consumer durables sectors) and office employees (post office checking accounts, banking, French National Statistics Office, etc.). Sociologists began to describe this situation as a "crisis of simple work," viewing it as one cause of lower productivity gains, which fell from 5–7% annually to 0.2–0.5% in the early 1970s.

The French translation of Harry Braverman's *Labor and monopoly capital* (1974) provided scientific foundations, rooted in Marx's texts, for an analysis of the crisis of simple work. The end result was a debate led by Michel Freyssenet in his 1977 book *La division capitaliste du travail* that offered a different interpretation of the division of labour, one based on the de-qualification/over-qualification of work. The idea here was that due to the automation of productive processes, the dominant Taylorian organisation had led to a new kind of de-qualification of skilled workers and a re-qualification of maintenance and supervision workers or technicians. At more or less the same time (1979), Benjamin Coriat published *L'atelier et le chronomètre* ("The Workshop and the Stopwatch"), offering a vast and well-documented historical fresco of the division of labour. This original and synoptic review of the history of the scientific organisation of work would influence a number of young sociologists of work, as did an equally well-known book written in 1978 by Robert Linhart, *L'établi*. Linhart, a Maoist working on the factory floor at Citroën, had a poignant way of relating conditions in industrial workshops, replete with hierarchical conflicts, personal rivalries, attempted wildcat strikes and frustrated activism. *L'établi* is often cited as the French counterpart to Huw Beynon's *Working for Ford* (1973) which was published in the same socio-economic era, sharing as it does a similar worker-centred view of work and the politics of production.

Friedmann's supporters joined forces to create the *Groupe de Sociologie du Travail* (GST), founded by Claude Durand in 1971 after he had fallen out with Touraine. The GST perpetuated certain empirical traditions but largely abandoned any quantitative approach, with Durand publishing *Le travail enchaîné* in 1978, following his 1975 book *La Grève* ("The Strike"), written in collaboration with Pierre Dubois. The biggest story of the era, however, would be the organisation of conferences in the French city of Dourdan, the

first of which in 1977 covered the division of labour, followed by a second in 1979 focusing on employment. These conferences mobilised the entire community of researchers with an interest in work, a group that was relatively small at the time (featuring fewer than 100 participants), yet made up for this with the enthusiasm of their debates. The texts published in the wake of these meetings bore witness to the quality of the fieldwork being undertaken and the theoretical questioning driving the discipline. The conferences saw, for instance, an extension of work that had begun in the *Sociologie du travail* relating to the crisis of work such as it was being portrayed by employers and the other actors responsible for the organisation of work, largely revolving around a so-called enrichment of tasks. A few French factories' gradual importation of semi-autonomous workgroups coming from Northern Europe would be perceived by many sociologists as one possible solution—although the following decade did away with this illusion as the economic crisis worsened, industrial de-localisations spread and technological utopianism emerged. On top of this, in April 1976 the non-Marxist CFDT *Confédération française démocratique du travail* trade union organised a conference at Université Paris-Dauphine to analyse the "damage done by progress" (CFDT 1977) bringing together union activists as well as academics (including Pierre Naville) of a certain persuasion. Based on conceptual approximations such as "the automation of work," the union and its guests formulated a critique of the organisation of work and the use of information and communications technologies in secondary and tertiary activities, without ever addressing the underlying causes of the problem, being an economic logic rooted in the exploitation of labour.

The Left in Power in France: From Technological Investment to Participation

The electoral victory in 1981 of a coalition of left-wing parties (including the PCF) did not lead to any particularly radical transformation in the social and economic landscape. It did, however, have a real effect on political, trade union and academic actors' representation of the world, and on the business leaders who were still responsible for the organisation of production and labour. The nationalisation of a number of French companies and large banks did not really modify their internal operations despite several reform efforts (see discussion below on participation initiatives). Having said that, the interventionist approach pursued by Socialist Jean-Pierre Chevènement at the head of a mega-ministry combining industry, research and higher

education would have a major effect on social sciences' status in society as a whole. Companies and private or public sector research centres (including CNRS labs and universities) were given significant financial and human resources in fields ranging from computing, robotics, telecommunications, sociology, technology and cognitive science to philosophy. Schemes such as PIRTTEM (*Programme interdisciplinaire de recherche Technologie Travail Emploi et Modes de vie*) which ran from 1984 to 1992, the *Travail, Emploi et Technologies* mobiliser programme, and the *Robotique* mission (especially its *Automatisation et mutations économiques et sociales* component) offered new outlets for social science specialists. Companies began opening up much more easily to researchers, with the "knowledge contracts" that the French State signed with certain large firms and the country's two main trade unions (CGT and CFDT) enabling them to work much more confidently.[7] This generally upbeat period also featured, in addition to these rapprochements between natural and social sciences, greater co-operation among sociologists, management specialists, psychologists, philosophers, cognition experts and economists, all researching similar topics and meeting at the same conferences that they would often co-organise. Similarly, engineering school researchers often found themselves collaborating with university academics and private sector consultants on the same projects.

This general movement did meet with some opposition, however, as epitomised by the CRIN (*Clubs de recherché sur l'innovation*) that Michel Crozier and certain business leaders founded and tried to finance by diverting public funds to initiatives being run in parallel to the ones cited above. Otherwise, March 1981 also saw Michel Freyssenet and Patrick Fridenson found GERPISA (*Groupe d'études et de recherches permanent sur l'industrie et sur les salariés de l'automobile*), the automotive sector research group, whose originality was its cross-disciplinary nature and singular focus on a particular industrial branch. Lacking any financial support at first, Gerpisa would subsequently receive funding from automakers, France Télécom, France's Ministry for Research and the CNRS research labs. Last but not least, the sociology of work itself would begin to be structured via a bi-annual conference, the *Journées de Sociologie du Travail*, first held in Nantes in 1986.

This great upheaval in the status awarded to work-related sciences (including sociology) by France's scientific community came with two major transformations in the country's industrial and service sectors: a massive

---

[7]The most exhaustive and accessible summary of these provisions has been achieved by Lucie Tanguy (2011, 3rd section) using CNRS archives. Unfortunately, most Ministry of Research and Ministry of Labour archives disappeared when staff moved on.

business investment in production technology and the re-discovery that 'employee participation' and the organisation of work might serve as tools of mobilisation.

A Massive Investment in Production Technology

Beginning in the late 1970s and especially towards the mid-1980s (once the US auto industry emerged from its previous crisis), Western business leaders generally viewed robotics and other IT applications[8] as a godsend remedying the crisis of simple work, if only because robots never strike. In France and after years of government policy fluctuations, the period ended with a victory for supply-side economics—one explanation being because the demand-side policies of 1981–1983 were unaccompanied by an *ex ante* reconstruction of the country's industrial fabric, they had caused its trade deficit to explode. From the mid-1980s onwards, French industry attempted to replace workers performing monotonous and repetitive tasks with robots and other sophisticated computerised systems. This was at a time when a country's technological level was measured by the number of robots per capita, despite the lack of any common definition of what actually constituted a robot. Considerable investments in ICT were agreed without any real efficiency analysis being undertaken until the following decade. Machines and facilities were being invented with the sole objective of reviving France's dying capital goods production sector.

The role increasingly performed by researchers and sociologists—themselves caught up in this vast maelstrom of modernisation—was to support work and technology investment-related re-organisations so they might be instigated without causing uproar. The technological and thematic paradigm of technological determinism came back to life through debates, conferences and sociological reviews. The issues here included technology's role in the organisation of work and the possibility of designing organisations of work other than the ones dominating France's secondary and tertiary sectors at the time (which was before everyone started talking about services). In *La robotique* (1983) and *L'atelier et le robot* (1990), Coriat evoked "computer-assisted Taylorism" to situate the new technologies' arrival in an organisational framework that had remained more or less traditional. Jeantet and

---

[8]The list of computer-assisted functions was endless, including technical specification, design, manufacturing, management, artificial intelligence and irrigation in agriculture. Ultimately, the whole of the company would end up depending on computers.

Tiger (*Des manivelles au clavier*, 1988) highlighted the generational aspect of the decision to work using numerical control machines, with the 1988 Riboud report to the French Prime Minister—written by sociologists—encouraging SME investment and suggesting that information be shared by everyone involved in the industrial modernisation process (and even depicting this sharing as the sine qua non of its success). Other authors such as Tertre (1989, 1992) and Durand (1989) would later analyse the nature of technology in conjunction with the production organisation to ascertain the relative effectiveness thereof. Durand et al. (1986) emphasised the need to re-classify professional training as a tool that could be used to transform companies and the organisation of work. Elsewhere, Vatin (1987) returned to theses first formulated by Naville regarding the trend towards a greater fluidification of industrial production, now driven by the rise of IT. And Lojkine (1992) began writing about an "informational revolution," viewing ICT as having the potential to support and even accelerate societal change.

Of course, texts analysing technology overlapped with analyses of human communication (Durand 1990), work management modes and, above all, employee participation in the organisation of work.

From Employee Expression to Quality Circles

In the early 1980s, the more left-wing factions in France's Socialist and Communist government sought a profound transformation in employees' business roles by giving them greater powers in law. This followed greater recognition of trade union branches within companies, the obligation that management negotiate annually with unions, greater prerogatives (and financial resources) for company work councils, the creation of health and safety committees, employee representative attendance at company board meetings, and new employee rights of expression with regard to working conditions.

The purpose of the law was to improve working conditions and hierarchical relationships in companies. One goal was to increase the productivity of labour, which had been on a downwards slope, in part because of the crisis of simple work. This was both a vestige of previous efforts to enrich work (imported from Scandinavia) and/or an expansion or extension of this effort, viewed by France's left-wing government of the time as a bona fide political project. Sociologists appropriated the new object of study because it was congruent with their critiques of the Fordist–Taylorian organisation of work in factories and offices. At the same time, the view that employees should

be allowed to express themselves disturbed trade unions, who saw the new policy more as undermining their daily practice and less as something complementary or supportive (Linhart 1985; Borzeix 1986).

In short, the advent of an employee right of expression enabled the construction of a new object of sociological study, one combining three of the seminal elements that had constituted this sub-discipline at the end of World War II: organisation of work (with all the hierarchical relationships that accompany this); voice for workers, and trade unionism (mobilisation, representativeness and the organisation of social movements). Critical sociologists (inter alia, Linhart 1985; Borzeix and Linhart 1986; Borzeix 1986; Bachet 1985) stepped into the breach, soon to be joined by linguists such as Josiane Boutet, Bernard Gardin and Michèle Lacoste writing in the *Cahiers Langage et travail*. These analyses were often sceptical about the success of "employee direct expression groups" deeming them to have no clear connection to the actual relationships structuring the forces found in the business world (Lojkine 1996). What these groups did achieve, however, was to advance knowledge about the informal and tacit aspects of social life, helping in this way to make worker communities more cohesive. "Between worker communities on factory floors, with their informal and tacit rules, and an expression group that is asked to be transparent (to ensure that the demands or proposals it formulates are backed by written evidence of its internal debates), there is a huge gap, one that is often impossible to bridge. What is at stake here are the modalities of solidarity" (Borzeix and Linhart 1986, 97–98). Indeed, the same authors would talk about "blurring" when describing the unanticipated effects of employee expression, outcomes that were often diametrically opposed to what lawmakers had originally had in mind. In the end, employer opposition to the new laws—and the political and economic struggles of the Socialist government—buried once and for all the idea of direct employee expression. It remains the case that the terminology would later be revived (albeit in a totally mutated form), once quality circles began to flourish, first as "employee participation" and then as "participative management."

Although the "Japanese model" would only begin to be formalised in 1990 following the international dissemination of an MIT study by Womack et al.—translated into French in 1992—management experts hastened to promote quality circles, Total Productive Maintenance and *kaizen* on factory floors and later in offices. All of these systems purported to enhance employee participation in the improvement of production and the organisation of work—hence in working conditions. The idea was that this would

radically change traditional ways of thinking in these areas (Coriat 1991).[9] This sparked a great deal of doubt in sociological circles, with many considering that employee participation would necessarily benefit workers. Others, however, were sceptical about this reversal of managerial roles, one where Western business interests appropriated a theme (participation) that they had borrowed from the sociology of work for very different reasons than the disciplines' traditional critique of work. The purpose now was to re-motivate and re-mobilise operational employees who were tired of monotonous work and the lack of prospects for career progression. At a time when business interests were becoming aware of the economic failings of over-investing in technology, participative management seemed a timely way of resolving the crisis of simple work. This materialised in the great popularity of lean production over the next 20 years. Of course, in parallel to these work mobilisation problems, other sociologists were trying to popularise a very different approach by creating what would come to be known as "sociology of the corporation."

From the Sociology of the Corporation to the Professionalisation of Sociology

The new left-wing government elected in France in 1981 may have tried certain transformative policies early in its term of office, but the economic turn towards austerity in 1983 was little more than a return to supply-side policies, at a time when all Western economies were falling prey to Ronald Reagan's turbo-capitalist vision (1980–1988). Despite its left-wing politics, France also fell in line with the general move, which materialised in the rehabilitation of companies, incarnated by marauding entrepreneurs like Bernard Tapie, or in the French State's creation of national champion companies in all strategic industrial and banking sectors.

Sociology of the Corporation

Sociologists—mainly coming out of the sociology of organisations (i.e. the Crozier school)—began to organise to create a theory of companies. "The

---

[9]It took until the following decade for people to realise that the "Japanese model" was falsely participative, in the sense that operatives engaged in minimal participation with senior management being the only echelon to make real decisions after receiving very little input from front-line workers (Shimizu 1999).

sociology of work and of organisations, heretofore in conflict with one another, can be reconciled via companies since the latter is common territory for both disciplines. The goal is not to focus on simple organisations rooted in power relationships but instead on institutions where actors create cooperative connections through their actions, and use this to constitute their respective identities" (Tanguy 2011, 192). In March 1986, the review *Sociologie du travail*—in an issue entitled *Retour sur l'entreprise*—featured a text by Renaud Sainsaulieu and Denis Ségrestin offering a veritable manifesto for the sociology of the corporation. This was largely based on corporate culture, which over the decade in question became a topic of great interest to business managers and a number of sociologists. Notwithstanding concerns that sociologists were no longer focusing on the concept of conflict, there was in fact a new proposition here, namely that companies should be portrayed as "the central social locus for developing new state regulating social relations" (Sainsaulieu and Ségrestin 1986, 335). Subsequent texts (Sainsaulieu 1987; Sainsaulieu and Piotet 1994) would depict companies as seminal societal institutions governing and organising society's values. In this way, and contrary to the sociological (and Marxist) vision that companies result from social relationships of production, they had now become institutions that serve to structure society.

The sociology of the corporation would have a lasting influence on the sociology of work because it coincided with a number of organisational and technological changes occurring in both private and public sector companies and public administrations. Now there was a radical critique of the scientific organisation of work that everyone shared, one where a paramount role was being attributed to actors and their efforts to transcend Taylorism and to control change. Sainsaulieu's central thesis involved the "social development of companies," a relatively vague notion not only covering all sorts of managerial, trade union or employee desires but also encompassing the rest of society as well. Participative dynamics, listening, collective action, autonomy, partnerships and corporate culture became the toolbox for this new branch of sociology (Sainsaulieu 1997), one that would have a strong influence on management sciences, having borrowed the latter discipline's vocabulary (but not its participative methods). Similarly, the new branch also reproduced the concept of "actor strategies" that Crozier had been proposing for the past 20 years. All in all, the diffusion of the sociology of the corporation in France was redolent of the rise in Great Britain of *Human Resource Management* thinking in opposition to the *Labour Process* school, sharing many of the former school's fundamental principles.

Alongside this, the sociology of gender and social relationships began to weave itself through the topic of work, materialising in 1982 in the creation of the APRE Production-Reproduction Workshop and leading to the 1984 publication of an international collection called *Le sexe du travail, structures familiales et système productif*. Danièle Kergoat and Helena Hirata would found the GEDISST *Groupe d'étude sur la division sociale et sexuelle du travail* in the mid-1980s, thereby creating a new sub-topic in the sociology of work while also opening up a new paradigm, one exploring the links between productive systems, family structures and a gendered division of labour. The focus here would be to combine traditional paradigms found in the sociology of work with others found in the sociology of gender at work.

The Professionalisation of Sociology

The sociology of the corporation would not have been as successful had a number of French academics not been so interested at the same time in ensuring their students' future. After all, with the number of sociology students in France skyrocketing as a result of the democratisation of higher education in the country (no fees and without entrance examinations), it would be impossible for every graduate to become a University professor or even secondary school teacher. The risk was that this growing cohort would acquire skills that it would be unable to monetise in the labour market. The creation of a DESS *Diplômes d'Études Supérieures Spécialisées* postgraduate degree by the French State was one remedy to this situation. Sainsaulieu was a leading advocate for this type of professionalised education, given that his brand of sociology led quite naturally to the training of experts capable of entering the business world to resolve conflicts found there while also implementing any technical and/or organisational changes (Tanguy 2011). In less than ten years, nearly all sociologists of work teaching in French universities possessed a DESS, which was formally given an MA equivalence in 2003. A few felt somewhat schizophrenic as a result since they were being asked to train experts apt to find jobs in business to smooth out certain intrinsically conflictual situations found there, while also pursuing academic research that was supposed to be independent of the pressing issues constituting social relationships of production.

Alongside the output of these experts going off to work for business, public administrations, consulting firms, etc., the French State, together with the country's largest companies, began funding applied research by

organising calls for tender or awarding bespoke contracts. This was another aspect of the professionalisation of the sociology of work, with research becoming increasingly useful in the sense that it was now supposed to culminate in concrete corporate restructuring proposals (and possibly achieving social transformation in this way). The main consequence of the new situation, which accelerated from the 1980s onwards, was to confuse people. Some academic researchers no longer knew whether they were experts meant to serve business, trade union or work council interests—or if they were supposed to be researchers operating independently of any financial consideration.

In short, the 1980s, despite being largely defined in France by the left-wing government of the time, was a decade that saw a renewed instrumentalisation of sociology, particularly of the sociology of the corporation (especially once this became professionalised). Critical schools of sociology, particularly Marxism, had no foothold in this new landscape, or if so, only marginally. Things began to change, however, in the following decades.

Lean Production, Precarious Employment and the Sociology of Services (1990–2015)

From the early 1990s onwards, the world of work underwent major changes, three of which had a significant effect on French sociology of work, its objects of analysis and its paradigms. The talk now was about productive reconfigurations, the erosion of Fordian employment norms and the tertiarisation of activities.

Post-Fordian Productive Reconfigurations

Businesses undertook an in-depth re-organisation of the production of work during the 1980s and 1990s in response to the crisis of Fordism (and more specifically, the crisis of simple work). To study these transformations and specify the characteristics of the newly emergent productive model, a number of sociologists of work began working more closely with Regulation School economists (Durand 1993; Robert and Jean-Pierre 1997; Boyer and Freyssenet 2002) whose research highlighted a new coherence between growth modes, profit strategies and company governance, all based on the radical transformations happening in the productive systems:

- Transition from standardised mass production with secure commercial outlets to lean production (on-demand and just-in-time) that turned out to be more flexible, responsive to market fluctuations and capable of engendering, through its lean management approach, a permanent reduction in production costs;
- Accelerated diversification in product policies enabled by these changes in the organisation of production and work;
- Transition from large Fordian companies to networked firms supported by a hierarchy of subcontractor tiers;
- An individualised wage–labour nexus;
- Transition from a skills-driven model to one based on competency[10];
- Increased teamwork based on the rise of polyvalence and self-managed work teams.

Whereas some of the authors taking part in this research programme ended up around the turn of the century defending the idea that several productive models might co-exist (depending on the national configuration, growth mode and profit strategy, cf. Boyer, Freyssenet 2000), others, such as Jean-Pierre Durand, placed greater emphasis on the coherence and transversality of such transformations, viewing the "new productive combination" as a major shift away from the Fordian era not only in most of the older industrialised countries but also in all sectors of activity, including services (Durand 2007, 2017).

In parallel to these neo-Marxist studies that mainly focused on productive reconfigurations, a number of other analyses targeted the new management modes. Situating them within a class struggle paradigm, some authors scrutinised the policies leading to the systematic individualisation of work situations and how they undermined worker communities by creating competition between employees and placing them in a position of subjective precarity (Linhart 1991, 1994, 2015). Other more Freudian–Marxian studies would analyse how managerial ideologies instrumentalise employees' desire for omnipotence, causing them to always want to transcend themselves and the limits they face (Auber and Gaulejac 1991). Others adopted a neo-Weberian approach building on conventionalist research programmes (Boltanski and Thévenot 1991) and studying how managerial rhetoric had co-opted artistic and social criticism from the 1960s–1970s by deploying a new "justification register" and promoting autonomy, change, mobility and self-realisation at work (Boltanski and Chiapello 2007).

---

[10]Generating many debates, notably the one between Jean-Pierre Durand and Philippe Zarifian (Durand 2000; Zarifian 2000).

Amongst these studies, the conventionalist approach, being an attempt to break free from structuralism (deemed an overly deterministic over-reach), occupied a key and possibly dominant position within the sociology of work due to its institutional importance and editorial success. Claiming to be pragmatic, and hence somewhat at odds with the American version, most of these studies placed individuals instead of social structures at the heart of the analysis. This was redolent of the primacy, during the mid-1980s, of ultra-neoliberal ideas in French society and politics, in most of Europe, and of course, in the United States.

Erosion of the Fordian Norm of Employment and the Sociologies of Precarity

With the crisis in the Fordism, open-ended full-time employment contracts began to be partially replaced as the employment norm, as witnessed by the doubling between 1981 and 2000[11] in the number of atypical jobs (i.e. fixed term, interim or part-time concerts), which account for nearly 90% of all hirings today.[12] Faced with this phenomenon, sociologists of work began analysing the effects of more precarious employment conditions, especially from the 1990s onwards. Some would offer a social-historical analysis of wage-earning (Castel 1995) with others adopting a more Durkheimian perspective to study the forms of professional integration awaiting these precarious employees (Paugam 2000). Further studies looked at the experiential and professional trajectories of temporary workers (Beaud 1993; Faure-Guichard 2000; Glaymann 2005), part-time employees (mainly female; Maruani and Reynaud 1993) and, more recently, interns (Briant and Glaymann 2013).

From the 2000s onwards, the Fordian employment norm came under scrutiny due to another phenomenon, namely the rising number of independent workers who, albeit still a minority, would attract sociologists' attention for at least three reasons. For some analysts, the elements associ-

---

[11]Between 1982 and 2000, temporary jobs (fixed term and interim contracts) rose as a percentage of total salaried employment from 6.4 to 13.5%, with part-time work increasing from 8.6 to 18.1% (cf. COE *Conseil d'orientation pour l'emploi report*, "L'évolution des formes d'emploi," 8 April 2014, found online at http://www.coe.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/140430-_Rapport_pour_site.pdf).

[12]Temporary contracts (fixed term and interim) rose from 74 to 87% of all hirings between 1999 and 2015 (cf. COE *Conseil d'orientation pour l'emploi* report, "L'évolution des formes d'emploi," 8 April 2014, found online at http://www.coe.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/140430-_Rapport_pour_site.pdf).

ated with this category of commitment, such as the uncertainty in which certain independent workers operate, constituted the archetype of the situation that all employees could expect to face in the future (Menger 2002). Others were interested in the blurring of boundaries between wage-earning and contract work (Supiot 2000; Bernard and Dressen 2014) and how this led to the emergence of a hybrid category of workers combining legal independence with economic dependency on one or several of the contracting parties who provide most of the contractor's income. Operating in what some would call the "grey zone of salaried employment," these "false independents" (Morin 1999), or "economically dependent independent workers" (Mondon-Navazo 2017), would become the subject of numerous investigations involving, for instance, freelancers (Pilmis 2013), self-employed (Abdelnour 2017) or "mompreneurs" (Landour 2015).[13] Thirdly, new workforce entry modes were beginning to appear involving digital platforms, the most well known being "uberisation" impacting minicab drivers' (Abdelnour and Bernard 2017). This created a number of problems, notably legal ones, with indications showing that these kinds of jobs would proliferate in the years to come.

The Fordian norm of employment also came under pressure as new kinds of workforce entry modes began to develop, ones that were invisible and considered free of charge (simply because they were thought of in that way). The new modes interlinked with (and sometimes replaced) salaried employment, with examples including volunteering (Simonet 2010), customer working (Tiffon 2007, 2013; Dujarier 2008; Bernard et al. 2011) or "digital labour" (Fuchs 2014; Casilli and Cardon 2015) based on the commercialisation of users' personal data, something achieved on a massive scale by firms like Google and Facebook.

It may be difficult to determine a clear-cut paradigmatic shift across this corpus but what is evident is the existence of three paradigms that conflict with one another. The first is precarity versus integration, a debate that has been especially widespread since the 1990s, featuring authors such as Robert Castel and Serge Paugam. The second involves uncertainty, perceived as something ambivalent and potentially a source of autonomy and emancipation. This debate would develop in the 2000s based on work carried out by authors like Pierre-Michel Menger, whose work saw him eventually being appointed to the Collège de France.

---

[13]Whereas other studies have shown, to the contrary, that some employees' working conditions resemble independent workers', under a regime that Caveng has called "neoliberal wage-earning" (2011 and 2014).

Lastly, the 2010s saw debate about the non-salaried subordination (and exploitation) of "false independents" and "invisible workers," mainly based on studies carried out by a new generation of researchers whose position in the overall field would turn out to be less central than the role played by tenants of the other two paradigms.

Tertiarisation of Activities and Changing Sociological Paradigms

The third major transformation affecting the world of work has involved an extremely rapid rise in service activities that in France (like most of the older industrialised countries) account nowadays for nearly 75% of all jobs, versus 22% in industry and barely 3% in agriculture. For French sociology of work (which has long been focused on the central figure of factory workers, especially those employed in the automotive industry), the analysis of service activities has considerably altered the field of study. From the 1990s onwards, there have, for instance, been a large number of monograph surveys in a wide variety of sectors of activity and professional universes.[14] Without necessarily constituting a veritable "sociology of the professions," the studies have been conducive to a new "sociology of professional groups",[15] being a corpus mainly focused on issues such as career, autonomy and professional identity.

Service activities have also been a prime focus for the so-called interactionist analyses. Reproducing a conceptual framework first developed by Erving Goffman (1968), most studies in this area have tended to reduce service research to service relationship studies after producing extremely micro-sociological analyses where interactions are described in great detail, notably through direct observation and transcribed conversations. Moreover, in order to overcome any "wage prism" (Bidet 2011) and "avoid an overly hasty politicisation of the objects of study" (Ughetto 2013), research in this area has often adopted subjective and inductive approaches intended, methodologically and epistemologically, to prioritise those elements that make meaning and cause problems from actors' point of view.[16]

---

[14]As emphasised notably by the organisers of the Paris JIST *Journées internationales de sociologie du travail* conference, which would be re-run in Lille 10 years later (Caldéron et al. 2016).

[15]For a summary of studies applying this approach and how they have evolved over time, see Dubar et al. (2015 [1999]), Demazière and Gadéa (2009), Champy (2011) and Vézinat (2016).

[16]For a deeper look at the paradigmatic issues raised by service relationships, see the *Controverse* section of the *Nouvelle revue du travail* review (Tiffon 2013), notably an article by Pascal Ughetto (2013), along with the debate (Tiffon et al. 2013).

Expressed differently, service relationship issues have become a Trojan horse for the paradigmatic shift (or quantum leap) from a more traditional sociology of work, which had previously apprehended transformations in working processes in light of the relationship between capital and labour. Far from accepting the investigation of new fields as a valid response to the tertiarisation of activities, the tenants of this approach promoted another analytical matrix, thereby moving away from Marxism, which would subsequently be presented as a paradigm that ran out of steam because it had allegedly become too deterministic, i.e. only able to come up with findings (domination, exploitation or alienation) that it already expected at the start of the investigation. In turn, this gave birth to self-designated interactionist approaches, often revolving around work conducted by Isaac Joseph (Joseph 1992, 1994; Joseph and Jeannot 1995), ethnomethodology (Weller 1999), conventionalism (Warin 1993; Eymard-Duvernay and Marchal 1994) or a focus on activities (Borzeix 1994; Bidet et al. 2006; Borzeix and Cochoy 2008), all of which sought to analyse how agreements might be co-constructed over the course of a service relationship and more broadly as an activity unfolds, subtext here being that social reality might be no more than the product of reciprocal adjustments of this sort.

Since the early 2000s, however, a number of theses and studies have demonstrated the importance of analysing the service relationship in social relationship terms. Examples including studies by Aurélie Jeantet, Yasmine Siblot and Jean-Pierre Durand opened the door to many other analyses that returned to some extent to a Marxist approach insofar as they apprehended the elements played out within a service relationship in class terms (Jeantet 2003; Siblot 2005) and in light of employment and commercial relationships (Durand 2007, 2017) that work upstream to structure and condition the framework and nature of interactions between service relationship protagonists. Otherwise, services involving traditionally female workers or activities tending to be occupied by immigrant populations would also be dealt with in studies that linked, in a "consubstantialist" perspective (Kergoat 1978, 2009, 2012)[17] class, gender relations and the so-called race relationships (notwithstanding reservations about the use of this latter category) to ensure the joint study of all forms of oppression. In other words, at both the theoretical and political levels, the approaches developed during the 2000s all contrasted with (and even opposed) the interactionist and subjective paradigm that had dominated the sociology of services from the 1990s onwards. With the exception of a few studies (Durand 2007; Tiffon 2013),

---

[17]See Galerand et Kergoat (2014) regarding this approach and how it differs from intersectionality.

however, this paradigmatic opposition was not particularly explicit or pub-licised, with most analyses emerging alongside the interactionist paradigm rather than directly opposing it, i.e. there were very few debates pitting the two approaches against one another.

In sum, from the early 1990s onwards, the sociology of work diversified, fragmented and experienced several paradigmatic shifts. This was particularly visible in analyses of the main work transformations that the present chapter has discussed. The same applied, however, to other themes (such as health and safety at work) that would also develop and translate into a number of stud-ies, notably after the 2000s when a series of workplace suicides focused public attention on the rise in "psycho-social risks." Despite their disciplinary, meth-odological, theoretical and paradigmatic diversity (a topic to be explored else-where), studies by social science researchers-sociologists, but also psychologists, ergonomics experts, economists and historians, would ultimately converge around the basic idea that the increase in psycho-social risks mainly resulted from organisational and managerial factors and not from individual problems, as intimated in hygiene-centric approaches often promoted by business man-agers and experts such as Philippe Nasse and Patrick Légeron (2008). Trade unions then ordered a number of studies[18] from academics and Ministry of Labour-authorised consultants, the purpose being to develop "health and safety expertise." This offered interesting prospects outside of academia to many holders of a Master's or a Ph.D. degree in sociology. It remains the case however that because of the current balance of power between trade unions and business interests, the findings or recommendations of these studies have rarely been incorporated (and if so, only marginally). The end result is that working conditions have generally continued to deteriorate in recent years.

Conclusion

Founded principally by Georges Friedmann and Pierre Naville in the years immediately following the Second World War, the sociology of work largely developed outside of the trade union movement, with humanistic thinking derived from Social Catholicism that had more of an influence than, for instance, the kind of academic Marxism with which Pierre Naville was asso-ciated. During France's postwar reconstruction years, the outcomes of this

---

[18]For an inventory of how trade unions have viewed workplace health issues, see notably Goussard Lucie and Tiffon Guillaume (dir.), *Syndicalisme et santé au travail. Quel renouvellement de la conflictual-ité au travail?* Paris, Le Croquant, 2017.

new discipline were applied for functional purposes (preventing industrial action, mobilising workers) or towards political ends (developing harmonious professional relationships far from the class warfare advocated at the time by the PCF and the CGT).

From the 1960s–1970s onwards, sociologists developed a new critique of the scientific organisation of work (and of its fragmentation). The employee representation laws enacted by the country's left-wing government in 1982 converged with the importation of quality circles to expand frontline employees' participation in the organisation of work without changing the nature of work per se. Many sociologists of work began investing substantial resources in this new field, with others looking instead at the effects of an intensified use of technology (automation, robots and information and communications technologies in general) by business leaders seeking to surmount the crisis of simple work. During the same era (1975–1990), the Crozier school of organisational sociology broadened its object of study to create a sociology of corporations that aspired to develop alongside the technological and organisational changes taking place in companies without ever questioning their objectives. This sociology of corporations led to major reforms in the way that sociology was taught in universities, creating a professionalisation that culminated in the training of new experts who would then look to get hired by business or public administrations. Alongside this, the sociology of work faced increasing demand for public and private sector research and analysis, thereby influencing, through the way these orders were funded, the content of scientific output, which became increasingly utilitarian.

The generalisation of lean production from the 1990s onwards led to major changes in the organisation of production and work, dividing sociologists between a more or less radical critique of this new productive system and a delusional vision that viewed it as something which could improve employees' working conditions. At the same time, the sociology of work moved to analyse transformations in salaried employment, focusing on growing precarity, rising unemployment and more generally the immiserisation of workers with lower skill sets or less social capital. The tertiarisation of economic activities induced sociologists to renew their object of study to include services and confirm their predilection for individualistic paradigms that became increasingly important due to service relationships' face-to-face aspects. Finally, during this latter period, the rising malaise at work and the increasing number of workplace suicides prompted trade unions (but also corporate executives and public administrations) to ask sociologists to find the causes of this situation and propose remedies. Proposals diverged here between superficial changes and attempts at an in-depth transformation of work.

In sum, the theoretical oppositions that used to tickle the exchanges between Georges Friedmann and Pierre Naville during the 1950s–1960s have ultimately marked the entire history of the sociology of work in France. Despite Marxism's strong influence on the country's social or political life (the apex being the power that the PCF and CGT exerted after the Second World War) and despite Marxism's influence on intellectuals, this philosophy, and indeed the radical critique of work in a capitalist society, never attained anything more than a marginal place in the sociology of work. Given the working-class focus of the PCF and CGT, but also because of the class orientation of many professional sociologists (academics, researchers, business practitioners or consultants), the influence of Marxism has been limited. The end result is that there was never any fundamental questioning of the origins of the disorders witnessed in the world of work.

It is only since the 1980s that a veritable Marxist school of thought has emerged, albeit one that still has very few connections with trade unionism (with the PCF having been weakened considerably over the period in question). This Marxism has remained marginal in a landscape characterised by theoretical divides and an unequal balance of power between the schools of thought that structure the field in question. Irrespective of the objects of study, the dominant paradigms (uncertainty, conventionalism or interactionism, etc.) would continue to have theoretical and political affinities with liberalism, even if they denied this. Developed in opposition to critical sociology, deemed to be overly deterministic, over-arching and politicised, they would be carried forward by socially and institutionally situated sociologists who, behind their expressed desire to renew theoretical frameworks, were working in reality against any movement seeking social transformation. To this extent they were contributing, again, without recognising this, to the maintenance of the existing social order. In the end, it is this that has prevented sociology from fulfilling the aspirations that it might otherwise have had to transform and emancipate society.

Bibliography

Abdelnour, S. (2017). *Moi, petite entreprise. Les auto-entrepreneurs, de l'utopie à la réalité*. Paris: PUF.

Abdelnour, S., & Bernard, S. (2017, février 17). Entrepreneurs ou salariés déguisés? Le cas des chauffeurs Uber. *Journée d'étude "Tous entrepreneurs? Le brouillage des frontières entre emploi salarié et emploi indépendant"*. Poitiers: Festival Filmer le travail.

Aglietta, M. (1976). *Régulation et crises du capitalisme*. Paris: Calmann-Lévy.

Auber, N., & De Gaulejac, V. (1991). *Le coût de l'excellence*. Paris: Le Seuil.

Bachet, D. (dir.). (1985). *Décider et agir dans le travail*. Paris: CESTA.

Beaud, S. (1993). Le rêve de l'intérimaire. In P. Bourdieu (dir.), *La misère du monde*. Paris: Le Seuil.

Bernard, S., & Dressen, M. (dir.). (2014). *Indépendance et salariat*, La nouvelle revue du travail, (5) (en ligne).

Bernard, S., Dujarier, M.-A., & Tiffon, G. (dir.). (2011). L'activité des clients: un travail? *Sciences de la société,* (82).

Bidet, A. (2011). *L'engagement dans le travail*. Paris: PUF.

Bidet, A., Borzeix, A., Pillon, T., Rot, G., & Vatin, F. (dir.). (2006). *Sociologie du travail et activité*. Toulouse: Octarès.

De Briant, V., & Glaymann, D. (dir.). (2013). *Le stage. Formation ou exploitation?* Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Boccara, P. (1974). *Études sur le capitalisme d'État, sa crise, son issue*. Paris: Éditions sociales.

Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, E. (2007). *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Verso.

Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (1991). *De la justification. Les économies de la grandeur*. Paris: Gallimard.

Borzeix, A. (1994). L'implicite, le contexte et les cadres: à propos des mécanismes de l'interprétation. *Le travail humain, 57*(4), 331–343.

Borzeix, A., & Cochoy, F. (2008). Travail et théories de l'activité: vers des workspace studies? *Sociologie du travail, 50*(3), 273–286.

Borzeix, A. (1986). Le droit d'expression des travailleurs: un point de vue syndical. *Revue Française des Affaires Sociales*, (2).

Borzeix, A., & Linhart, D. (1986, Janvier). Le droit d'expression: la boule de cristal. *Les Temps Modernes*.

Borzeix, A., & Rot, G. (2010). *Genèse d'une discipline, naissance d'une revue. Sociologie du Travail*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de Paris Ouest.

Boyer, R., & Freyssenet, M. (2000). *Les modèles productifs*. Paris: La Découverte.

Boyer, R., & Freyssenet, M. (2002). *The Productive Models: The Conditions of Profitability*. London: Macmillan.

Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and Monopoly Capital. The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Bright, J. R. (1958). *Automation and Management*. Boston: Harvard University.

Caldéron, J., Demailly, L., & Muller, S. (dir.). (2016). *Aux marges du travail.* Toulouse: Octarès.

Casilli, A., & Cardon, D. (2015). *Qu'est-ce que le Digital Labor?* Paris: INA.

Castel, R. (1995). *Les métamorphoses de la question sociale*. Paris: Fayard.

Caveng, R. (2011). *Un Laboratoire du salariat libéral. Les instituts de sondage*. Bellecombe: Éditions du Croquant.

Caveng Rémy. (2014). Institutionnalisation et usages d'un salariat libéral. Les vacataires des entreprises de sondage. *La nouvelle revue du travail*, (5) (en ligne).

CFDT. (1977). *Les dégâts du progrès. Les travailleurs face au changement technique*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Chapoulie, J. M. (1991). La seconde fondation de la sociologie française, les Etats-Unis et la classe ouvrière. *Revue française de sociologie, XXXII*(3), 321–364.

Champy, F. (2011). *Nouvelle théorie sociologique des groupes professionnels*. Paris: PUF (Le lien social).

Collectif. (1971). *Le capitalisme monopoliste d'État, traité marxiste d'économie politique*. Paris: Editions sociales.

Coriat, B. (1979). *L'atelier et le chronomètre*. Paris: Christian Bourgois Éditeur.

Coriat, B. (1990). *L'atelier le robot. Essai sur le fordisme et la production de masse à l'âge de l'électronique*. Paris: Christian Bourgois Éditeur.

Coriat, B. (1991). *Penser à l'envers*. Paris: Christian Bourgois Éditeur.

Crozier, M. (1956). *Petits fonctionnaires au travail*. Paris: Editions du CNRS.

Crozier, M. (1963). *Le phénomène bureaucratique*. Paris: Le Seuil.

Crozier, M. (1965). *Le monde des employés de bureau*. Paris: Le Seuil.

Crozier, M., & Friedberg, E. (1977). *L'acteur et le système*. Paris: Le Seuil.

Demazière, D., & Gadéa, C. (dir.). (2009). *Sociologie des groupes professionnels. Acquis récents et nouveaux défis*. Paris: La Découverte, coll. "Recherche".

du Tertre, C. (1989). *Technologie, flexibilité, emploi. Une approche sectorielle du post-taylorisme*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

du Tertre, C., & Giancarlo, S. (1992). *Automatisation et travail*. Paris: PUF.

Dubar, C., Tripier, P., & Boussard, V. (2015). *Sociologie des professions*. Paris: Armand Colin, 4e édition (1999).

Dujarier, M.-A. (2008). *Le travail du consommateur*. Paris: La Découverte.

Durand, C. (1978). *Le travail enchaîné. Organisation du travail et domination sociale*. Paris: Le Seuil.

Durand, J. P. (1989). Sociologie de l'information et de la communication. In J.-P. Durand & R. Weil (Eds.), *Sociologie contemporaine*. Paris: Éditions Vigot.

Durand, J. P. (1990). Du paradigme productique à la communication. *Technologies de l'information et société*, Québec, *2*(3).

Durand, J. P. (dir.). (1993). *Vers un nouveau modèle productif?* Paris: Editions Syros.

Durand, J. P. (2000). Les enjeux de la logique compétence. *Gérer et comprendre*, (62).

Durand, J. P. (2007). *The Invisible Chain. Constraints and Opportunities in the New World of Employment*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Durand J.-P. (2007). Services: de l'urgence de sortir de la vulgate interactionniste. In W. Gasparini & J.-P. Durand (dir.), *Le travail à l'épreuve des paradigmes sociologiques* (pp. 127–141). Toulouse: Octarès.

Durand, J. P. (2017). *La fabrique de l'homme nouveau, Travailler, consommer, se taire?* Lormont: Le Bord de l'eau.

Durand, J. P., Durand-Sebag, J., Lojkine, J., & Mahieu, C. (1986). *L'enjeu informatique: former pour changer l'entreprise*, Méridiens. Paris: Klincksieck.

Eymard-Duvernay, F., & Marchal, E. (1994). Les règles en action: entre une organisation et ses usagers. *Revue française de sociologie, 35*(1), 5–36.

Faure-Guichard, C. (2000). *L'emploi intérimaire*. Trajectoires et identités: Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes.

Freyssenet, M. (1977). *La division capitaliste du travail*. Paris: Savelli.

Friedmann, G. (1963 [1950]). *Où va le travail humain?* Paris: Gallimard.

Friedmann, G. (1964 [1956]). *Le travail en miettes.* Paris: Gallimard.

Friedmann, G., & Naville, P. (dir.). (1961, 1962). *Traité de Sociologie du Travail.* Paris: Armand Colin.

Fuchs, C. (2014). *Digital Labour and Karl Marx*. New York: Routledge.

Galerand, E., & Kergoat, D. (2014). Consubstantialité vs intersectionnalité? À propos de l'imbrication des rapports sociaux. *Nouvelles pratiques sociales, 26*(2), 44–61.

Glaymann, D. (2005). *Le vie en intérim*. Paris: Fayard.

Goffman, E. (1968). *Asiles. Études sur la condition sociale des malades mentaux et autres reclus*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.

Goussard, L., & Tiffon, G. (dir.). (2017). *Syndicalisme et santé au travail. Quel renouvellement de la conflictualité au travail?* Paris: Le Croquant.

Guilbert, M., & Isambert-Jamati, V. (1956). *Travail féminin et travail à domicile*. Paris: Editions du CNRS.

Jeantet, A. (2003). "A votre service!" La relation de service comme rapport social. *Sociologie du travail, 45*(2), 191–209.

Joseph, I. (1992). Le temps partagé: le travail du Machiniste-Receveur. *Sociologie du travail, 32*(1).

Joseph, I. (1994). Attention distribuée et attention focalisée; les protocoles de la coopération au PCC de la ligne A du RER. *Sociologie du travail* (vol. 36, No. 4). Dossier: Travail et cognition.

Joseph, I., & Jeannot, G. (coord.). 1995. *Métiers du public*. Paris: Éditions du CNRS.

Kergoat, D. (1978). Ouvriers = ouvrières? Propositions pour une articulation théorique des deux variables: sexe et classes sociales. *Critiques de l'économie politique*, (5).

Kergoat, D. (2009). Dynamique et consubstantialité des rapports sociaux. In E. Dorlin (dir.), *Sexe, race, classe, pour une épistémologie de la domination*. Paris: PUF.

Kergoat, D. (2012). *Se battre, disent-elles*. Paris: La Dispute.

Landour, J. (2015). *S'engager en parentalité et créer son activité. L'entreprise paradoxale des Mompreneurs (2008–2014)*, Thèse de doctorat de Sociologie. Paris: EHESS.

Linhart, D. (1985). Le droit d'expression des travailleurs: un point de vue syndical. *Revue Française des Affaires Sociales*, Avril–Juin.

Linhart, D. (1991). *Le torticolis de l'autruche*. Paris: Le Seuil.

Linhart, D. (1994). *La modernisation des entreprises*. Paris: La Découverte.

Linhart, D. (2015). *La comédie humaine du travail*. Paris: Erès.

Linhart, R. (1978). *L'établi*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.

Lojkine, J. (1992). *La révolution informationnelle*. Paris: PUF.

Lojkine, J. (1996). *Le tabou de la gestion. La culture syndicale entre contestation et proposition*. Paris: Les Éditions de l'Atelier.

Mallet, S. (1969). *La nouvelle classe ouvrière*. Paris: Le Seuil.

Maruani, M., & Reynaud, E. (1993). *Sociologie de l'emploi*. Paris: La Découverte.

Menger, P.-M. (2002). *Portrait de l'artiste en travailleur. Métamorphoses du capitalisme*. Paris: Le Seuil.

Mondon-Navazo, M. (2017). Analyse d'une zone grise d'emploi en France et au Brésil: les Travailleurs Indépendants Economiquement Dépendants (TIED). *Revue interventions économiques*, (58).

Monjardet, D. (1985). À la recherche des fondateurs: les traités de sociologie du travail. In Claude Durand (coord.), *Le travail et sa sociologie. Essais critiques*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Montuclard, M. (1963). *La dynamique des comités d'entreprise. Exploration sociologique de quelques effets de l'institution des comités d'entreprise sur les relations industrielles*. Paris: Editions du CNRS.

Morin, M.-L. (1999). *Prestation de travail et activité de service*. Paris: La Documentation française.

Nasse, P., & Légeron, P. (2008). Rapport sur la détermination, la mesure et le suivi des risques psychosociaux au travail, *des relations sociales et de la solidarité*. Paris: Ministère du travail.

Naville, P. (1961a). *L'automation et le travail humain*. Paris: Editions du CNRS.

Naville, P. (1961b). La mesure du niveau d'automatisation d'après J. Bright et R. Teani. *Cahiers d'Etude de l'Automation*, (2).

Naville, P. (1962). Sur la mesure de la polyvalence d'emploi. *Cahiers d'études de l'automation et des sociétés industrielles*, (3).

Naville, P. (1963). *Vers l'automatisme social? Problèmes du travail et de l'automation*. Paris: Gallimard.

Paugam, S. (2000). *Le salarié de la précarité. Les nouvelles formes de l'intégration professionnelle*. Paris: PUF.

Philip A. (1955). *La démocratie industrielle*. Paris: PUF.

Pillon, T. (2009). *Lire Georges Friedmann. Problèmes humains du machinisme. Les débuts de la sociologie du travail*. Paris: Editions Ellipses.

Pilmis, O. (2013). *L'intermittence au travail. Une sociologie des marchés de la pige et de l'art dramatique.* Paris: Économica.

Pierre, R. (1971). *Introduction à la Sociologie du travail.* Paris: Larousse.

Robert, B., & Jean-Pierre, D. (1997). *After Fordism.* London: Macmillan.

Sainsaulieu, R., & Ségrestin, D. (1986). Vers une théorie sociologique de l'entreprise. *Sociologie du travail, XXVIII*(3), 335–352.

Sainsaulieu, R. (1997 [1987]). *Sociologie de l'entreprise. Organisation, culture et développement.* Paris: Dalloz and PFNSP.

Sainsaulieu Renaud et Piotet Françoise. (1994). *Méthodes pour une sociologie de l'entreprise.* Paris: PFNSP and ANACT.

Shimizu, K. (1999). *Le toyotisme.* Paris: La Découverte.

Siblot, Y. (2005). Les rapports quotidiens des classes populaires aux administrations. Analyse d'un sens pratique du service public. *Sociétés contemporaines*, (58).

Simonet, M. (2010). *Le travail bénévole. Engagement citoyen ou travail gratuit?* Paris: La Découverte.

Supiot, A. (2000). *Au-delà de l'emploi. Transformations du travail et devenir du droit du travail en Europe.* Rapport pour la Commission européenne. Paris: Flammarion.

Tanguy, L. (2008). Retour sur l'histoire de la sociologie du travail française: place et rôle de l'Institut des sciences sociales du travail. *Revue française de Sociologie, XLIX*(4).

Tanguy, L. (2011). *La sociologie du travail en France. Enquêtes sur le travail des sociologues, 1950–1990.* Paris: La Découverte.

Tiffon, G. (2007). La microsociologie n'est pas de l'individualisme. In J.-P. Durand et W. Gasparini (dir.), *Le travail à l'épreuve des paradigmes sociologiques.* Toulouse: Octarès.

Tiffon, G. (2013). *La mise au travail des clients.* Paris: Économica.

Tiffon, G. (dir.). (2013). Relation de service, rapport social de service. *La nouvelle revue du travail*, (2) (en ligne).

Tiffon, G., Ughetto, P., & Zarifian, P. (2013). Relation de service, rapport social de service. Quelle grille d'analyse? *La nouvelle revue du travail*, (2) (en ligne).

Touraine, Alain. (1955). *L'évolution du travail ouvrier aux usines Renault.* Paris: Editions du CNRS.

Tréanton, J. R. (1986). Sur les débuts de la sociologie du travail. *Revue française de Sociologie, 27*(4).

Ughetto, P. (2013). L'enjeu paradigmatique de la relation de service au sein de la sociologie du travail. *La nouvelle revue du travail*, (2) (en ligne).

Vatin, François. (1987). *La fluidité industrielle. Essai sur la théorie de la production et le devenir du travail.* Paris: Méridiens Klincksieck.

Vézinat, N. (2016). *Sociologie des groupes professionnels.* Paris: Armand Colin*, coll. "128".*

Warin, P. (1993). Les relations de service comme régulations. *Revue française de sociologie, 34*(1), 69–95.

Weller, J.-M. (1999). *L'État au guichet.* Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.

Vomack, J. P., Jones, D. T., & Roos, D. (1990). *The Machine that Changed the World.* New York: Rawson.

Zarifian, P. (2000). Sur la question de la compétence. Réponse à Jean-Pierre Durand. *Gérer et comprendre, 62,* 25–28.

3

Sociology of Work in Germany

Holm-Detlev Köhler

Introduction

The chapter aims to give an overview of the main developments, research foci and debates of post-war sociology of work in West Germany (1945–1990) and of the current Sociology of Work in the re-unified German Federal Republic after 1990. Sociology in East Germany (1948–1989) had been incorporated into official Marxist–Leninist state ideology which did not allow for real academic debate and research. We start with an analysis of the context of the re-foundation of sociology after the liberation of the country from Nazi dictatorship at the end of World War Two. Sociology of work in terms of empirical studies on work organisation, technological rationalisation and workers' consciousness were at the centre of the re-consolidation of Sociology in the 1950s and 1960s. The first signs of crisis of Fordist development, the eruption of new social movements, waves of strike and protest and the recovery of critical theory by a new generation of young social scientists had multidimensional impacts on the sociology of work in the 1970s which finally entered a transformation process in both societal and academic terms.

H.-D. Köhler (✉)
Department of Sociology, University of Oviedo, Oviedo, Spain
e-mail: hkohler@uniovi.es

The second period (1975–1990) is characterised by the sudden end of the "dream of everlasting prosperity" (Lutz 1984), the crisis of the Fordist accumulation model and the end of the 'normal' employment relationship. The fragmentation of work and employment is also felt in Industrial Sociology in terms of an increasing variety of theoretical and empirical approaches and a loss of common theoretical and conceptual frameworks, a period labelled by Jürgen Habermas (1986) as "new obscurity."

The third period (1990–2015) of accelerated globalisation under neo-liberal dominance coincided in Germany with the (re-)unification process. Increased international competition, flexibilisation and deregulation of financial and labour markets and the Technologies of Information and Communication (TIC) revolution met with the specific German model of organised capitalism or coordinated market economy. A path-dependent institutional transformation process led to a hybrid and non-coherent model of German post-Fordist financialised capitalism.

The notion of 'Sociology of Work' differs according to social and linguistic contexts. In Germany, the Sociology of Work is an all-encompassing term that includes several more specific terms such as Industrial Sociology, Sociology of the Firm or Industrial Relations. In contrast to Anglophone countries, Industrial Relations was never established as an independent field of social theory and research but remained as a sub-field of the dominant Industrial Sociology. Industrial Sociology was conceived as an approach to understand the complex interaction of industrial work and societal institutions in modern capitalism. In this view, the firm is perceived as a public affair, a constitutional social community, wherein workers receive their democratic rights and the owner has to fulfil a set of social duties. "One could also say that the US and Britain focused on 'private contracts' whereas Germany focused on a 'social contract' within a firm" (Frege 2008, p. 48).

The chapter is organised as follows. The following section outlines the specific context of the re-foundation of Sociology after World War Two and describes the pioneering young generation of social researchers and their main studies. The third part analyses the impact of the resurgence of social protest and worker unrest in the late 1960s and 1970s on Industrial Sociology in Germany. The fourth section outlines the impact of the crisis of the Fordist regime, (re-)unification and globalisation in Germany on the Sociology of Work.

The Fordist Period: Reconstruction and Economic Miracle (1945–1975)

The Re-foundation of Sociology After World War Two

Systematic academic research on work and industry started in Germany with the pioneering studies by the 'Association for Social Policy' (Verein für Sozialpolitik) in the early twentieth century. Through the collaboration of Max and Alfred Weber and Heinrich Herkner, the divorce of empirical social research from the former reform-orientated social policy reports led to three fundamental studies on industrial work (1907–1909) that reached a considerable methodological standard and an empirical richness (Lutz and Schmidt 1977; Schmidt 1980a). Empirical social research thus started in Germany as industrial research on the structural conditions and conflicts of life and work in industry, considered the core of modern society. In contrast to Anglo-Saxon countries, in Germany, as in other continental European countries, no independent academic employment or industrial relations departments were established and the study of work and employment issues remained the subject of various social science disciplines (Frege 2013).

During the Nazi regime (1933–45), Sociology virtually disappeared in Germany and its main representatives and institutions such as the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt had to live in exile. In the first post-war decade, only a handful of universities reinstated sociological studies and empirical research, and it was not until the 1960s that most universities re-established Sociology as part of the academic curriculum.

Sociology of work soon established a threefold division into the sociology of firms and industries, the sociology of professions and occupations, and the sociology of the society of work. In Germany, there is a long-standing tension between two perspectives: "Betriebssoziologie" (sociology of the firm/workplace), understood as the study of work through its actors, norms and practices in public and private economic organisations, and "Industriesoziologie" (Industrial Sociology) which adopted a more theoretical approach to the entire world of industrialised societies (Deutschmann 2002). The latter often took the dominant role of sociology-as-such, insofar as it identified Industrial Sociology as the study of modern industrial societies, "the industrial mode of production and the industrial way of life" (Wilbert E. Moore 1948, quoted in Deutschmann 2002, p. 7). Sociology of work and industry dealt with the fundamental sociological issues such as work as the medium for social integration, restructuring of firms and

work organisation as indicators of social change and the capital–labour conflict as the main force for structural transformation of society. The section "Industrial Sociology," founded in the mid-1950s, was for a long time the most dominant section within the German Sociological Association. Most sociologists of the first post-war generation began their theoretical and empirical work in the field of industrial sociology (Lutz and Schmidt 1977, p. 153). The strong effort in developing empirical foundations and conducting research in the field also reflected what Paul Bahrdt called "a thirst for reality" (Mickler 2000, p. 137) after the long years of Nazi propaganda.

Thus, Germany never developed a proper discipline of industrial or employment relations and even the term 'Sociology of Work' was hardly used in contrast to the Sociology of the Firm and Industrial Sociology. The latter, however, covered a much larger field of topics compared with other and particularly Anglophone countries and was always closely connected to general sociology and social theory. The interaction between industry and society was considered the adequate focus for understanding the modern capitalist world.

The context of the German economic miracle—between 1955 and 1966 the German economy was, together with Japan, the fastest growing of the developed world based on an accelerated re-industrialisation—contributed to the centrality of industry in social research. Modern society was seen as the result of the process of industrialisation and industry therefore was the core issue of modern sociological studies. Since the industrial mode of production and the industrial way of life characterise our societies, they have to be at the centre of social theory and research.

Three main and interrelated reasons edged Industrial Sociology into a dominant position in social research in Germany (Schmidt 1980b, p. 265):

- West Germany experienced an accelerated process of industrialisation that set the foundations for the 'economic miracle' of the 1950s and 1960s. Industrial work and organisation thus occupied a central position in the understanding of the social, cultural and political dynamics in post-war Germany.
- In the context of political disenchantment and conservative restoration, the engagement in the study of industrial workers, their working and living conditions, class consciousness and interest organisations appeared as a privileged field of work for progressive social scientists. The implementation of parity co-determination in the steel and coal industries made these sectors a particularly interesting object of empirical research.

- Certain specific German traditions in social thought and philosophy such as the Historical School (Gustav von Schmoller, Lujo Brentano), a romantic criticism of modern industrialism (Oswald Spengler, Ernst Jünger), together with the subliminal influence of Weber and Marx, motivated an interest in the social consequences of industrial and technological development among German intellectuals.

At a critical distance from the Human Relations movement (Mayo 1945; Roethlisberger and Dickson 1939), which reduced workplace problems to a technical, socio-therapeutic question of motivation, the early post-war sociologists in Germany such as Hans Paul Bahrdt, Heinrich Popitz, Theo Pirker, Friedrich Fürstenberg or Burkart Lutz related their studies on industrial work to the general dynamics of industrial-capitalist societies. The technification and reification of control and dominance of the worker in the firm contributed to the integration of the working class and its organisations into the new West German social order (Popitz et al. 1957a, b). The emphasis on 'hard' technological determinants of the work process expressed an open contrast to the American Human Relations School with its focus on informal 'soft' work climate variables.

These pioneering industry studies of the 1950s and early 1960s were conducted in an underdeveloped institutional context with only two consolidated sociological research institutes: the Social Research Centre Dortmund (Sozialforschungsstelle Dortmund) and the Institute for Social Research in Frankfurt (Institut für Sozialforschung). The first, located in the Ruhr area, West Germany's leading coal and steel region, had an explicit industrial sociology orientation manifest in the studies of its leading researchers Otto Neuloh, Hans-Paul Bahrdt, Heinrich Popitz and Carl Jantke. The specific institution of parity co-determination in the coal and steel industries further moved the research interests to the big steel and mining firms. But even in the Frankfurt Institute, located in the emerging financial centre of West Germany, industrial sociological research dominated in this period such as the study on workplace climate coordinated by Theodor W. Adorno and Walter Dirks (1955). The Economic Research Institute of the German Confederation of Trade Unions (Wirtschaftswissenschaftliches Institut der Gewerkschaften WWI) also organised some pioneering industrial research by authors such as Siegfried Braun, Theo Pirker and Burkart Lutz.

These particular post-war conditions made the German steel industry the initial empirical object for the reconstruction of West German sociology. The three major research groups and empirical studies of the 1950s were

all centred on the workers and working conditions of the co-determined steel plants, which had been saved from allied dismantling and/or closure threats—particularly the French government had an interest to eliminate the dominant German competitors after the war—and were now moving again to the centre of the recovering German industrial power.

The group around Popitz and Bahrdt et al. (1957a, b) published two studies out of the same empirical research project, one on the impact of technological modernisation on industrial work and another on the societal image of the workers. The detailed empirical research on the consciousness of German industrial workers by Popitz et al.—the authors lived for nine months in the workers' residence area of the plant—represented a milestone in German post-war sociology. The authors identified a loss of societal experience, a growing gap between the daily living world and the societal context conditions, that workers filled with different forms of simple images of society. A common feature of the workers' idea of society was a clear dichotomy between the people at the bottom and the people at the top, a dichotomy that was structurally fixed and impossible to overcome. This fatal dichotomy dominated German workers' identity until the late 1960s when the situation of the working class became more heterogeneous with more white-collar and higher qualified workers and growing welfare. The Social Research Centre Dortmund also published some early studies on the Ruhr Area coal mining communities (Jantke 1953; Croon and Utermann 1958).

The findings of the study by Pirker et al. (1955) were advanced and supported by the trade union research institute WWI and aimed to establish a new concept of social workplace policy designed around the co-determination model. The co-determination in the steel industry gave trade unions the power to nominate the human resource managers of the firms and thus excellent access for researchers who cooperated with trade unions. This was one of the reasons for the overwhelming presence of this sector in these early industrial sociological works. The WWI developed the concept of "social rationalisation" as being complementary to technological modernisation and economic rationalisation and tried to establish a systematic cooperation among social scientists, managers and worker delegates (Lutz 1952). After the conservative political restoration of West Germany, the hopes for a less hierarchical and more democratic society moved from the political level to the firm, demanding a social use of the potentials inherent in the technological modernisation of production.

The third pioneering study, realised by von Friedeburg, Becker, Teschner und Weltz and coordinated by Theodor W. Adorno and Walter Dirks (1955),

at the re-founded (after 20 years in exile) Institute of Social Research in Frankfurt on workplace climate attempted to contrast Pirker et al.'s study through deliberate research on the views and opinions of workers on co-determination. The study was commissioned and financed by the Mannesmann Corporation, a delicate circumstance given the close cooperation of the company with the Nazi regime, on the one hand, and the dominance of formerly exiled Jewish scientists at the Institute (Wiggershaus 1988, pp. 534ff). The research group organised 1176 interviews with employees and group discussions with 539 employees in two plants of the company. The Mannesmann management used the study to demonstrate its commitment to the well-being of its workers, whereas the trade unions reacted angrily because one of the findings indicated a low interest towards, and valuation of, works councils and co-determination among workers.

All of these early post-war studies on workers' consciousness, job satisfaction and industrial atmosphere revealed the ambiguous state of the German working class, which was neither smoothly integrated in modern liberal capitalism, as the dominant liberal ideologies and sociologists propagated,[1] nor a conflict-oriented supporter of union struggles and social transformation, which was the hope of critical social scientists and union militants. The empirical findings pointed towards a combination of a clear consciousness of class dichotomy and conflicting interests with a resignation towards the possibility of transforming the given power relationships. Although the older generation expressed high degrees of satisfaction with their work situation and, due to the seniority principle, often occupied better jobs, younger workers showed a significant level of dissatisfaction and criticism that, years later, motivated Burkart Lutz (1989, 1992) to ask: Where has the critical potential of the young generation of the 1950s gone? His own answer was that it had widely disappeared over the course of the economic miracle and the possibilities for wealth and promotion generated in those years.

In spite of their ideological and methodological differences, these three research groups shared a lot of common interests and experiences and belonged to the same generation (born in the 1920s), which facilitated their leading role in the constitution of the German Industrial Sociology Section (Lutz and Schmidt 1977, p. 158). The majority of these young social scientists were not academic sociologists and developed their empirical research

---

[1] The most influential German sociologist of that period, Helmut Schelsky (1953), invented the concept of a levelled middle class society (*nivellierte Mittelstandsgesellschaft*) in which the collective ascent of the working class ended up with traditional class divides and conflicts.

in non-university institutes but became sociologists by empirical social research (von Friedeburg 1997). The search for a new social theory of the large industrial enterprise and its social and political environment, based on well-founded empirical knowledge, was the shared academic objective of this post-war generation of industrial sociologists. In some cases, the disenchantment with the conservative political restoration added the motivation to study, at least, the possibilities for democratic and social control of large industry (see Jander 1988). Under conservative Christian-democratic governments and the pressure of cold-war anti-communism, the trade unions and their influence via codetermination rights in the large industries appeared as the only progressive forces acting as a counterweight to the restorative forces in the West German society (Mickler 2000). The weakness of an imposed democracy by the Western allies in the absence of a strong labour movement provided another reason to consider the democratic potential of workers and their organisations (von Friedeburg 1997).

Three primary interlinked aims and interests were characteristic of the first post-war generation of industrial sociologists:

1. The intermediation of social research and empirical foundation with a general theory of industrial capitalist development and of working-class consciousness.
2. A methodological approach that overcame the fragmentation of social reality revealing the interrelationship between working process and societal context.
3. The introduction of the results of social research in a process of social change and democratic progress.

Besides these ambitious Industrial Sociology projects, there were also some micro-sociological workplace studies on informal group building and management styles (König et al. 1956; König 1961; Hofstätter 1957). These concrete empirical studies abstained from general sociological theory building, but rejected also the normative and manipulative aspects of the American Human Relations School.

The firm in the sense of the physical working environment (Betrieb)[2] had long been at the centre of sociological interest in Germany, and important sociologists, such as Ralf Dahrendorf (1959) and Rainer Maria Lepsius

---

[2]It is interesting that there is no English equivalent for the German term 'Betrieb', that can be interpreted as establishment, plant, shop floor, work organization.

(1967), both influenced by Max Weber, in the 1960s developed a widely accepted concept of the firm as a 'social system' with two dimensions: the system of cooperation and the system of domination and conflict (Lutz and Schmidt 1977, pp. 177ff.). From this view, the firm as a system of social order crystallises the central structures and conflicts of an industrial society.

The studies on manufacturing workers' consciousness were complemented by several research projects on white-collar and administrative occupations and sectors. Bahrdt (1958) and Pirker (1963) investigated the effects of the increasing mechanisation and automation of administrative jobs on the mentality of employees. Building on these pioneering works, in 1970, Siegfried Braun and Jochen Fuhrmann published a huge study on the mentality of administrative workers in different industries. They drew a differentiated picture of trends with women strongly affected by standardised mechanical jobs, while men occupied different and specialised technical, commercial and administrative jobs with lower degrees of mechanisation. In general terms, the traditional differences between white- and blue-collar jobs and mentalities tended to diminish. Both occupational groups were losing their common identity in favour of more segmented and differentiated occupational identities.

Empirical research on work in the first post-war decades was thus centred on workers' consciousness, their ideas of society and the impact of new production technologies, while the concrete work organisation played only a marginal role. Following the images of Max Weber and Frederic W. Taylor, a general model of a big hierarchical bureaucratic industrial organisation figured as the generally accepted model of the capitalist firm.

Some of the issues of western Industrial Sociology also entered academic discussions of the German Democratic Republic (GDR), although always with the proviso that they should contribute to the development of socialist society and its 'scientific economic planning' (Heinz Kallabis 1965). This emphasised the importance of the incorporation of technical progress in the socialist firm and Horst Berger (1965) attempted to offer a methodology for industrial sociological studies in socialist society. The latter became a leading figure in the establishment of empirical sociology in the GDR.

The Resurgence of Social Conflict and Critical Theory

The 1960s witnessed not only the re-establishment of Sociology as an academic discipline but also the emergence of a new post-war generation with new protest movements and the recovery of Sociology as an instrument for

critical reflection on social problems. The defensive position of the first post-war sociologists, looking for progressive forces in worker participation and co-determination in the context of conservative restoration, was replaced by a more deliberate critique of capitalist work and limited liberal democracy from a perspective of social reform and transformation. For the Sociology of Work, the new protest generation meant a certain renaissance after years of losing strength and influence in a conservative academic environment and the frustration with the progressive hopes of the 1950s.

The critical Sociology of Work developed the concept of a "political economy of the workforce" in opposition to the "political economy of capital" (Negt 1984) to adopt explicitly a perspective of worker emancipation. Several editorial projects such as 'Express', edited by the Socialist Bureau in Frankfurt, the *Critical Trade Union Yearbook*, edited first by Fischer and then by Rotbuch, the 'Trade Union Collective' of the journal Probleme des Klassenkampfs (Problems of Class Struggle) in Berlin or the 'Socialist Study Groups' with its journal Sozialismus (Socialism) in Hamburg brought together left-wing social scientists and union militants in the attempt to recover trade unions as an emancipatory social movement (Köhler 1998). The focus on workplace conflicts and struggles aimed at a productive alliance between socialist theory and dissident militant worker groups.

The wave of social protest, strikes and conflicts in 1967–1973 thus led to a sort of renaissance of Industrial Sociology and a dense network of research institutes and university departments which undertook industry studies (Lutz and Schmidt 1977, p. 218; Müller-Jentsch 2001). Besides the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research, two new ones, the Sociological Research Institute (SOFI) in Göttingen (1968) and the Institute for Social Research (ISF) in Munich (1965), took the lead in industry and work studies. The recovery of Marxist theory helped overcome the traditional theoretical deficit of a phenomenological sociology which had developed its main concepts by inductive observation. Important studies on trade unions (Bergmann et al. 1975) and workers' consciousness (Kern and Schumann 1970) sought to feed, with empirical research, the thesis of a new militancy against capital. Marx's concept of real subsumption of labour under capital in advanced capitalist production was linked with Max Weber's concept of bureaucratic rationalisation and Joseph Schumpeter's idea of the self-destruction of capitalism through the substitution of entrepreneurs by large industry administrations. Harry Braverman's critique of the degradation of work through Taylorist mass production was widely discussed and further developed. Another influential work was Serge Mallet's thesis of a 'new

working class' (1963) formed by qualified technical employees with a certain revolutionary potential.

In 1970, Kern and Schumann published a study on industrial work and worker consciousness in eight different manufacturing sectors. Against the dominant idea of a general upgrading of industrial work, they defended the thesis of a polarisation between a highly qualified workforce in relation to the implementation of new automation technologies, on the one hand, and the persistence of huge areas of low-quality and low-salary work on the other hand. The concrete working life experience remained the dominant factor for the attitude and images of workers with regard to their work and society. Concerning workers' consciousness, the authors reported an increasing fragmentation of work experiences among different occupational groups, which impeded a shared class position. This vision of the passive worker lacking class consciousness was criticised by many scholars who considered that the survey method and standardised interviews were too superficial to capture the real feelings and thoughts of working people.

A significant topic in sociological studies of work in this period was the relationship of work organisation and technological development with a clear dominance of technic-optimism. The general interpretative scheme proposed a three-period industrial revolution starting with high-qualified autonomous handicraft work, replaced by standardised industrial mass production which finally was substituted by re-qualified post-industrial knowledge work. Technical rationalisation and automation is seen as relieving people from hard mechanical work in favour of more communicative and cooperative intellectual work. In this process, traditional hierarchical control would be replaced by self-accountable interactive work in flat hierarchies. Technological progress and social progress were seen as closely interlinked.

During the 1960s, German industrial sociologists developed a concept of technological progress as an inherent part of societal development in contrast to views which saw technology as exogenous and neutral. In this sociological view of technological development, conflicting interests on the use and implementation of technologies (and further political consequences) re-emerged as a central analytical concern (Lutz 1987).

This optimistic linear progress model of technological development came under critical assessment in the 1970s in the context of new empirical studies and new theoretical approaches (Pfeiffer 2010). The studies of Kern and Schumann (1970) and Mickler et al. (1976) showed very different forms of technological rationalisation and its impact on work and qualification in different sectors and occupations with parallel trends of upgrading and deskilling. The interest-driven application of technologies under profit-seeking

management and the non-use of the emancipatory potential of new technologies came into view, relieving the neutral instrumental concepts of technology. The so-called "Firm Approach" (Betriebsansatz) of the Institute for Social Science Research in Munich (Altmann and Bechtle 1971; Altmann et al. 1978) conceived the implementation of new technologies as one of several rationalisation strategies in the context of firms as social structures of dominance. These studies developed the basic elements for the later debate on *The End of Technic Determinism* (Lutz 1987) with several main insights that structured future analyses of work and technology. The argument was that the development of work is not the automatic result of technological progress, but rather of the strategies and politics of rationalisation. Technologies and work organisation have to be studied under the perspective of social actors and their conflicting interests, the social consequences of specific technological applications and the dominant paradigms (*Leitbilder*) of technologies. Technical development definitely became a social process.

The neo-Marxist view of the firm as an integral part of the capitalist value production process, which is dominated by the constant pressure for productivity increases and private accumulation of profit, was contrasted with more traditional sociological views of organisations and systems theories. The firm has to be analysed as a social process instead of a closed system, or organisation, and the firm is conceived as an intermediary institution between the individual capitalist and societal production and accumulation processes (Altmann and Bechtle 1971; Altmann et al. 1978). The new "Firm Approach," however, tried to overcome the dominant structural, deterministic view of the firm as an agency of capital where labour is employed to generate value and profit. The firm is more than a realisation of value for capital and has some autonomy as a historical and contextualised unit of different strategies with contingent results on the methods of work organisation and the implementation of technical and organisational innovations. The firm is the most concrete form of the implementation of capitalist dominance through two transformation strategies. The first strategy consists of the transformation of external contextual conditions, such as market developments or legal frameworks, into neutral framework conditions that leave enough space for autonomous firm strategies. The second transformation refers to the development of firm-specific strategies combining technology, work organisation and skills. The firm as organised capitalist control thus implies certain degrees of autonomy and micro-politics. The combination of flexible socio-technical components and their strategic transformation differs among firms even under common framework conditions.

Following Brandt (1990), the main debates among industrial sociologists in that period occurred between the followers of a 'production model' and a 'subsumption model'. They were directly referencing Marxist capital theory. The former focussed on the development of productive forces (technological progress) and human work as central issues for neo-Marxist sociology, whereas the latter supposed the progressive subordination of productive forces and labour under the logic of capital accumulation to be the central issue of modern critiques of political economy (Benz-Overhage et al. 1985). Using the potential of new IT technologies, the process of constant rationalisation and capital valuation acquired a systemic character (Altmann et al. 1986) focussing on the integration of the entire intra- and inter-firm relationships and steering technologies, leaving human work in a peripheral position. The German subsumption model literature had many similarities with Braverman's (1974) thesis on the degradation and deskilling of work.

In terms of methodology, industrial sociology in this period was clearly dominated by qualitative workplace studies with direct observation, different interview techniques and group discussions. In some cases, intensive observer participation complemented the interviews and helped create very dense and complex descriptions of the labour process and its agents.

The end of the economic miracle and the Fordist class compromise in the 1970s again required a re-orientation of industrial sociology and empirical research, thus opening a new period. Although the late 1960s and early 1970s had seen a strong upgrading of Industrial Sociology as a consequence of a more progressive climate in society and universities, at the end of the 1970s the wind started to change. This heralded a questioning of the hegemony of social-democratic policies, institutions and social research.

The Transformation Period: Post-Fordist Uncertainties (1975–1990)

Where to Go After Fordism?

The Sudden End of the Dream of Everlasting Prosperity, the title of a very influential study by Burkhart Lutz (1984), was the context for the pragmatic, theoretically less ambitious reorientation of Industrial Sociology in Germany. The workplace and the firm re-emerged as the main objects of social research to the detriment of more holistic industrial society approaches. The social democratic government fostered a huge research pro-

gramme on the "Humanisation of Work" advocated by the trade unions, which was similar to programmes in other countries such as the UK and Sweden (Quality of Work Life Movement). The neo-Marxist idea of explaining industrial developments as a consequence of the logic of capitalist value production was widely abandoned.

Industrial Sociology in Germany entered the 'post-Fordist' period as a much-consolidated discipline and research area in universities and research institutes. However, the changing contextual conditions[3] together with the increasing theoretical and methodological fragmentation of social sciences provoked a profound "professional uncertainty" among the German Industrial Sociology community (Braczyk et al. 1982, p. 18).[4]

The new openness after three decades of Fordist development created a lot of uncertainty in socio-political as well as in theoretical terms. The seminal study by Burkhart Lutz (1984) analysed, using a historical political economy approach, the conditions of post-war prosperous capitalism as an accidental and exceptional historical moment in the overall discontinuous and crisis-driven capitalist development. He argued that the three decades of Fordist prosperity were the result of the final colonisation (*Landnahme*), in Rosa Luxembourg's sense, of non-capitalist social spaces and traditional economic spheres due to capitalist commodification of social life. The creative destruction, in Schumpeter's terms, of rigid economic structures during the war, opened the way for a singular restoration of dynamic mass production and mass consumption in Western Europe. Germany was at the forefront in economic reconstruction and served as a geopolitical barrier to the soviet world. This exceptional context came to an end with the fiscal and oil crisis of the 1970s, which opened a new space of social and intellectual uncertainty.

In this context, Industrial Sociology in Germany lost its hegemonic position in social science. For many scholars and analysts, Industrial Sociology belonged to the industrial era, which had come to an end, and the emerging post-industrial society required new theoretical and conceptual approaches. André Gorz' *Farewell to the Working Class* (1980a) or Alain Touraine's analysis of new social movements (1981) beyond the old class conflict had

---

[3]A more conservative political climate with increasing criticism of the welfare state, collective industrial relations, state intervention in economic regulation and other institutions that were designed to give capitalism a human face.

[4]The uncertainty and anomy, the need to re-orientate the professional work and situation, in some cases even provoked personal crisis such as the suicide of one of the most excellent German industrial sociologists Gerhard Brandt 1987.

a strong influence within German social and political science. The firm as the centre of social structuring and conflict lost its hegemonic position in research and society. On the other hand, the dominant theoretical polarisation among structural functionalism versus neo-Marxism was replaced by a broader pluralism with system-theory and rational choice approaches becoming new powerful theoretical strands. All these empirical and theoretical developments moved Industrial Sociology towards a more peripheral position in social science and motivated certain transformations within the sub-discipline.

Three primary trends may be identified as shaping the sociology of work in Germany in the 1970s and 1980s. First, international and inter-sectoral comparative analyses led to an institutionalist shift focussing on the institutional settings and complementarities within specific national and sectoral articulations of industrial order. The second trend was more focussed on the organisation of firms and production, using concepts such as "new production concepts" or "lean production" in the context of the end of mass production and Taylorism in the form of a "second industrial divide" (Piore and Sabel 1984). The third trend referred to the retreat of traditional manufacturing replaced by growing service sectors and activities. Tertiarisation created new challenges to economic actors and social researchers.

One emerging strand in the study of work and industry was the international comparison of institutional settings, the recognition of "varieties of capitalism." Authors such as Burkhard Lutz (1976), Werner Sengenberger (1987) or Arndt Sorge (see Maurice et al. 1980) compared the work organisation, management styles, education and employment systems of the large capitalist states (the USA, GB, France, Germany), identifying significant national particularities even in the same transnational companies and sectors. The comparative institutionalist view thus maintained the analytical relationship within the workplace and the broader societal context.

The institutionalist turn moved three primary institutional systems, which structure labour markets and limit the commodity character of the labour force, to the centre of analysis (Deutschmann 2002, p. 143). The system of education and training and of occupations and qualifications structured internal and external labour markets. The industrial relations system regulated individual and the collective bargaining over employment condition. Finally, the welfare system established security mechanisms against certain labour force risks that are inherent to the labour market.

In the 1980s, German Industrial Sociology anticipated several issues that later dominated Anglo-Saxon debates on national business systems and varieties of capitalism. The debate on "Model Germany Inc." conceptualised

the specific institutional setting of Germany's socio-economic constellation underscoring what Hall and Soskice (2001) later called institutional complementarity. The German production and accumulation regime was characterised by the following institutional elements:

- Vertically integrated large- and medium-sized enterprises with clearly formalised internal functional differentiation;
- A normalised employment regime with tenured jobs, five days/40 h per week working time;
- A male breadwinner family model and a corresponding social security system;
- A qualified workforce, based on the dual apprenticeship system, and well-defined occupational career ladders;
- Co-operative trade unions integrated in a corporatist social partnership system;
- Export-oriented productive industries with underdeveloped service sectors;
- Close relationship between commercial banks and industrial companies with underdeveloped investment banking and capital markets.

This German business system, consolidated during the post-war economic miracle, was now considered too rigid and industry oriented, not adequate for the future service and knowledge economy. Among the industrial sociologists emerged a debate about the future with one stream advocating a deliberate move towards new service- and knowledge-based activities with another stream defending a modernised high-quality industrial economy built upon the traditional strongholds of Germany's export sector (Schumann 2000).

The institutionalist perspective assumed efficacy of the concepts of internal and external, and of segmented, labour markets, developed in the USA (Doeringer and Piore 1971) and applied it to a particular "German model" (*Standort Deutschland*). The segmentation into core and peripheral workforces in external and internal labour markets was problematised and specific German institutional competitive advantages were identified to defend them against the developing neoliberal offensive. Particular competitive advantages included the internal flexibility of the core workforce, the professional training system leading to qualified, highly skilled workers, the innovative capacity of cooperative managements and workforces and co-determination, with its high commitment by the workforce and associated low levels of conflict (Sengenberger 1987; Köhler and Krause 2010).

However, policies of deregulation, the sectoral economic transformation (tertiarisation) and the increasing international competition eroded these competitive advantages through downsizing the traditional strongholds of the German model and increasing precarious labour markets.

The consequences of the "crisis of normal employment" (Mückenberger 1985), intimately related to the crisis of the welfare state, occupied considerable space within sociology. Normal employment meant for decades a normal worker (male qualified breadwinner), developing a normal biography (climbing up well-defined career ladders), a normal working day (40 hours divided into five days/week from morning to afternoon) and normal working conditions regulated by collective agreements and social security. This normalised institutional setting structured social life in Fordist societies and began to erode under the neoliberal offensive of deregulation and flexibilisation beginning in the early 1980s.

The important advantage of these neo-institutionalist approaches lies in the analysis of firm and management strategies and bargaining processes against the long dominant abstract economic models. In Germany, labour markets are closely linked to the education and professional training system and the industrial relations system with strong trade union participation. The skill system and occupational gender segregation are further elements of the segmented approach to labour markets, thus allowing the connection between labour market processes and social class analysis. In this sense, occupational segregation in terms of gender, or ethnicity, consolidated social hierarchies and these affected all spheres of social life.

New Production Concepts, Lean Production and Systemic Rationalisation

The very influential studies of the Sociological Research Institute in Göttingen in the 1980s led to an innovative shift towards detailed empirical studies of the organisation of work and production. This left out former neo-Marxist attempts to relate this to general social theory. Under the label of "new production concepts," researchers tried to identify new general trends in work organisation due to the application of new technologies, new skills and hybrid occupational qualifications in manufacturing (Kern and Schumann 1984a, b), and service industries (Baethge and Oberbeck 1986). More encompassing skills in a more human-centred work organisation were replacing the traditional Taylorist work organisation. Following Kern and Schumann, the return of productive intelligence and the

re-professionalisation of industrial work characterised the new rationalisation paradigm. The authors thus revisited their former studies on polarisation of industrial work and proclaimed the end of the Taylorist division of work, while admitting a growing number of "rationalisation losers" in the form of jobless or precarious workers. The 'new production concepts' in post-Fordist German industry implied the following:

- The end to the idea of complete automation of production and the unmanned factory;
- The end of the dynamic of Taylorist–Fordist rationalisation;
- The replacement of simple repetitive jobs by enriched, upgraded, more intellectual work, although in an unbalanced way, including net employment destruction;
- The re-integration of tasks and functions;
- The increased use of workers' knowledge and experience.

The "new production concepts" and "the end of the division of work" were clearly conceived as counters to the neo-Taylorist deskilling paradigm proposed by Harry Braverman (1974). The view was that the creation of value in capitalism does not degrade industrial work but needs workers' skills and production know-how to attain long-run profitability. The optimistic focus on enriched, human-centred rationalisation, however, could not withstand empirical evidence to the contrary and with the wave of lean production and Toyotism a new dominant rationalisation paradigm entered Western industries and sociological debates (see below).

The intention of many industrial sociologists to demonstrate the superiority of the qualified German industrial worker (*Facharbeiter*) and the German occupational and apprenticeship model motivated a certain blindness towards the risks and problems of the new management techniques (Köhler 1998). Reports of "management by stress" from practitioners, trade unionists and critical empirical researchers (Parker and Slaughter 1993; Wannöffel 1991) were ignored or marginalised. The widespread de-skilling and re-Taylorisation trends in the new production concepts threatened the German model of skilled work and high-track quality production. Industrial Sociology, only with considerable delay, began to recognise, and analyse, the changes and transformation of post-war German capitalism.

Baethge and Oberbeck (1986) investigated the impact of the massive implementation of electronic data processing on administrative occupations. The results showed different trends, with some functions increasingly standardised (Taylorisation of mental work), whereas others, particularly

marketing and customer-orientated functions, were upgraded, with new interactive communication skills. The authors used a concept developed by their colleagues in Munich (Altmann et al. 1986), "systemic rationalisation," which became the dominant rationalisation paradigm in German sociology in this period. In contrast to Taylorist rationalisation, systemic rationalisation focussed on the restructuring of the whole value chain and the combination of multiple potential for the improvement of productivity and profit. German industrial sociology became aware that rationalisation had outgrown the frontiers of the firm (Wittke 1996). The new IC technologies allowed for flexible control and governance of complex intra- and inter-firm processes with administrative and coordination functions even more important than direct production work. In contrast to the narrow view of Kern and Schumann, centred on industrial workers' concrete work experiences, the systemic approach tried to recover the neo-Marxist view of the integrated value production process which now implied integral rationalisation and control mechanisms.

The advocates of Marxist real subsumption theory came to quite similar conclusions in their studies on the increasing automation of work, the dominance of the cost-saving time economy and flexible, market-driven production regimes (Benz-Overhage et al. 1982, 1985). The broad use of IC technologies led to a new quality of real and immediate subsumption of human work under the logic of abstract capital and total mechanical control. The dominance of the capitalist production system became even more total and universal, with human work even more integrated and subordinated under the logic of the production value. The emancipation hopes of other competing approaches, such as those of Marxists, or liberal post-industrialists, seemed highly utopian. Modern computer technologies overcame, in this view, the traditional contradictions between use value and exchange value, and between standardised production and flexible markets, in favour of a totalitarian capitalist production system. Max Weber's 'iron cage' won the battle against Marx' emancipatory hopes.

The third trend shaping sociology of work after Fordism was tertiarisation. Tertiarisation included two dimensions, the sectoral shift from manufacturing to service sectors and the shift from direct productive activities to administrative, maintenance and other service activities in all firms and sectors (Deutschmann 2002, pp. 27ff.). The traditional distinction between blue-collar and white-collar was replaced by a differentiated picture of service activities and occupations. The process of economic value creation turned out to be increasingly immaterial and intangible.

Tertiarisation, Humanisation and Micro-politics

Tertiarisation was closely linked to lean production in the sense that firms tended to be seen to concentrate on a few core competencies while out-sourcing the major part of their activities along the value chain towards specialised service providers and suppliers. The vertical integration of the large Fordist firm was replaced by a network organisation around a core company. The network metaphor, however, should not obscure the often hierarchical structure of these networks and the declining quality of working and employment conditions in line with the growing distance from the core company.

Another aspect of tertiarisation was the incorporation of women into the labour markets with women-specific service occupations. The frontiers between "natural feminine" and professional qualifications and competences became blurred (Jacobsen 2010). Social and communicative competence was particularly demanded for service work with clients, patients, users, families, etc. The quantitative increase of the female labour force was accompanied by the qualitative feminisation of work contents and qualifications.

The ongoing debates on the relationship between rationalisation and technological change received a new input from the huge research programme on "Humanisation of Work" launched by the German ministry of Research and Technology. Adopting the view of the end of technical determinism, the shaping of technological innovation under human aspects and quality of working life criteria became a widely discussed norm. Empirical studies showed that the same technology may be employed in very different social and working conditions producing identical economic results, while technological development by no means follows a logic of technical and economic efficiency (Lutz 1987).

The *Humanisation of Work* initiative (Rave 1982) reflected the end of the post-war belief that economic growth, working time reduction and technological progress would automatically improve the quality of work. The experience in many industries, however, revealed increased stress, health and safety problems and dissatisfaction. Social protest and the entrance of the social democrats into Government in the 1970s motivated the programme for the systematic improvement of working life. The state and collective bargaining took responsibility to correct the degradation of work inherent in economic and technological development. Working conditions such as breaks and recovery times, cycle times and ergonomic conditions entered collective bargaining and labour conflict agendas. Many research projects

were conducted in the framework of the initiative which lasted officially from 1974 till 1989. Many social scientists shared the hope for a conciliation of rationalisation and humanisation.

Inspired by the seminal study of Michel Crozier and Erhard Friedberg (1979), *Sociology of Work and Organization in Germany* developed new approaches to the analysis of power relations in firms and organisations, centred on multiple actors and organisational levels. While traditional labour process and industrial relations theories focused exclusively on the capital–labour conflict, the new micro-political and network approaches brought the complex interplay between multiple individual and collective actors, inside and outside the organisation, into focus. All formal organisations implied fields of uncertainty and open spaces for power games among their members and users. This politicisation of Industrial Sociology went beyond the former debates on technological versus capital profit determination and moved the actors, with their various interests and conflicts, to the centre of analysis. The firm was conceived as a social order of norms and routines that shaped the daily action of workers, thereby reducing uncertainty (Hildebrandt and Seltz 1989).

Ulrich Jürgens and Frieder Naschold (1984) developed the concept of "labour politics," following Michael Burawoys' (1979) distinction between "politics in production" (work process design) and "politics of production" (the state and other contextual agents). They argued that the organisation of work and the concrete form of employment are not rational or instrumental processes but political power struggles. Jürgens (1984) developed a fundamental distinction between primary power, defined as the power resources of employees and employee collectives in the immediate employment relations in the firm, and secondary power, based on the accumulated, collectively achieved, norms and institutions. Following Crozier and Friedberg (1979), power struggles and resource allocation take place in spheres of non-determination opened, and demarcated by, existing institutional settings and accumulated experiences beyond the well-known power asymmetries in the external and internal labour markets. Organisations are never completely determined but have always space for manoeuvre and negotiation among actors as a source of uncertainty. The labour politics concept reflects many empirical findings in Industrial Sociology, where workers relied much more on their primary power resources, such as their practical know-how and experience, as against the secondary power resources of trade unions or works councils (see, e.g., the analysis of shipyard workers in Schumann et al. 1982). The hope of trade unions and progressive politicians and scientists

that the humanisation campaign would foster a strong movement for better work ran up against reality: many worker collectives were sceptical of the possibility for any real human-centred reforms.

Jürgens (1984) identified three primary power resources: (1) the knowledge and experience of production; (2) the vulnerability of the production process (employment of production knowledge in workers' interest) and (3) the options in the internal labour market (3). These primary power constellations were understood as conditioning informal negotiation processes between workers and management while also influencing formal bargaining terrains. The interaction between primary and secondary power structures became the main focus of critical employment analysis.

In a similar vein, several authors recovered Tom Burns' concept of "micro-politics" (1961) to overcome economic rationalist concepts of the firm, conceiving firms as political arenas and contested terrains (Edwards 1979). In reference to Giddens' theory of structuration (1984), firms were conceived as structured arenas of social action with collective actors mobilising different power resources in pursuit of their interests, thus constituting a complex of micro-political games (Ortmann 1995; Küpper and Ortmann 1988; Lauschke and Welskopp 1994). It was argued that economic, organisational and technological conditions structured an organisational field and limited the space for actors and groups to manoeuvre in line with their various strategic interests (Riegraf 2005).

The politicisation of industrial relations and human resources management, including the strategies of technological modernisation, were complemented by a more systematic concept of contingency. Employment policies were thus conceived as the undetermined outcome of micro-political games, on the one hand, and contextual conditions, on the other. Two main clusters of contextual variables were identified by Sorge and Streeck (1988). The organisation of work and the skill structure, on the one hand, and the market and product strategies, on the other, were perceived to be the main factors conditioning micro-political struggles within the firm.

Subjectivation and Gender

The Sociology of Work in the period under scrutiny received two further enriching influences. Sociology in general, and Industrial Sociology in particular, recovered the concepts of 'subject' and 'subjectivity' after many years of structuralist, functionalist or systemic dominance when the notion of the

subject was widely marginalised (Kleemann and Voß 2010). The study of occupational biographies and the accumulated experiences during working life became prominent research issues.

The strong emergence of gender as a fundamental category in social research also entered the *Sociology of Work* (Jürgens 2010). Gender studies criticised narrow perspectives on contractual, salaried work and included reproductive activities in a broader work and life perspective. Beck-Gernsheim (1980) and Ostner (1978) developed the concept of a specific, socially determined "female labour force," whereas Becker-Schmidt (1980; 1982), and her many followers, analysed the twofold socialisation of women as family and salaried workers. Work at home, in the family, and work in factories and offices were interlinked as identity-building life experiences that lay claim to a wider concept of work than that found in traditional Industrial Sociology.

Gender studies recovered home and care work for a Sociology of Work, which had marginalised these spheres with the differentiation of work-place and household at the beginning of modernity (Geissler 2010). Private households were seen as part of the economic system providing fundamental material and immaterial goods for society and, at the same time, essential institutions for the social integration of individuals in modern societies. Work in private households was understood mainly as care work within the framework of mutual personal commitments and emotional relationships. On the other hand, households were understood as playing an increasing role in the demand for professional personal service work. The so-called "domestic work debate" (*Hausarbeitsdebatte*; see Beer 1990; Paulus 2013) opened the horizon for an extended concept of work and working life for the post-Fordist sociology of work and for the feminist stream of gendered capitalist society analysis.

In Germany, even more than in other countries, sociology of work and industry lost its dominant position as the type of sociology that integrated concrete empirical and theoretical research with general social theory. Industrial work was no longer the natural entrance to the centre of modern society but just one among other concrete sociological realities. On the other hand, the incorporation of many concepts from organisational analysis, institutionalism, gender and labour market theories enriched the research instruments of Industrial Sociology in Germany for an even more complex and fragmented future.

Re-unification and Globalisation (1990–2015)

Post-Fordism, Post-industrialism or Knowledge Society?

The end of the twentieth and the beginning of the twenty-first century saw two main new developments in the dynamic of capitalist society. Globalisation separated economic development from the control of nation states leaving the latter in a precarious situation. In parallel, financialisation shifted the dominance from productive firms and markets towards financial investors and markets. Both interrelated trends had deep impacts on social welfare, employment relations and Industrial Sociology. In Germany, these fundamental transformations coincided with the unification after the fall of the wall in 1989.

Since the early 1990s, there has been a clear consciousness of a fundamental transformation of our societies in sociological analyses. In Germany, this awareness was even stronger due to the fall of the wall, the unification of the two Germanys and the end of the Cold War. The Fordist dream of stable class compromise, social progress, increased welfare and democratic participation was finally abandoned. Since then, there has been an open and ongoing debate on the new form of society emerging out of the ruins of Fordism. A lot of labels have been invented since Daniel Bell (1973) and Alain Touraine (1971) in the early 1970s started to talk about the coming of post-industrial society. The inflationary use of the prefix "post" indicates the shared consciousness of the end of an era but an uncertainty as to what might come next and where it might go.

What soon became clear was that the idea of an end of work society, popularised, from André Gorz (1980b) to Jeremy Rifkin (1995), was empirically and theoretically unsustainable. But there was a whole set of deep transformations that demanded a re-conceptualisation of work and society, among which the most evident were as follows:

- Flexibilisation and deregulation of labour markets and labour contracts;
- Flexibilisation and restructuring of work organisation;
- Decentralisation of firms and organisations;
- Internationalisation of firms, networks and value chains;
- Increasing importance of knowledge and intangible assets;
- Privatisation and cutback of public social welfare systems;
- Feminisation and multi-ethnic composition of the workforce;
- Individualisation and fragmentation of work biographies and life styles.

The result of all these interrelated trends is by no way clearly defined as a new type of work regime and society but much more a fragmented puzzle of hybrid combinations of organisational and lifestyle patterns. The list of new society labels is too long to be referenced here but, concerning the changes in work and employment, some authors shifted the generalisation of manufactured risks in the social organisation of work and life to the centre by speaking of a "global risk society" (Beck 1992; Giddens 1990). Labour markets, occupational careers and work–life balances are in constant change, requiring a permanent risk management from individuals without the aid of the traditional anchors of stability and protection. Other researchers focused on the central role of science and intellectual work in a world dominated by the new technologies of information and communication (TICs), thus talking about a *The Rise of the Network Society* (Castells 2000) or a "Knowledge Society," the latter increasingly established as an official term by international organisations such as the UNESCO (2005), the World Bank (2002) or the European Union (2000). Among German industrial sociologists, however, there have been important voices claiming that ongoing changes in capitalist industrial society have to be made sense of in terms of the industrialisation of immaterial production processes which provide the main content of the current socio-economic transformation (Hack and Hack 2005). Software, culture and communication industries do not lose their capitalist industrial character, even when working in abstract and global systemic networks (Hack 1988) integrating scientific and productive activities.

After many years of diverse empirical research in post-Fordist heterogeneity without clear concepts of society and production models, the worldwide crisis of global capitalism beginning in 2008, and its ongoing consequences, provoked a kind of wake-up call among German industrial sociologists. Capitalism was not just a faceless abstract complex metaphor, as it had been used for a long time, but a concrete and conflictual societal form. "Bringing capitalism back in!" was the programmatic title of a conference organised by several leading industrial research institutes in 2009 (Dörre et al. 2012). The lost connection between workplace analysis and capitalist critique would have to be recovered in a situation where the contradictions and damages of the global capitalist system again became evident. Sarah Nies and Dieter Sauer (2012) argued in favour of a combination of 'social critique' (precariat, social exclusive labour markets, increasing inequality) and a critique of the alienation of working conditions: two perspectives often not related in contemporary Sociology of Work.

Claus Offe (in Kocka and Offe 2000) nuanced the strong notion of the 'end-of-work' thesis by discussing the double crisis of salaried work.

Two secular trends, the sustained structural mass unemployment and the end of the normal employment contract, undermined the central role of work as a source of identity and biographical planning, the main pillars of the twentieth century's developed societies. *The Social Architecture of Industrial Societies* (Dettling 2000), the golden triangle of growing national economies, consolidated welfare states and a stable family model around the male breadwinner, was definitely fading away.

Martin Baethge and Volker Baethge-Kinsky (1998; see also Kern and Sabel 1994) did not speak of the end of work but of the 'end of the profession' in the specific German form, where the qualified professional worker organised his social identity and status around his professionality. New flexible work regimes and process-oriented work organisation undermined the stable occupational structure of industrial work, demanding more volatile cross-functional qualifications. In a similar vein to Richard Sennett's flexible and fragmented personality (1998), the authors analysed the erosion of the profession as a source of personal biography and social integration.

The debates on work organisation in the final decade of the twentieth century were focused on teamwork and quality production under the influence of lean production as the new dominant management model. Whereas some authors tried to revitalise their former re-professionalisation theses, others, supported by empirical conflicts and rejections on behalf of many affected workforces, viewed lean production as a sophisticated neo-Taylorist management strategy. In their *Trend Report Rationalisation*, Schumann et al. (1994) attempted to prove their thesis of a trend towards more upskilled and integrated industrial work formulated a decade earlier. However, the new qualified "system integrator" represented only a small minority, while automation and new technologies in no way eliminated vast areas of simple repetitive manual work. The hope for a diffusion of "new production concepts" and "innovative labour policies" could not be confirmed empirically.

With the massive implementation of lean production in German industries, sociologists paid special attention to teamwork, recovering thus several topics of the socio-technical humanisation of work debate of the 1970s. Schumann and Gerst (1997) differentiated among structural conservative and innovative forms of teamwork and tried to imbue the latter with more autonomy and democratic self-management, but empirical reality suggested that the innovative model was a rare exception (Springer 1999; Jürgens 1997). Further development soon downplayed the centrality of teamwork as one element of a wide range of new restructuring and reengineering strategies in the context of transnationalisation and company reorganisation.

Under the label of "Integrated Production Systems", the current debate in Germany has attempted to bundle a wide range of organisational concepts, which seek to integrate productive, logistical and inter-organisational value chain operations into coherent management and rationalisation strategies (Hirsch-Kreinsen 2013). The primary features of this approach may be summarised in three elements:

- The process orientation that focuses on the whole value production, including administrative tasks, suppliers and partners, all of which are part of a smooth flow of value-adding activities;
- Efficient resource management and high-quality standards, avoiding all sorts of waste and frictions;
- High degrees of standardisation throughout the whole process that guarantee stability and efficiency along the entire value chain.

In a similar vein, Heil and Kuhlmann (2013) distinguished four dimensions in the Integrated Production System approach, that sometimes also appears under the labels of 'operational', 'manufacturing' or 'business excellence':

- The supply-chain and logistic perspective seeks the smooth organisation of flows among customer, final assembly, and supplier with just-in-time/just-in-sequence systems thus avoiding storekeeping.
- The quality management perspective builds on many formal certification systems, such as ISO, EFQM or Six Sigma, implementing transparent standardised procedures to guarantee quality and low-defect production with responsibility distributed among all involved employees and departments.
- The industrial engineering perspective focuses on the continuous improvement and optimisation of the production processes and flows and involves experts and workers.
- Labour politics, finally, focuses on the participation and involvement of the workforce in the constant process of optimisation, promoting teamwork, multi-tasking and multiple communication strategies.

The Integrated Production System is thus a further development and extension of the lean, or Toyota system, integrating its different elements such as teamwork, continuous improvement, targeting and controlling into an all-encompassing management concept (Frerichs 2015). Its search for high levels of standardisation and the integration of all stages of the value creation process places great pressure on workers and leaves low margins for human-centred innovative work organisation practices.

Decentralisation, Marketisation, Networks and Subjectivation

Marketisation and decentralisation became the central strategic elements of the post-Fordist reorganisation and rationalisation debates (Sauer 2010; 2013). Flexibilisation of working time, contracts and employment relations and "subjectivation" of work in terms of self-control and performance-based evaluation and reward systems are transforming people's working lives and work–life balance.

Decentralisation implies different forms of reorganisation in smaller units through outsourcing, concentration on core competencies, de-hierarchisation and assigning more autonomy to the local organisational units. Marketisation refers to the strategic use of market mechanisms in corporate governance in two ways. The decentralised units are set under direct control and the pressures of market developments and market-like control mechanisms are implemented in the intra-firm governance system with cost and profit centres as organisational units. The organisation of self-responsibility under the constant pressure of imposed targets and evaluation data has led to individualised and stressed workforces.

Another multifaceted concept with inflationary use in the Sociology of Work is the "network" as a new flexible form of coordination and governance within and between organisations (Windeler and Wirth 2010; Sydow and Windeler 2000). The research group "firm networks" at the University of Berlin has developed a specific network approach based on Anthony Giddens' structuration theory. Network is defined as a social system formed by competent actors, who interact in a given set of institutions using its norms, rules and resources (Windeler 2001). Networks are governance systems of durable relations different from markets (supply/demand following price signals) and organisations (hierarchical management), although they may imply both market and hierarchical elements. Empirical research has focused on different forms of network in specific sectors such as supply chains in the automobile industry (Köhler 2000), retail (Wirth 1999) and television sectors (Sydow and Windeler 2004). Network governance implies three main coordination mechanisms (Riegraf 2005, p. 160):

- Coordination by standardisation: the network actors require common binding standards regarding quality, security, interaction procedures, etc., to be able to interact in a routinised manner in order to reduce transaction costs.

- Coordination by plan: the organisation of network processes such as just-in-time delivery or inter-firm flows of people and material require stable decision schedules and sequences for all involved actors.
- Coordination by mutual adjustment: the most complicated, interdependent and not-standardisable interactions require a difficult and complex coordination of reciprocal co-operative adjustments with fluent communication procedures. This genuine network coordination provides both a critical advantage and high vulnerability with regard to network governance.

It is argued that networks reflect the increasing interdependence of economic action and the importance of micro-politics beyond hierarchies and ongoing power–resources imbalances. The increasing network governance is seen to be related to the above mentioned trends of marketisation and decentralisation and to the growing precariat (Standing 2011) in modern economies. In many network-dominated sectors such as retail and TV, collective action and representation is weak and atypical employment high. The same holds true for new service sectors such as call centres and online marketing.

The younger generation at the Munich Institute for Social Science Research attempted to combine the traditional firm approach (see above, Altmann et al. 1978) with the new supra-firm network concept, conceiving both, firms and networks, as complementary forms of capitalist rule (Schmierl and Pfeiffer 2005). In their view, networks are forms of capitalist inter-firm governance that allow additional profit sources, flexible adjustments to more volatile investment conditions and the management of complex logistics in capital circulation. Rationalisation strategies in firms and networks have to be adjusted, which means increased complexity and new challenges for management and labour politics.

The precariat debate acquired some particular issues since Germany is traditionally considered to be a coordinated and organised market economy with high standards of employment protection. The famous 'Agenda 2010' reform package of the social democrat-green Government under Gerhard Schroeder (2003/04) opened the door to a fast-growing low-wage and atypical employment sector, which in few years accounted for a third of German employment contracts. The argument was that the relationship between employment and social integration was interrupted such that many employees found themselves in unsecure life situations with the added risk of poverty.

The segmentation and fragmentation of workers' activities required a redefinition by Sociologists of Work that would include new and increased

peripheral collectives. Michael Schumann (2001) distinguished five primary, sometimes overlapping, categories to describe the current workforce.

1. The outsiders: people excluded from employment with few possibilities of employment. The list of groups at risk of exclusion in modern labour markets includes the long-term unemployed, ethnic minorities, immigrant workers, certain age groups and the low qualified. Exclusion research has to be an integral part of the Sociology of Work.
2. The precariat: this includes a growing group of workers in a situation of permanent instability and insecurity, such as temporary, agency, subcontracted, low-wage workers without career perspectives.
3. Traditional low-qualified workers performing simple repetitive jobs have not disappeared and in some industrial and service sectors their numbers have increased, while the pressure and intensity of work for those in this category has become more challenging.
4. The (re-)qualified employee: particularly in high-tech areas and new media sectors creative people with considerable autonomy are working in highly flexible and complex organisational contexts, facing high demands but attractive development perspectives.
5. The knowledge worker: close and sometimes overlapping with the former category, these people are highly qualified doing specialised jobs in finance, R&D and high-tech sectors with high degrees of autonomy and responsibility.

A renewed Sociology of Work has to elaborate conceptual frameworks to integrate this diversity of experiences and situations in modern volatile contexts.

Part of the fragmentation and deterioration of working conditions is the direct outcome of politics. 'Agenda 2010' implied labour market reform with cutbacks in employment protection and the creation of a huge low-wage sector with precarious employment contracts. Trade unions and related social groups attempted to react, inspired by the International Labour Organization (ILO), with the decent work campaign. Since 2007, the German Confederation of Trade Unions DGB has organised a yearly survey among salaried workers on work quality and has elaborated a synthetic index on good work. This campaign has referred explicitly to the humanisation movement of the 1970s (see above; Sauer 2011) although content and context differ a lot. The social consensus and reform orientation of the 1970s has been removed by the neoliberal hegemony and the concept of decent, or good work, is seen as broader and more individualistic, going beyond

immediate working conditions and including work–life balance and social service issues.

Feminist and gender studies continue to investigate non-salaried housework as a structural part of modern capitalist economies while also exploring changes in households and gender relations. Another focus was that of the "subjectivation" of work and the increased use of the entire person for working targets beyond the formal employment contract, using flexible working time and constant connectivity, new forms of work such as telework. The argument has been that this has increased problems for work–life balance and management and the organisation of housework. A growing number of household activities, which had traditionally been realised by housewives as non-salaried private work, are seen as returning to the market in the form of increasing demand for care and cleaning services. The bulk of these care and cleaning jobs are typically precarious, atypical low-wage work (Geissler 2010). The growing marketisation of housework forms part of a general economisation of life with private and public spheres becoming objects of instrumentalist economic management.

The gender approach towards work is much inspired by the concept of work as subjectivating action (Böhle 2013; Lohr 2013) that distinguishes between objectivating social action, based on rational planning and decision making, and subjectivating social action, based on practical dialogue, sensory perception and environmental interaction. From this perspective, practical experience beyond rational analysis acquires ever more relevance for the analysis of work in the context of the new systemic, all-encompassing rationalisation strategies and new types of workforce such as the "entreployee" (see below). The multidimensional relation to work at home, and in the workplaces of many women, brought the subjectivating dimension of work as social action to the fore.

New forms of work, such as the "labour force entrepreneur," "entreployee" (Voβ and Pongratz 1998) or "contract work" (Schmidt 2010), emerged beside the traditional salaried work forms. Debates about "knowledge work" (Böhle 2010; Willke 1999) describe a new type of work, based on constant renewal of knowledge, learning and innovation with highly autonomous workers. Work no longer means the transformation of material objects but rather the processing of abstract intangible information. The worker as an entrepreneur of his own labour is no longer oriented towards internal company labour markets, but tries to constantly improve his or her individual employability in competitive labour markets.

The debate on the *Subjectivation of Work* (Kleemann and Voβ 2010) has focused on the blurring of boundaries between work and life and the

strategies for exploiting all productive forces of the working person beyond the employment contract. The subjectivation of work refers to a long-hidden dimension of the classical transformation problem: how to transform the variety of individual subjective attitudes, motives and capabilities into productive and highly efficient work? Worker subjectivity no longer means execution of assigned tasks but rather constant self-economisation and the self-rationalisation of one's own subjective forces. Subjectivation appears as a new dominant post-Fordist rationalisation paradigm with the entire person, not just the workforce, as agency. Not only work but the entire lifestyle becomes object of permanent rationalisation (Voβ 1994). The debate has been inspired by a range of theorists including Michel Foucault (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1987) and Boltanski and Chiapello (1999) who, in different ways, have suggested developments similar to those described by Elias in the "civilisation process."

Traditionally, subjectivation implied positive normative notions such as autonomy, self-realisation and creativity, but in the current context it becomes a label for new complete forms of exploitation of the entire productive forces of a person beyond the instrumental workforce. Subjectivation evidently has its limits and the concept has been criticised for not discussing them in an adequate manner. As a management strategy, it implies the attempt to go beyond the control of the workforce mobilising the entire person for productive targets all around the clock. This, of course, is impossible as nobody is able to meet this norm and to act strategically in this way in all spheres of life (Deutschmann 2001). However, the increased instrumentalisation of private competences and activities for professional purposes is an important pathology of modern working life and the frontiers between work and private life are becoming increasingly blurred.

Financialisation

"Will shareholder-value economy gobble up modern work?" was Michael Schumann's (1997) troubled question. He was concerned with the failure of innovation team-work in the context of the pressure posed by short-term financial markets. Since the 1990s, the debate on the character of post-Fordist capitalism has acquired a clear direction towards a new type of capitalist regime, identified as financial market-driven capitalism. The political deregulation of financial markets in the wake of the breakdown of the Bretton Woods system in the 1970s converted the formerly regulated financial system, which had guaranteed the framework for international trade and investment,

into a highly uncertain and uncontrolled source of instability, attracting increasing amounts of floating capital. The subsequent financialisation of the global economy led to a fundamental reorientation of strategic management resulting from the pressures, norms and demands of the international financial markets (Kädtler 2010). Financialisation imposes the notion of shareholder value as it becomes the dominant management strategy. It consists of outsourcing, a concentration on core competencies, management rewards linked to the stock market value, autonomous profit units, control via market figures, US accounting standards and communication systems linked to financial market agencies. The institutionalisation of a specific public space composed of institutional investment funds, analysts, brokers, rating agencies, media and other agents of the financial community reproduces a set of norms to evaluate the performance of managers and firms. A new type of ownership, investment funds, different from the traditional entrepreneur and from the shareholder in the era of managerial capitalism, with the financial markets as its main field of action, imposes new rules of governance on the firms.

In Germany, the financialisation debate has been linked to the 'end of the Germany Inc.' and the erosion of the specific German stakeholder business model, responsible for the economic and social welfare in the Fordist period (Streeck and Höpner 2003; see above). Since the 1990s, the deregulation of the financial system and complementary neoliberal reforms has led to the steady erosion of the institutional pillars of the model. Authors such as Martens and Bluhm (2007) interpreted financialisation as the third wave of Americanisation of European corporate governance after Taylorism (the first wave in the interwar period) and the market-oriented American management style of the post-war boom period (1950–1970).

Working in the Twenty-First Century

There has been a growing awareness among sociological analysts that we are living in a world of fundamental changes in the organisation of work and labour markets. Some research groups, such as the Institute for Social Research in Munich and the Sociology of Work group at the University of Jena (see Dörre et al. 2012), have identified a rupture in the management of economic organisations towards a new form of dominance (Nies and Sauer 2012). Incorporating *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (Boltanski and Chiapello 2007) as critique of the hierarchical-bureaucratic organisation, the new form of indirect control is assumed to be based on the apparent

autonomy of the self-managed employee, who responds to targets, benchmarks and other signals from the markets and internal market simulations. Flexible marketisation replaces the institutional workplace order.

The latest challenge for German industrial sociologists is the "smart factory" or "Factory 4.0" programme that began officially in 2012. In contrast to other large European economies, such as the UK, France, Italy or Spain, Germany has not de-industrialised but rather has always maintained a strong industrial and internationally competitive manufacturing industry. When the USA launched a National Manufacturing Innovation Network as reaction to the massive relocation towards Asia and particularly China, the German government and social partners immediately reacted, being aware of the importance of keeping pace with industrial renewal. Intelligent, digitalised manufacturing networks with people, machines and firms connected in real time are the new paradigm for future manufacturing with highly qualified workers. The virtual internet world incorporates the material manufacturing world: the customer communicates directly with the production machine and the logistic network to order his/her personalised product cheap and quickly (see, e.g., the advances in 3D printing). According to some analysts, the forth industrial revolution has begun (Buhr 2015).

The debate on the impact of smart production systems on work and society has just begun and some elements remember the automation and unmanned factory debates of the 1980s, but a major impact on the occupational and organisational structure of industrial work appears evident. Many traditional manual tasks and functions will be replaced by intelligent machinery. The controlling and directing tasks will become more complex, the responsibility of control and supervisory work will increase, and the relationship between humans and machines will change (Hirsch-Kreinsen 2014).

Two different organisational models have emerged in the current debate on Industry 4.0 in Germany (ibidem): the polarised organisation and the crowd organisation. The former is divided into a residual group of low-qualified operative employees and a new highly qualified group of experts, technicians and specialists. The latter assumes a relatively homogeneous and egalitarian collective of flexible, highly qualified workers, interacting in a smooth network organisation with flat hierarchies and high levels of interdependent autonomy.

German Industrial Sociology thus enters a new challenge with new technological and organisational systems and networks, but very old normative, research questions: How to control technological innovation in a way that combines economic and social progress while allowing German industry to

maintain its competitive advantage when employing highly skilled and participative workforces?

The Sociology of Work at the beginning of the twenty-first century lacks a clearly defined model of organisation and rationalisation, able to replace the Fordist model of post-war capitalism. Instead, there seems to be a constant reorganisation, restructuring and recomposition of different strategies and organisational forms with a range of hybrids and blurred boundaries, although sometimes bundled under labels such as 'Integrated Production Systems' or 'Business Excellence'. Pluralism and segmentation of models of work organisation and employment relations characterise the current situation in Germany and also the academic debates on post-Fordist Sociology of Work (Trinczek 2010). If a general social trend might be discerned in the huge variety of empirical studies, it is that of the extended conquest of the whole person for the production of economic value. All current rationalisation and reorganisation strategies follow the aim of subordinating all spheres of life to flexible adjustments attending market requirements—and to exert 24-hour pressure on the workforce to meet production targets. The central idea of the real subsumption of work under capitalism (Marx), widely abandoned in German industrial sociology in the 1980s, might be more relevant than ever.

"Half a century ago it was the mission of research on industrial relations and the world of work to teach capitalism how to respect a growing sphere of social rights and flourish nevertheless, as a condition of social stability and political support for democracy" (Streeck 2008, p. 19). In an era of neoliberal globalisation, this identity-building mission has been lost, and German industrial sociologists lack a common normative framework. Nevertheless, the conceptual and methodological tools for a critical sociological analysis of the world of work, elaborated over the seven decades since World War Two, are worth keeping and developing further. Although fragmented and diverse, German Industrial Sociology has demonstrated that it can renew itself as it links qualitative empirical research to social theory.

References

Adorno, T. W., & Dirks, W. (Eds.). (1955). *Betriebsklima. Eine industriesoziologische Untersuchung aus dem Ruhrgebiet*. Frankfurt/M.: EVA.

Altmann, N., & Bechtle, G. (1971). *Betriebliche Herrschaftsstruktur und industrielle Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt/M./New York: Campus.

Altmann, N., Bechtle, G., & Lutz, B. (1978). *Betrieb - Arbeit - Technik. Elemente einer soziologischen Analytik technisch-organisatorischer Veränderungen.* Frankfurt/M./New York: Campus.

Altmann, N., Deiß, M., Döhl, V., & Sauer, D. (1986). Ein 'Neuer Rationalisierungstyp'- neue Anforderungen an die Industriesoziologie. *Soziale Welt, 37*(2/3), 189–207.

Baethge, M., & Baethge-Kinsky, V. (1998). Jenseits von Beruf und Beruflichkeit? - Neue Formen von Arbeitsorganisation und Beschäftigung und ihre Bedeutung für eine zentrale Kategorie gesellschaftlicher Integration. *Mitteilungen aus der Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung, 31*(3), 461–471.

Baethge, M., & Oberbeck, L. (1986). *Die Zukunft der Angestellten. Neue Technologien und berufliche Perspektiven in Büro und Verwaltung.* Frankfurt/M.: Campus.

Bahrdt, H. P. (1958). *Industriebürokratie.* Stuttgart: Enke.

Beck, U. (1992). *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity.* New Delhi: Sage.

Beck-Gernsheim, E. (1980). *Das halbierte Leben. Männerwelt Beruf - Frauenwelt Familie.* Frankfurt/M.: Fischer.

Becker-Schmidt, R. (1980). Widersprüchliche Realität und Ambivalenz. Arbeitserfahrungen von Frauen in Fabrik und Familie. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 32*(4), 705–725.

Becker-Schmidt, R. (1982). Lebenserfahrung und Fabrikarbeit: Psychosoziale Bedeutungsdimensionen industrieller Tätigkeit. In G. Schmidt et al. (Eds.), *Materialien zur Industriesoziologie (Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Sonderheft 24/1982)* (pp. 297–311). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Beer, U. (1990). *Geschlecht, Struktur, Geschichte. Soziale Konstituierung des Geschlechterverhältnisses.* Frankfurt/New York: Campus.

Bell, D. (1973). *The Coming of Post-industrial Society.* New York: Basic Books.

Benz-Overhage, K., Brandt, G., & Papadimitriou, Z. (1982). Computertechnologien im industriellen Arbeitsprozeß. In G. Schmidt et al. (Eds.), *Materialien zur Industriesoziologie (Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Sonderheft 24/1982)* (pp. 84–104). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Benz-Overhage, K., Brumlop, E., & von Freyberg, T. (1985). *Neue Technologien und alternative Arbeitsgestaltung. Auswirkungen des Computereinsatzes in der industriellen Produktion.* Frankfurt: Campus.

Berger, H. (1965). *Methoden industriesoziologischer Untersuchungen.* Berlin: Staatsverlag der DDR.

Bergmann, J., Jacobi, O., & Müller-Jentsch, W. (1975). *Gewerkschaften in der Bundesrepublik.* Frankfurt/Köln: EVA.

Böhle, F. (2010). Arbeit als Handeln. In Böhle et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 151–176). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Böhle, F. (2013). Subjektivierendes Arbeitshandeln. In H. Hirsch-Kreinsen & H. Minssen (Eds.), *Lexikon der Arbeits- und Industriesoziologie* (pp. 425–430). Berlin: Edition Sigma.

Böhle, F., Voβ, G., & Wachtler, G. (Eds.). (2010). *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, E. (1999/2007). *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London and New York: Verso.

Braczyk, H.-J., Knesebeck, J., & Schmidt, G. (1982). Nach einer Renaissance. Zur gegenwärtigen Situation von Industriesoziologie in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. In G. Schmidt et al. (Eds.), *Materialien zur Industriesoziologie (Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, Sonderheft 24/1982)* (pp. 16–55). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Brandt, G. (1990). *Arbeit, Technik und gesellschaftliche Entwicklung*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and Monopoly Capital. The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York/London: Monthly Review Press.

Buhr, D. (2015, April). Soziale Innovationspolitik für die Industrie 4.0. *WISO Expertise*. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

Burawoy, M. (1979). *Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labour Process Under Monopoly Capitalism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burns, T. (1961). Micropolitics: Mechanisms of Institutional Change. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 6*(3), 257–281.

Castells, M. (2000). *The Rise of the Network Society* (2nd ed.). Wiley: Blackwell.

Croon, H., & Utermann, K. (Eds.). (1958). *Zeche und Gemeinde*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).

Crozier, M., & Friedberg, E. (1979). *Macht und Organization. Die Zwänge kollektiven Handelns*. Königstein/Ts: Athenäum.

Dahrendorf, R. (1959). Betriebssoziologie. In *Die Wirtschaftswissenschaften* (Beitrag Nr. 46). Wiesbaden: Gabler.

Dettling, W. (2000). Diesseits und jenseits der Erwerbsarbeit. In J. Kocka & C. Offe (Eds.), *Geschichte und Zukunft der Arbeit* (pp. 202–214). Frankfurt/M.: Campus.

Deutschmann, C. (2001). Die Gesellschaftskritik der Industriesoziologie – ein Anachronismus? *Leviathan, 23,* 58–69.

Deutschmann, C. (2002). *Postindustrielle Industriesoziologie*. Weinheim/München: Juventa.

Doeringer, P. B., & Piore, M. J. (1971). *Internal Labour Markets and Manpower Analysis*. Lexington: Sharpe.

Dörre, K., Sauer, D., & Wittke, V. (Eds.). (2012). *Kapitalismustheorie und Arbeit*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (Eds.). (1987). *Michel Foucault. Jenseits von Strukturalismus und Hermeneutik*. Frankfurt/M.: Athenäum.

Edwards, R. (1979). *Contested Terrain. The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Basic Books.

European Union. (2000). *Lisbon European Council 23 and 24 March Presidency Conclusion*. Available at http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/ec/00100-r1.en0.htm. Accessed 12 Mar 2018.

Faust, M., Funder, M., & Moldaschl, M. (Eds.). (2005). *Die "Organisation" der Arbeit*. München/Mehring: Rainer Hampp Verlag.

Frege, C. (2008). The History of Industrial Relations as a Field of Study. In P. Blyton, N. Bacon, J. Fiorito, & E. Heery (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Industrial Relations* (pp. 35–50). Los Angeles: Sage.

Frege, C. (2013). Competitive Perspectives in Employment Relations Research. *Industrielle Beziehungen, 20*(4), 285–303.

Frerichs, M. (2015). Industriearbeit 4.0: Gestaltungskonzepte für Gute Arbeit. In R. Hoffmann & C. Bogedan (Eds.), *Arbeit der Zukunft* (pp. 459–467). Frankfurt/New York: Campus.

Geissler, B. (2010). Haushaltsarbeit und Haushaltsdienstleistungen. In Böhle et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 931–962). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1990). *Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gorz, A. (1980a). *Abschied vom Proletariat*. Frankfurt/M.:EVA.

Gorz, A. (1980b). *Paths to Paradise: On the Liberation from Work*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.

Habermas, J. (1986). The New Obscurity: The Crisis of the Welfare State and the Exhaustion of Utopian Energies. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, 11,* 1–18.

Hack, L. (1988). *Vor Vollendung der Tatsachen*. Frankfurt/M.: Fischer.

Hack, L., & Hack, I. (2005). *Wissen, Macht und Organisation*. Berlin: Sigma.

Hall, P. A., & Soskice, D. (2001). *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heil, B., & Kuhlmann, M. (2013). Produktionssysteme sind gestaltbar. *SOFI-Mitteilungen, 7*(18), 1–5.

Hildebrandt, E., & Seltz, R. (1989). *Wandel betrieblicher Sozialverfassung durch systemische Kontrolle? Die Einführung computergestützter Produktionsplanungs- und –steuerungssysteme im bundesdeutschen Maschinenbau*. Berlin: Sigma.

Hirsch-Kreinsen, H. (2013). *Wandel von Industriearbeit. Herausforderungen und Folgen neuer Produktionssysteme in der Industrie* (Soziologisches Arbeitspapier Nr. 32). Dortmund: Lehrstuhl Wirtschafts- und Industriesoziologie, Technische Universität Dortmund.

Hirsch-Kreinsen, H. (2014, Dezember). Welche Auswirkungen hat 'Industrie 4.0' auf die Arbeitswelt? Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (Ed.), *WISO direkt*. Bonn: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.

Hirsch-Kreinsen, H., & Minssen, H. (Eds.). (2013). *Lexikon der Arbeits- und Industriesoziologie.* Berlin: Edition Sigma.

Hofstätter, P. R. (1957). *Gruppendynamik. Kritik der Massenpsychologie.* Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Höpner, M. (2003). *Wer beherrscht die Unternehmen? Shareholder Value, Managerherrschaft und Mitbestimmung in Deutschland.* Frankfurt/M./New York: Campus.

Jacobsen, H. (2010). Strukturwandel der Arbeit im Tertiarisierungsprozess. In F. Böhle et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 203–228). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Jander, M. (1988). *Pirker über Pirker.* Marburg: SP-Verlag Schüren.

Jantke, C. (1953). *Bergmann und Zeche.* Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).

Jürgens, U. (1984). Die Entwicklung von Macht, Herrschaft und Kontrolle im Betrieb als politischer Prozeß – Eine Problemskizze zur Arbeitspolitik. In U. Jürgens & F. Naschold (Eds.), *Arbeitspolitik* (pp. 58–91). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Jürgens, U. (1997). Rolling Back Cycle Times: The Renaissance of the Classic Assembly Line in Final Assembly. In K. Shimokawa, U. Jürgens, & T. Fujimoto (Eds.), *Transforming Automobile Assembly* (pp. 255–273). Berlin: Springer.

Jürgens, K. (2010). Arbeit und Leben. In F. Böhle et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 483–510). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Jürgens, U., & Naschold, F. (Eds.). (1984). *Arbeitspolitik. Materialien zum Zusammenhang von politischer Macht, Kontrolle und betrieblicher Organisation der Arbeit. Leviathan SH 5.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Kädtler, J. (2010). Finanzmärkte und Finanzialisierung. In F. Böhle et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 619–639). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Kallabis, H. (1965). Der technische Fortschritt und die Entwicklung der Gruppenbeziehungen und -Interaktionen im sozialistischen Industriebetrieb. *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie, 13*(12), 1465–1473.

Kern, H., & Sabel, C. F. (1994). Verblaßte Tugenden. Zur Krise des deutschen Produktionsmodells. In N. Beckenbach & W. von Treeck (Eds.), *Umbrüche gesellschaftlicher Arbeit, Soziale Welt SB 9* (pp. 605–624). Göttingen.

Kern, H., & Schumann, M. (1970). *Industriearbeit und Arbeiterbewußtsein.* Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

Kern, H., & Schumann, M. (1984a). *Das Ende der Arbeitsteilung. Rationalisierung in der industriellen Produktion.* München: Beck.

Kern, H., & Schumann, M. (1984b). Neue Produtkionskonzepte haben Chancen. *Soziale Welt, 35*(1/2), 146–158.

Kleemann, F., & Voß, G. G. 2010. Arbeit und Subjekt. In F. Böhle et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 415–450). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Kocka, J., & Offe, C. (Eds.). (2000). *Geschichte und Zukunft der Arbeit*. Frankfurt/M.: Campus.

Köhler, H.-D. (1998). Der Betrieb, Die Sozialwissenschaft und die deutsche Linke. In C. Goerg & R. Roth (Eds.), *Kein Staat zu machen* (pp. 404–426). Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Köhler, H.-D. (2000). Netzwerksteuerung und/oder Konzernkontrolle? Die Automobilkonzerne im Internationalisierungsprozeß. In J. Sydow & A. H. Windeler (Eds.), *Steuerung von Netzwerken* (pp. 280–300). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Köhler, C., & Krause, A. (2010). Betriebliche Beschäftigungspolitik. In F. Böhle et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 387–412). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

König, R. (1961). *Die informellen Gruppen im Industriebetrieb*. Berlin/Baden-Baden: Organisation, TFB Taschenbuchreihe, Bd. 1.

König, R., Attesländer, P., Treinen, H., & Stieber, H.-W. (1956). Betriebssoziologische Mikroanalyse. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 8*(1), 46–91.

Küpper, W., & Ortmann, G. (Eds.). (1988). *Mikropolitik. Rationalität, Macht und Spiele in Organisationen*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Lauschke, K., & Welskopp, T. (1994). *Mikropolitik im Unternehmen*. Essen: Klartext Verlag.

Lepsius, R. M. (1967). Industrie und Betrieb. In R. König (Ed.), *Das Fischer Lexikon* (pp. 129–142). Frankfurt: Fischer.

Lohr, K. (2013). Subjektivierung von Arbeit. In H. Hirsch-Kreinsen & H. Minssen (Eds.), *Lexikon der Arbeits- und Industriesoziologie* (pp. 430–437). Berlin: Edition Sigma.

Lutz, B. (1952). Industriesoziologische Untersuchungen des Wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Instituts der Gewerkschaften. *WWI-Mitteilungen, 5*(3), 58–63.

Lutz, B. (1976). Bildungssystem und Beschäftigungsstruktur in Deutschland und Frankreich – Zum Einfluss des Bildungssystems auf die Gestaltung betrieblicher Arbeitskräftestrukturen. In H. G. Mendius (Ed.), *Bildung – Arbeitsmarkt – Qualifikation* (pp. 83–151). Frankfrut/M./München: Aspekte.

Lutz, B. (1984). *Der kurze Traum immerwährender Prosperität*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus.

Lutz, B. (1987). Das Ende des Technikdeterminismus und die Folgen. In B. Lutz (Ed.), *Technik und Sozialer Wandel* (pp. 34–52). Frankfurt/M. and New York: Campus.

Lutz, B. (1989). Was wurde aus dem Kritikpotential der 'jungen Generation' der fünfziger Jahre? In R. Erd, D. Hoß, O. Jacobi, & P. Noller (Eds.), *Kritische Theorie und Kultur* (pp. 336–353). Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

Lutz, B. (1992). Konfliktpotential und sozialer Konsens: Die Geschichte des industriellen Systems der BRD im Spiegel des Schicksals einer Generation. In O. Rammstedt & Schmidt, G. (Eds.), *BRD ade! Vierzig Jahre in Rück-Ansichten von Sozial- Kulturwissenschaftlern* (pp. 101–122). Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

Lutz, B., & Schmidt, G. (1977). Industriesoziologie. In H. Daheim, B. Lutz, & G. Schmidt (Eds.), *Beruf, Industrie, sozialer Wandel in unterentwickelten Ländern* (pp. 101–262). Stuttgart: Enke.

Mallet, S. (1963/1975). *The New Working Class*. Nottingham: Spokesman.

Martens, B., & Bluhm, K. (2007). *Shareholder Value' ohne Aktionäre? Diffusion und mögliche Folgen wertorientierter Unternehmenssteuerung im industriellen Mittelstand* (Working Paper). Jena: University of Jena.

Maurice, M. F., Sorge, A., & Warner, M. (1980). Societal Differences in Organizing Manufacturing Units. *Organization Studies, 1*(1), 59–86.

Mayo, E. (1945/1975). *The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. London: Routledge, Kegan Paul.

Mickler, O. (2000). La sociología del trabajo en Alemania Occidental. *Sociología del Trabajo*, (Nr. 39), 135–152.

Mickler, O., Dittrich, E., & Neumann, U. (1976). *Technik*. Campus: Arbeitsorganisation und Arbeit. Eine Untersuchung n der automatisierten Produktion. Frankfurt/M./New York.

Mückenberger, U. (1985). Die Krise des Normalarbeitsverhältnisses. *Zeitschrift für Sozialreform, 31*(7), 457–475.

Müller-Jentsch, W. (2001). Germany. In D. B. Cornfield & R. Hodson (Eds.), *Worlds of Work: Building an International Sociology of Work* (pp. 221–252). New York: Kluwer.

Negt, O. (1984). *Lebendige Arbeit, enteignete Zeit*. Frankfurt/NY: Campus.

Nies, S., & Sauer, D. (2012). Arbeit - mehr als Beschäftigung? In Dörre et al. (Eds.), *Kapitalismustheorie und Arbeit. Neue Ansätze soziologischer Kritik* (pp. 34–62). Frankfurt and New York: Campus Verlag.

Ortmann, G. (1995). *Formen der Produktion*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Ostner, I. (1978). *Beruf und Hausarbeit. Beruf und Hausarbeit. Die Arbeit der Frau in unserer Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt/M./NY: Campus.

Parker, M., & Slaughter, J. (1993). Management-by-Stress: Die dunkle Seite des Teamkonzepts. In B. Lüthje & C. Scherrer (Eds.), *Jenseits des Sozialpakts* (pp. 50–64). Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Paulus, S. (2013). *Hausarbeitsdebatte Revisited. Zur Arbeitswerttheorie von Haus- und Reproduktionsarbeit*. Arbeitspapier TU Hamburg-Harburg. Available at https://d-nb.info/1048574024/34. Accessed 29 May 2018.

Pfeiffer, S. (2010). Technisierung von Arbeit. In Böhle et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (231–261). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Piore, M., & Sabel, C. (1984). *The Second Industrial Divide. Possibilities for Prosperity*. New York: Basic Books.

Pirker, T. (1963). *Bürotechnik - Zur Soziologie der maschinellen Informationsbearbeitung*. Stuttgart: Enke.

Pirker, T., Braun, S., Lutz, B., & Hammelrath, F. (1955). *Arbeiter, Management, Mitbestimmung*. Stuttgart/Düsseldorf: Ring.

Popitz, H., Bahrdt, H. P., Jüres, E. A., & Kesting, H. (1957a). *Technik und Industriearbeit*. Mohr (Siebeck): Tübingen.

Popitz, H., Bahrdt, H. P., Jüres, E. A., & Kesting, H. (1957b). *Das Gesellschaftsbild des Arbeiters*. Mohr (Siebeck): Tübingen.

Rave, D. (1982). Zukünftige Aufgaben der industriesoziologischen 'Forschung zur Humanisierung des Arbeitslebens'. In G. Schmidt, H.-J. Braczyk, & J. Knesebeck (Eds.), *Materialien zur Industriesoziologie. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* (pp. 516–522). SH 24.

Riegraf, B. (2005). Mikropolitische Analysekategorien und der Wandel von Verhandlungssystemen in Organisationen. In Faust et al. (Eds.), *Arbeit, Innovation und Nachhaltigkeit Band* (147–164). München/Mehring: Rainer Hampp Verlag.

Rifkin, J. (1995). *The End of Work: The Decline of the Global Labor Force and the Dawn of the Post-market Era*. New York: Putnam Publishing Group.

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. (1939/1956). Management and the Worker. Cambridge/MA: Harvard University Press.

Sauer, D. (2010). Vermarktlichung un Vernetzung der Unternehmens- und Betriebsorganisation. In Böhle et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 545–568). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Sauer, D. (2011). Von der 'Humanisierung der Arbeit' zur 'Guten Arbeit'. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, (Nr, 15) 18–24.

Sauer, D. (2013). *Die organisatorische Revolution. Umbrüche in der Arbeitswelt – Ursachen, Auswirkungen und arbeitspolitische Antworten*. Hamburg: VSA Verlag.

Schelsky, H. (1953). *Wandlungen der deutschen Familie in der Gegenwart*. Dortmund: Ardey.

Schmidt, G. (1980a). Max Webers Beitrag zur empirischen Industrieforschung. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 32,* 76–92.

Schmidt, G. (1980b). Zur Geschichte der Industriesoziologie in Deutschland. *Soziale Welt, 31,* 257–278.

Schmidt, G. (2010). Arbeit und Gesellschaft. In Böhle et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 127–147). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Schmidt, G., Braczyk, H.-J., & Knesebeck, J. (Eds.). (1982). *Materialien zur Industriesoziologie* (p. 24). SH: Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie.

Schmierl, K., & Pfeiffer, S. (2005). Lego-Logik der kapitalistischen "Netzwerkökonomie" – Theoretische Spekulationen zum Wandel von Betrieb und Technik. In Faust et al. (Eds.), *Die "Organisation" der Arbeit* (pp. 43–66). München und Mering: Hampp Verlag.

Schumann, M. (1997). Friβt die Shareholder-Value Ökonomie die moderne Arbeit? *Frankfurter Rundschau, 18*(11), 1997.

Schumann, M. (2000). Industriearbeit zwischen Entfremdung und Entfaltung. *Sofi-Mitteilungen* (Nr, 28), 103–112.

Schumann, M. (2001). Kritische Industriesoziologie – Neue Aufgaben. *SOFI-Mitteilungen* (Nr, 29), 93–97.

Schumann, M., Baethge-Kinsky, V., Kuhlmann, M., Kurz, C., & Neumann, U. (1994). *Trendreport Rationalisierung*. Berlin: Sigma.

Schumann, M., Einemann, E., Siebel-Rebell, C., & Wittemann, K. P. (1982). *Rationalisierung, Krise, Arbeiter. Eine empirische Untersuchung der Industrialisierung auf der Werft*. Frankfurt/M.: EVA.

Sengenberger, W. (1987). *Struktur und Funktionsweise von Arbeitsmärkten. Die Bundesrepublik Deutschland im internationalen Vergleich*. Frankfurt/NY: Campus.

Sennett, R. (1998). *The Corrosion of Character, The Personal Consequences of Work In the New Capitalism*. New York: Norton.

Sorge, A., & Streeck, W. (1988). Industrial Relations and Technical Change. The Case for an Extended Perspective. In: R. Hyman & W. Streeck (Eds.), *New Technology and Industrial Relations* (pp. 19–47). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Springer, R. (1999). *Rückkehr zum Taylorismus*. Campus: Arbeitspolitik in deer Automobilindustrie am Scheideweg. Frankfurt/M./NY.

Standing, G. (2011). *The Precariat: The New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury.

Streeck, W. (2008). *Industrial Relations Today: Reining in Flexibility* (MPIfG Working Paper 08/3). Köln: Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung.

Streeck, W., & Höpner, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Alle Macht dem Markt? Fallstudien zur Abwicklung der Deutschland AG*. Frankfurt/M./NY: Campus.

Sydow, J., & Windeler, A. (2000). *Steuerung von Netzwerken. Konzepte und Praktiken*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Sydow, J., & Windeler, A. (2004). *Organisation der Content-Produktion*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Touraine, A. (1971). *The Post-industrial Society. Tomorrow's Social History: Classes, Conflicts and Culture in the Programmed Society*. New York: Random House.

Touraine, A. (1981). *The Voice and the Eye: An Analysis of Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trinczek, R. (1989). Betriebliche Mitbestimmung als soziale Interaktion. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 18*(6), 444–456.

Trinczek, R. (2010). Betriebliche Regulierung von Arbeitsbeziehungen. In Böhle et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 841–872). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2005). Toward knowledge societies. *UNESCO World Report*.

Voβ, G. (1994). Das Ende der Teilung von 'Arbeit und Leben'? In N. Beckenbach & W. von Treeck (Eds.), *Umbrüche gesellschaftlicher Arbeit* (pp. 269–294). Soziale Welt SB 9, Göttingen.

Voβ, G., & Pongratz, H. (1998). Der Arbeitskraftunternehmer. Eine neue Grundform der Ware Arbeitskraft? *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 50*(1), 131–158.

von Friedeburg, L. (1997). Kooperation und Konkurrenz. Industriesoziologische Forschung in der westdeutschen Nackkriegszeit. *SOFI-Mitteilungen, 25,* 25–31.

Wannöffel, M. (1991). *Sachzwang Japan.* Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Wiggershaus, R. (1988). *Die Frankfurter Schule.* München: DTV.

Willke, H. (1999). Organisierte Wissensarbeit. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie, 27*(3), 161–177.

Windeler, A. (2001). *Unternehmungsnetzwerke. Konstitution und Strukturation.* Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Windeler, A., & Wirth, C. (2005). Strukturation von Arbeitsregulation: eine relationale Mehrebenenperspektive. In Faust et al. (Eds.), *Die "Organisation" der Arbeit* (pp. 165–193). München und Mering: Hampp Verlag.

Windeler, A., & Wirth, C. (2010). Netzwerke und Arbeit. Arbeit als Handeln. In Böhle et al. (Eds.), *Handbuch Arbeitssoziologie* (pp. 569–596). Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Wirth, C. (1999). *Unternehmungsvernetzung, Externalisierung von Arbeit und industrielle Beziehungen.* München/Mehring: Rainer Hampp Verlag.

Wittke, V. (1996). *Wie entstand industrielle Massenproduktion?* Berlin: Edition Sigma.

World Bank. (2002). *Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for Tertiary Education.* Washington.

4

Labour Sociology in Italy: Resisting Erosion Through Transformation and Dynamism

Valeria Pulignano

Introduction

In a contribution written for *Current Sociology* in 1999, Juan José Castillo (1999) reflected on the current sociological debate on the 'future of work.' The author treated the subject from at least two complementary and inter-related perspectives: the supposed material disappearance of work and the corresponding change in its meanings for individuals. Interesting enough, several years later, John Scott (2005) and Gayle Letherby (2005) called in *Sociological Research Online* for a discussion about future trends in sociology by focusing broadly on the sub-discipline of work and employment. It was suggested that there was a problem in the area caused in part by intellectual trends and fragmentation—much more visible in the Anglo-Saxon world—which risked jeopardizing the future of the sociology of work. Moreover, it was claimed that because of this challenge, during the 1980s–1990s, the sociology of work was progressively marginalized within the wider discipline of sociology. For Strangleman, "such a marginalization can be witnessed in the decline the role sociology of work plays in undergraduate education, in the textbooks available for such courses and a more general sense in which it is perceived" (Strangleman 2005, p. 4).

V. Pulignano (✉)
Centre for Sociological Research (CESO), KU Leuven, Louvain, Belgium
e-mail: valeria.pulignano@kuleuven.be

125

The situation with regard to the future of the 'the world' and 'the discipline' of work as described by some sociological literature is certainly problematic. On the one hand, we encounter ideas from those who claim that work is in decline and that the sociology of work itself is waning. But on the other hand we also find a vast body of analytical reflections by sociologists who strongly caution against this popular 'common sense' vision of the end of work. In particular, these sociologists argue that as society evolves, so too does the sociology of work, not just in terms of 'what' it looks at, but especially 'how' it looks at it. Work changes, and sociologists of work try to capture these changes and their social implications. However, the way in which work changes reflects the inner transformations brought by capitalism. Therefore, understanding these transformations is essential for explaining historical evolutions in the sociology of work as a discipline across (and within) different national settings. This is clearly stated by Castillo (1999) in the article cited above. More specifically, he argues that the main problem for the sociology of work resides in the "technologisms, economisms, reductionisms and determinisms now threatening the discipline" (Ibid., p. 3). Therefore, Castillo calls for a radical change (or revitalization) of the sociology of work, which entails designing a discipline that is capable of resisting 'external' ideas that in the century to come risk effectively precluding an understanding of work based on people's lived experiences. This may further imply (re)considering a series of questions about the core components of the sociology of work, the epistemological models employed, the normative orientation and the full social complexity of the reality that we examine.

In this respect, the approach developed here represents an attempt to illustrate how the sociology of work in Italy has, since its beginnings, developed an interesting process of inner transformation (the so-called 'open' approach) as a way of responding to the challenges of fragmentation induced by globalization and external change within the context of the institutional and political constraints that Italy has experienced historically. This approach consisted of resisting the aforementioned process of fragmentation by keeping together the different (sub)areas: the micro (workplaces)-, the meso (organization)- and the macro (labour market, welfare state, employment and industrial relations)-areas of work.

We illustrate this while exploring the foundations, and subsequent historical developments, of the sociology of work in Italy since its origins in the period after the Second World War. The chapter suggests that this process reflects the specific features of the historical evolution of the sociology of work, which are nationally embedded. As Castillo (1997) argues, the phases, the progress or even the decline in the evolution of the sociology of work

reflect the influence of national histories, political influences and the changing approaches and demands of different national social actors. The result constitutes the 'core' of the sociology of work in Italy. It consists of four different areas of analysis: (1) the labour process in Taylorist and/or post-Taylorist industry as a process undermining classical work; (2) the sociology of labour markets and employment, and the bargaining processes of rules, identities and the value of work; (3) the reconciliation of work and labour in organizations; and (4) the reconciliation of work and family and cultural studies, including gender. As will be illustrated, these aspects represent the major fields across which the sociology of work developed in Italy over the years.

What sustained coherence to the sociology of work in Italy had as much to do with methods of analysis and its topic areas, which have covered diverse levels of analysis. In so doing, the sociology of work survived contemporary global challenges. Methodologically, on the one hand, process approaches helped overcome cross-sectional investigation. Theoretically, on the other hand, the social understanding of work has required the inclusion of social phenomena, which are external to immediate work settings. As a result, internal boundaries have had to be crossed within sociology.

For example, to understand social identities and the benefit of work, it is important to consider work, organization, education, industrial relations, domestic life and gender. Moreover, the topics covered by the sociology of work are sometimes shared with other sociologists (and non-sociologists) within other sub-disciplines. Thus, inter-disciplinarity emerges as another illuminating and crucial factor. Inter-disciplinarity here is conceived in a broad sense. It is the process through which sociologists of work engage in dialogue with other non-sociologists such as labour historians, labour political scientists, labour economists, economic geographers, industrial anthropologists or amongst themselves. Dialogue can be across diverse sub-disciplines so as to further enrich the sociological area by an engagement with other relevant theory and literature. As such, inter-disciplinarity cannot exclude cross-boundary activity. This enrichment, this synergy across (and within) the different disciplines should be developed and fostered. In this light, we conclude that the sociology of work in Italy has had the potential to widen its focus, so that the issues covered by labour sociology become increasingly more inter-disciplinary and comparative. We stress that these are crucial points, promising changes for the future of the sociology of work, and particularly helping the sociology of work in Italy overcome challenges coming from the outside, global, world as well as shaping its distinctiveness and intellectual property over the coming years.

The chapter is structured as follows. After a short background indicating the main socio-political transformations which occurred in Italy since the Second World War and their impact on labour relations, the first part examines the historical foundations and the evolution of the sociology of work in the country identifying its main themes and disciplinary specificity. In the second part, we will confront more directly the question of inter-disciplinary and cross-boundary fertilization with regard to the sociology of work. This will highlight how it is possible to be dynamic and distinctive while confronting institutional and political change. The final section offers a conclusion.

Background: Labour Relations in Italy After the Second World War[1]

The trajectory of the sociology of work in Italy after Second World War was linked to the evolution of the Italian political (and industrial relations) system as a whole. In 1944, union groups of different ideological orientations (Communists, Socialists, Catholics and others) joined ranks to establish a unitary union confederation, the *Confederazione Generale Italiana del Lavoro* (CGIL). The unions' organizational structures were reconstituted almost from scratch and were populated by party personnel who often lacked specific union experience (Romagnoli and Treu 1981). With the start of the Cold War, the unity of anti-fascist forces disappeared, both at the governmental and union levels. In 1950, both the Catholic faction and the republican and social-democratic factions quit the CGIL to establish independent union confederations: the *Confederazione Italiana Sindacati dei Lavoratori* (CISL) and the *Unione Italiana dei Lavoratori* (UIL), respectively. In the 1950s, Italian unions were weak and employers dominated employment relations (Locke 1995). Wages lagged below productivity (Salvati 1984). Strikes were rare, and when they occurred their motivation was predominantly political rather than economic (Bordogna and Provasi 1989). Wage moderation and labour quiescence contributed to creating the preconditions for the low-cost, export-oriented strategy of economic growth from which emerged the economic miracle of the late 1950s and early 1960s.

Change occurred in the 1960s. Labour market conditions became much more favourable to labour, especially in the north-western parts of Italy.

---

[1]Reworked and updated from Baccaro L. and Pulignano V. (2015).

With the diffusion and consolidation of Fordist models of work organization in large firms, trade unions began devoting a greater deal of attention and resources to negotiating work conditions at the shopfloor level than had previously been the case.

With the so-called Hot Autumn, a massive wave of strikes in the 1969–72 period, political divisions within the Italian labour movement were overcome from below (Pizzorno 1978). In many industrial plants—especially in the metalworking industry—the three union confederations embraced unity of action. In 1972, there was a partial reunification of the Italian labour movement, with the establishment of the so-called *Federazione Unitaria CGIL-CISL-UIL*.

The Hot Autumn introduced a number of innovations in collective bargaining. Campaigns for the unification of blue- and white-collar job classification schemes, the abolition of territorial differences in wage levels, demands for equal wage increases for all workers regardless of skill levels, improvements in health and safety conditions and reductions in the speed and duration of work were all promoted in these years. The metalworking federations of CGIL, CISL and UIL, together with the unitary *Federazione Lavoratori Metalmeccanici*, acted as vanguards for the whole labour movement (Golden 1988). They consistently practiced unity of action and used their power to push for higher wages, limit overtime, regulate layoffs, restrict internal mobility and slow down the pace of work. The Hot Autumn overturned virtually all the social, political and economic patterns established in the post-war period. However, it simultaneously impaired the national strategy of export-led growth by increasing inflation and unit labour costs, and squeezing profits (Barca and Magnani 1989). Italy's competitiveness in international markets deteriorated sharply, and the current balance turned from positive to negative.

By the middle of the 1970s, a general consensus emerged among Italian political–economic elites that union demands and industrial conflict were imposing unsustainable costs on the Italian economy (Lama 1976). With the worsening of Italy's economic crisis in the second half of the 1970s, the three major union confederations, CGIL, CISL and UIL, embraced a new strategy. With it, they accepted a moderation in wage demands and limits on industrial conflict in exchange for participation in national policy-making (Lange and Vannicelli 1982). In 1977, a first tripartite agreement entailing minor labour concessions was negotiated. National-level negotiations continued in the early 1980s. In 1983, a tripartite agreement cut wage indexation (*scala mobile*), imposed a series of wage ceilings on sectoral

collective bargaining negotiations and banned plant-level wage negotiations for eighteen months.

In the early 1990s centralized bargaining re-emerged. The first factor was economic: in the early 1990s, Italy found itself faced with a serious economic crisis and the Italian currency was excised from the European Monetary System in September 1992 (Vaciago 1993). The second factor was political: the old political party system, which had both shaped and constrained relations among collective actors, disappeared in the space of a few years. The Italian Communist Party changed its essential ideological and political characteristics in 1989, officially pledged allegiance to parliamentary and reformist methods of action and applied for membership in the Socialist International, i.e. the international association of social-democratic parties. In early 1992, a wave of corruption scandals, known as *Tangentopoli* shook all major governmental parties including the Christian Democrats and the Socialists. Both parties went through a tremendous legitimation crisis and were dismantled. Their place was taken by a new coalition of centre-right political parties, hegemonized by Silvio Berlusconi. At the end of the 1990s, the newly emerged corporatist system seemed well on its way to institutionalization and there was even talk of embedding it in the Italian Constitution (Carrieri 1997). Corporatist policy-making returned in full splendour in 2007. In 2008, the centre-right coalition returned to power. Strategic divisions among the three confederations resurfaced and the unions split once again. After 2009, the financial and economic crisis weakened social concertation at the national level even further. Faced with pressure from financial markets, all governments—Berlusconi (centre-right), Monti (technical), Letta (centre-left) and Renzi (centre-left)—refused to negotiate seriously with social partners on crucial government choices concerning the pension system and labour market (de-)regulation.

Developments in the Sociology of Work in Italy

Italian Sociology Between Unification and Idealism: Before the Second World War

Having briefly outlined the evolution of the post-Second World War political and labour relations context, we will now trace the historical phases which have characterized the evolution of sociology, and more particularly its relation to labour, in the country. Before examining the evolution of the

sociology of work in Italy in the period after the Second World War and the period of prosperity (1945–70s), it will be important to first look back to the period between Italian unification (1848) and the beginning of the twentieth century.

In the period between the end of the nineteenth century and the Second World War, Italian sociology reached a high degree of development under the philosophical approach of Positivism, whose most important exponent in the country was Roberto Ardigo. This is illustrated by the high quality and large quantity of publications in the area of sociology, which appeared during the period above. Although the quantity of publications may sound positive in assessing the progress made by the Italian sociology during this period, scholars in the social sciences have criticized the then excessive use of Positivism in Italy. These criticisms shed light on the need to examine the factors which have contributed to conditioning the evolution of sociology along the theoretical principles of Positivism. It is within this contested theoretical field that the first seeds of a labour sociology were grounded. It was motivated by the interests of some leading scholars to analyse social problems by following the approaches then prevalent in other disciplines, such as economy, politics and law. The aim was to regain sociability while analysing and trying to find solutions to the problems occurring in society at that time. This means that attention was paid to the social effects of the process of industrialization in the Northern regions of Italy and the creation of a working class (*proletariato operaio*). The latter became increasingly more numerous and aware of its social position in Italian society as well as their social conditions. These were seen as responsible for its degradation and subordination to capital (*coscienza di classe* or 'class consciousness', following Karl Marx). As we will outline more significantly below, in this context a theme which deserved the particular interest of sociologists was the need to understand the causes underlying the socio-economic regional duality between the country's North and South. More specifically, sociology dealt with the conditions of poverty and industrial and economic disparity characterizing the Southern region after the unification of Italy.

From the beginning of the twentieth century until the end of the Second World War, social studies in Italy suffered an overall decline. The precipitous loss of interest in sociology was largely due to the harsh criticism meted out by two of the major figures in Italian idealist philosophy—Benedetto Croce and Giovanni Gentile. They defined themselves as the 'philosophers of fascism' because their philosophical thoughts inspired the doctrine of the fascism of Benito Mussolini. Their actual idealism was grounded on three basic principles: compulsory state corporatism, abolition of the

parliamentary system and autarky. Although the wide diffusion of idealism reinforced feelings of opposition and hostility within the Italian social community to the study of sociology (jeopardizing its teaching at the university[2]), it would be inappropriate to conclude by saying that in the forty years of dominance of idealism social science study disappeared from the interests of Italian intellectuals. On the contrary, if idealism blocked the progress of sociology in the historical phase outlined above, it did not reduce the interests of scholars in other disciplines to develop studies in the arena of social science. Hence, similarly to what happened at the end of the nineteenth century, during the Second World War, Italian sociology was sustained by political scientists, lawyers, demographers, anthropologists and ethnologists (such as Alfredo Niceforo, Giuseppe Sergi, Corrado Gini, Filippo Carli, Giuseppe Mozzarella, Vincenzo Miceli, Roberto Michelis, Gaetano Mosca, Vilfredo Pareto). In their various ways, they sustained the basis for a continuing Italian sociology. This served to enrich sociological knowledge by providing theoretical insights (such as the theory of the élites, theories about political party, ideology and the establishment more broadly). These concerns were relevant for the future progress of studies in the social sciences. Nevertheless, as Scaglia (2007) emphasizes, studies in social science were dependent on a range of other disciplines which at first presented a dilemma for sociology, which was attempting to become an autonomous discipline. However, it could also be argued that the lack of scientific rigor by those involved in the field, on the one hand, and the absence of taught courses of sociology within universities, on the other hand, did not help overcome this impasse. We would have to wait till 1960 and afterwards to see a more stable attempt at the institutionalization of the study of sociology in the Italian context.

Themes and Developments in Italian Sociology in the Post-war Period (1945–1950s)

Following the end of the Second World War and the fall of fascism, there was a process of revitalization of studies and research in the field of social science in Italy, throughout the 1950s. This was facilitated by the creation of the Italian Association of Social Science (*Associazione Italiana di Science*

---

[2]We will have to wait till 1960 to have sociology been tough at the university. It was at the Congress of the Italian Association of Social Sciences (*Associazione Italiana di Scienze Sociali*) held in Ancona in 1962 that the position of sociology and of sociologists were clearly defined.

Sociali) in 1957.[3] Barbano and Viterbi (1959) define sociology after the Second World War as 'new'. In so doing, the authors refer to the novelty of the content, the directions and also the people involved in contributing to the design of the contours of Italian sociology in the post-war period. Treves (1959) highlights four key factors in Italy after the end of the fascist dictatorship, which together fostered the expansion of social studies: first, the return of democracy and the freedom of speech which had been repressed during fascism; second, a renewed interest in the creation of 'new' knowledge in social science by examining social reality and its attendant problems; third, the decline of idealism and the corresponding creation of new philosophical approaches which were no longer critical but, conversely, favourable and proactive for sociology; and finally the reinforcement and the intensification of the relationship with the United States which encouraged a growing interest amongst Italian sociologists in the theoretical and the methodological approaches currently in use in the American scientific sociological community (in particular the theories of Robert Merton).

Shortly after the Second World War, sociology in Italy became more systematized with an internal division between different sub-disciplines, which continues to characterize the discipline to a certain extent. Among the twelve newly created sub-domains in sociology, the sociology of industrial processes or industrial sociology was used as the official term for the sociology of labour in Italy. It mainly included the study of the firm as a social system while concentrating on the trade union movement, gender, human relations, industry and machines; technology and technological processes including automation and their social implications; work organization and labour markets. The 1950s were characterized by scant attention to work within the social sciences. Conversely, more interest was given to an examination of topical social issues, such as social and cultural integration, the problem of marginalization, poverty and social deviance.

During the 1950s, the majority of sociological research was concentrated on the study of the reasons underpinning the underdeveloped economic character of the Southern regions of Italy, including the conditions of poverty, and social and economic degradation. This required a focus on the study of the 'local community' in a particular geographical region—the South of Italy—which meant exploring the relationship of the locality

---

[3]1980–82 witnessed the formation of the Italian Association of Sociology (*Associazione Italiana di Sociologia*). Within a clear organizational and statutory form, it brought systematization and institutionalization to sociology.

to the political context, family life and the diverse forms of industrial and economic association. The aim of the bulk of studies was not only to advance hypothesis explaining the socio-economic difficulties facing part of the Italian population but also, and primarily, to produce concrete empirical research findings, which could positively influence, by improving, everyone's living conditions. Historical research, biographical interviews, analysis of family and company budgets were some of the methods and instruments used by scholars in social science in order to explore the causes of the social and economic marginalization in the process of attempting to influence the living conditions of the Southern population.

Drawing on this body of research, American scholars, such as Edward C. Banfield (1958), introduced the concept of '*familism*' to explain the system of social relations within a specific local context, such as the little Italian community in the South. '*Familism*' refers to the specific behaviour of a single individual aimed at protecting and maximizing family interests while establishing family relations with the outside social context. More specifically, Banfield argued that what characterizes the population of the Southern region in Italy is the inability to act together for the achievement of a common or collective goal which goes beyond the immediate material interest of the family which he defines as '*nuclear*,' such as at the 'core' of the system of social relations. Therefore, '*familism*' is the stereotypical image attributed by Banfield to the people living in the South of Italy. Accordingly, this population would think only about the family, and thereby it would be extremely individualistic, not capable of creating collective linkages with individuals outside the family. Within this context, unemployment would develop as a 'free choice' of people considered *Mafiosi*, high handed and vagabond, which are to be considered as the principal cause of the status of underdevelopment of this geographical region. Banfield's view was contrasted to those of Italian sociologists and leading political figures such as Domenico De Masi and Antonio Gramsci, who had provided a crucial impulse to the developments of labour sociology by drawing on a critique of capitalism. For example, in Gramsci's in-depth analysis of the Southern Italian social question (i.e. *La questione meridionale*), the main argument was that the status of marginalization and social and economic degradation of the population in the South of Italy could not be explained by reference to their current perceived incapacities and inferior status. Conversely, according to Gramsci, the historical economic and social foundations of capitalist society play a relevant role in explaining the so-called *questione meridionale* (the economic and social underdevelopment of the South). Gramsci's argument is based on the concept of the 'working class' which will become the theoretical focus

of the classical Italian labour sociology. Accordingly, Gramsci conceived the 'working class' as a 'collective political subject', which is able to combine the struggle for its social emancipation with the maturation of its 'consciousness' (*coscienza*) as 'civil producer'. The result of this combination is the accomplishment of the 'hegemonic' project of domination of the working class in the whole society.

Thus, Gramsci saw an urgent need to create a solid, unique and strong working-class movement able to overcome the problem of the socio-economic duality between the North and South in Italian society. The hypothesis at the root of Gramsci's argument was that working-class hegemony is a precondition for a robust labour movement which will play a crucial role in linking the regional disparities within Italian society as outlined above. Gramsci considered this hypothesis as indicative of two different, but nevertheless socially interlinked, aims of sociology: political action on the one hand and a sociological way of interpreting the transformations occurring in Italian society. As will be discussed in the following sections, these became the goals which were manifested concretely in the explosion of social unrest (the so-called 'Hot Autumn') characterizing Italy at the end of the 60s. They were indeed at the core of the developments of the sociology of work in Italy from 1960 to 1975 and more extensively from the mid-1970s to the beginning of the 1980s.

Dynamism in the Italian Sociology of Work

Work at the Shopfloor (1960–1975)

During 1960–1975, in Italy as in most industrial countries, many, though certainly not all and perhaps only a minority of, sociologists dealing with work embraced a radical Marxist perspective while concentrating on industrial blue-collar workers, the so-called direct producers. At the base of this approach, there was an acknowledgment among Italian sociologists that during Taylorism the productive advantages of capitalism would have inexorably led to enormous human and social costs. In this respect, with regard to the forms and the contents of work, the theoretical foundations of Italian sociology of work were widely influenced by a number of French sociologists, such as Friedmann, Naville, Veil and Touraine. For these researchers, industrialization and Taylorist rationalization were seen as constituting processes of degradation (Friedmann 1955, 1978), and in the face of highly

subdivided production processes, skilled independent workers were seen as losing any technical and conceptual control. Thus, the message coming from French critical sociology of work was imported into Italian labour sociology. However, the way in which Italian sociology of work during the twentieth century relates to the rising importance of French radical sociology is filtered through the inherent influence of Antonio Gramsci's work (see the previous section). In contrast to other international (mostly Anglo-Saxon) experiences, which were strongly embedded in Braverman's ideas expressed in *Labor and Monopoly Capital*, Taylorism at the shopfloor level was never conceived as a deterministic and inexorable downgrading of the labour process within capitalist society in Italy. Specifically, the Italian rejection of Taylorism and its social effects were accompanied by the conviction that it was possible and necessary to find a way to overcome, or at least reduce, the impact of work degradation and rationalization brought about by the 'scientific management model' of Taylor (Bonazzi 2002). This argument was inspired by two assumptions at the basis of Gramsci's sociological analysis. On the one hand, we refer to the conception of the 'working class' as the theoretical focus of the classical sociology of work. In particular, according to Gramsci the 'working class' is conceived as a 'collective political subject,' which is able to combine the struggle for its social emancipation with the maturation of its 'consciousness' (*coscienza*) as 'civil producer.' The result of this combination is the accomplishment of the '*hegemonic* project' of domination of the working class throughout society. On the other hand, it can be argued that because of the economic dualism of Italy's north and south, and its relevance for sociological studies, it was necessary to create a solid, unique and strong working-class movement able to overcome the problem of the socio-economic disparity between Italy's North and South.

These two assumptions—the domination of the working class, on the one hand, and the creation of a strong labour movement linking regional disparities in Italian society, on the other—refer to the sociological intent to understand the changes occurring in the Italian society and provide a response to it. These aims appeared to become concretely achieved in the explosion of social unrest (so-called 'Hot Autumn') which characterized Italian society in 1969. The Italian Marxist tradition of *Operaismo*, or 'workerism', represented a clear manifestation of this social unrest. It operated a Copernican inversion of the standard approach to the study of the relation between labour and capital, in which labour is portrayed as the "passive, reactive victim" (Cleaver 2000, p. 65) in relation to capital's territorial expansion through imperialist and colonial projects, and developments at the point of production. As Tronti (1964) (Tronti in Trott 2007, p. 205)

explained: "We too have worked with the concept that puts capitalist development first, and workers second. This is a mistake. And we now have to turn the problem on its head, reverse the polarity, and start from the beginning: and the beginning is the class struggle of the working class."

Because of the solidarity between workers from the North and the South as the result of social conflict, in the 1970s it was possible to rebalance power relations between capital and labour. The outcome was the improvement of working conditions and the emergence of a consensus among the workforce as the expression of the changing structural conditions at the workplace. Hence, the analyses of the reasons for the creation of consensus and compliance within the working class, rather than the examination of the attempt by the working class to overcome the social degradation of Taylorism, were at the core of the analysis of Italian sociology of work in the 1970s and also up to the beginning of 1980s. More specifically, in the light of the climate of high social dissent, which characterized the Italian 'Hot Autumn' at the end of the 1960s and 1970s, what was interesting for sociologists of work was an exploration of the social conditions which had led to the imminent slowdown of conflict. The latter was followed by the emergence of social peace in work. The aim was to assess the extent to which the re-establishment of the so-called productive normality at the level of the shopfloor was due to the change in the power relations between capital and labour or, by contrast, whether a real change in the strategies and politics of management had taken place. To what extent was consensus really a new form of workplace social control?

From Conflict Towards Consent-Based Relationships (1975–1980)

Since the beginning of the 1980s, new management approaches were adopted on a large scale. They favoured networks rather than hierarchies and changed authority to consent-based relationships, while raising issues such as teamwork, quality circles, autonomy and commitment, as the effects of the transformations that were occurring in work organizations. It was argued that the deskilling thesis, based on the degradation of work (Braverman 1974), as well as task standardization with its attendant problems of boredom at work, no longer fit the new social, economic and organizational realities of factory life. New forms of work and production organizations and models had been emerging under the banner of post-Fordism. Under the terms of reference of the new production models, it was claimed by some

sociologists of work that labour content was changing dramatically, putting an end to the links between pain and production (Bonazzi 1993; Regini 1995a; Ivaldi 1999) and between hands and tools (Veltz 2000). Although organizations designed along Tayloristic principles were far from having disappeared, Italian sociology of work considered the emergence of these new production models as the demonstration of the fact that Taylorism as such could probably no longer be seriously treated as the hegemonic model of production. This was in sharp contrast to the view of many other European sociologists, especially those working from within an Anglo-Saxon context committed to a labour process critique of contemporary capitalism. Sociological interest in work therefore began to broaden somewhat. At the core of the crucial social issues to be investigated, there was no longer, and 'only,' the working class and its hegemony in society. The response of the sociology of work to the challenges in society would now also be concerned with questions of social stratification and social mobility, as well as concerns with the creation of new entrepreneurships. For example, particular attention was given to understanding the causes and remedies of unemployment in labour markets. As a result, cooperation became more active between sociologists and economists of work. An exemplar of this was the new concept of spread entrepreneurship, which came out of a debate within economic sociology on the *Terza Italia* (Bagnasco 1994). Hence, from an Italian perspective we can argue that the controversies, which took place in the 1980s up to early 1990s in the sociology of work around the themes of 'the end of work' and 'the problem with the sociology of work,' can be considered as clear symptoms of the downgrading of work as an integrative feature in the discipline more widely. On the other hand, within and beyond Italian sociology of work, scholars began to explore the dynamics of a cross-disciplinary integration which were quite fruitful. Cross-disciplinary debates emerged around several issues. As a result, the agenda of the sociology of work in Italy was widely renewed. As the following sections will illustrate, sociology of work became interlinked with labour markets and employment studies, on the one hand, and family and gender, on the other hand.

From the Shopfloor to Labour Markets and Employment Relations (1980s–2000s)

One of the issues on which Italian sociology of work crossed boundaries, perhaps more sharply than occurred in other European countries, was with

respect to labour markets. More specifically, the attention traditionally allocated to actual labour at the shopfloor level began to be combined with greater emphasis on processes of social construction. Markets, for example, were thus treated as social constructions (Solow 1980), defining the rules of exchange specific to given occupations. Occupational identities, on one hand, and career rules and benefits, on the other hand, followed an interactive trajectory characterized by debate in the socio-economic and socio-political arenas (Pugliese 1993; Reyneri 1996). More specifically, while cocooned within other academic disciplines in the 1950s, the sociology of work found a niche left vacant by economics. At the turn of the 1980s the situation had changed. The sociology of work now began to deal with markets at the same time as neo-institutionalist and institutionalist economics started to theorize the firm as an organization (Williamson 1985).

Cross-disciplinary debates therefore started to emerge around several social issues and new research questions emerged. If markets were not limited to virtual places regulated by instant prices and quantities, was it possible to define other modes of economic regulation? For example, an important question was: 'How does micro-regulation of labour at the level of a given organization connect with macro-regulation inside large settings?' This arose due to the international competition that transnational companies were increasingly facing and led to issues around the labour costs and labour flexibility. Changes implied variations in the forms of labour contract with an increasing emergence of flexible (and precarious) forms of labour— the so-called *lavoratore di seconda generazione* (*the worker of second generation*) (Bologna and Fumagalli 1997)—such as part-time work, temporary work, etc. On the other hand, by considering labour markets as social constructions, the theme of power dimensions in the analysis of labour markets became more salient.

Thus, social networks, technical norms and institutionalized controls among peers through professional associations were recognized as the social means by which quality and product price, against individual or collective abuses in labour markets, were protected. As such, professions came to be seen as the product of power relations (Speranza 1992) characterized by the presence of skills and knowledge, which are specific for the competitiveness of the organization. This was, and remains, more evident for those sectors operating in a highly competitive market, such as information and communication technology.

As mentioned above, from the end of the 1970s industrial democracies faced major unemployment problems. In Italy, this situation reached dramatic consequences in the 1990s. The sociology of work could not ignore

this, and indeed its sustained interest in labour markets (including questions of work and unemployment) was rooted in concerns more usually seen as the preserve of economics. The social effects of a dramatic long-term decrease in jobs were openly explored and new classifications made. More specifically, using the theoretical work already developed by sociologists of work around occupations, a number of Italian social scientists began to construct what was termed the 'Italian model of unemployment' (Di Nicola 1998; Pugliese and Rebeggiani 1997). Accordingly, three main socio-historical configurations of unemployment in Italian capitalism were identified: 'incipient industrialism', which coincided with the abandonment of the land by the peasants who were therefore deprived of their means of subsistence; 'industrialism', characterized by the appearance of the large-scale industry and the emerging phenomena of 'job loss'; and the current phase, which was characterized by the difficulty in searching for work. According to Emilio Reyneri, one of the leading sociological figures researching labour markets, unemployment in Italy presented strong regional-territorial and therefore cultural components (unemployment and job loss have historically been demonstrated to be higher in the South than the North of the country) and moreover impacts mostly young people.

Growing interest in the social construction of work outside the workplace contributed much to a lively cooperation not only between sociology and economics but also between the sociology of work and political scientists interested in industrial and employment relations as it was the case in the 1960s. This is of particular interest considering that, by contrast with the Anglo-Saxon and German traditions, industrial relations as an autonomous academic field was slower to develop in Italy. Although social bargaining has accompanied the evolution in the regulation of labour relations in Italy, traditionally it had remained a weak and marginal way of handling social conflict during the 1960s and 1970s. To a large extent, this reflected a traditional vision of a society based on class conflict, a vision shared by the employers and trade unions alike. Industrial relations, and particularly the study of social conflict, trade unionism and the working class, remained enmeshed in the sociology of work. Things changed at the end of the 1970s when—as aforementioned—a strong impulse was given to industrial relations by sociologists of work. One such researcher, Pizzorno (1978), theorized the notion of the rationale of 'political exchange' which was meant to capture the institutional and political peculiarities of transformations characterizing labour relations in Italian society. Accordingly, concepts such as job regulation, which theorize how social compromises between employers, employees and the state may become a 'positive-sum' bargaining game,

were used in research. Theoretical frames in sociology were offered for the study of emerging phenomena linked to the regulation of the relationships between employers and employees at both macro- and micro-levels. In addition, employee participation as a channel for establishing 'social democracy' at work was also included into the mainstream of sociological studies (Regalia 1992; Baglioni 1995). As in other national realities in Europe, the issue of employee participation and representativeness in Italy progressively gained importance with the emergence in the 1980s of jobs *tout-court* ('new jobs'), not necessarily associated any longer with traditional blue-collar, permanent workers, operating in the manufacturing sector. Italian sociologists of work were (and still are) strongly engaged in studying the extent to which the trade unions were able to represent the new employees (Carrieri 1995; Zan 1992; Pulignano 2005) as well as to be inclusive of larger social categories as women, migrants, and young people. Hence, as the following section will highlight gender, particularly related to work–life balance, and migration become topics of high interest within the sociology of work in Italy since the 1980s.

Studies of Gender, Family and Migration (1980s–2000s)

Italian studies of family arrangements and transformation as well concerns with gender had gained momentum by the mid-1970s, and they received a boost from EU funding during the 1990s (Andreotti and Benassi 2014). Italian sociology of the family addressed the consequences arising from the transformations of family arrangements. Specifically, it highlighted changes to internal relations, the question of gender asymmetry (Saraceno 1991; Bimbi 1999) and care regimes at the intersection between the family and welfare policies (Trifiletti 1998; Naldini 2003).

   The most important contributions in Italy (and in the other Mediterranean countries) argued that the social regulation of labour (at the macro-level) and the occupational careers of individuals (at the micro-level) were strongly influenced by the distinct family traits and ties of reciprocity between family members (e.g. Reyneri 2005; Morlicchio 2005). For instance, the relatively low Italian female participation in the labour market is explained in relation to the division of labour within the household (the strong 'male breadwinner model') and the basic resource of the welfare state (the radical 'Bismarckian' model) together with North–South economic dualism (Reyneri 2010; Del Boca and Saraceno 2005). Other contributions to the debate on women and the economy emphasize the strong

ties in predefining an individual's first entry into an occupational career and subsequent work history (Barbieri 1997), thereby contributing to the debate on Granovetter's thesis of the 'strength of weak ties'. The analysis of the organization of production and of employment and industrial relations, as discussed above, starting from the collective movements of blue-collar workers in the 1960s (Pizzorno 1978), stressed the overwhelming importance of small- and medium-sized family firms and micro-regulation of local actors (Paci 1973; Regini 1995b, 1997; Regalia 2007).

The crucial role of the family in economic activity also emerges clearly from Italian research into inequality, social mobility and social stratification (De Lillo and Schizzerotto 1985; Pisati and Schizzerotto 2004), which underscores the extent to which social origins outweigh ascendant social mobility and, more recently, educational opportunities (Ballarino and Bratti 2009). Related to this area of research are the youth question and the transition to adulthood. This is a research theme that has emerged due to the fact that in Italy the latter has assumed pathological dimensions due to the remarkably long delay in leaving the parental home, revealing some of the deeper cultural foundations of Italian society (Schizzerotto and Lucchini 2004; Bernardi and Nazio 2005; Billari and Ongaro 1998).

One more research theme that deserves mention, as it has expanded very quickly over the last two decades under the pressure of recent rapid social changes, is that of migration. From the end of Second World War to the mid-1970s, Italy was a country of emigration to industrialized countries (France, Germany, Belgium, Switzerland and overseas) and of internal flows (from southern regions to industrial towns like Turin and Milan; see for instance Calvanese and Pugliese 1988). By contrast, starting in the late 1980s Italy suddenly became the destination of increasing inflows of migrants from Eastern Europe and North Africa, and later from other parts of the world (Latin America, Central Africa, China, the Philippines, India and Sri Lanka). This change in the direction of migration flows attracted the attention of scholars. The resulting empirical research largely shares the same patterns of analysis elaborated in the broader European context. Attention has focused on the problems generated by the unexpected arrival of millions of migrants in just a couple of decades, the challenges raised by a growing multicultural society, the emergence of discriminatory attitudes within the host population and the integration of the newcomers (for instance, Ambrosini 2001; Reyneri 1998). Besides these issues, however, immigration in Italy also interacts with the main feature of Italian society, that is, the centrality of the family and social networks. Thus, research has primarily

considered the development of economic sectors devoted to the production of services for Italian families. The phenomenon of the so-called *badanti* (salaried minders for the elderly), predominantly women from eastern Europe, has in certain ways effectively changed the patterns of family obligations, relieving Italian daughters or daughters-in-law from the task of caring for parents or parents-in-law during later life (Catanzaro and Colombo 2009; Da Roit 2007).

We argue that evolutions and transformations undertaken by the sociology of work in Italy have been relevant in revitalizing the discipline internationally. The trajectory illustrates the extent to which Italian sociologists of work have crossed sociological boundaries while studying work theoretically and empirically at the micro-, meso- and macro-levels. At the heart of the sociological method is an historical and inter-disciplinary approach that has been progressively developed in a manner that few if other disciplines can match. Moreover, work and its meanings have a salience within popular, policy and political discourses and this is something which needs to be continuously revitalized.

In this respect, despite the national specificities, insights by Italian sociologists of work illustrate that innovative and creative conceptual developments in the discipline have been undertaken. These developments have been evolving not in isolation from the mainstream of the sociology of work, which is considered as the core discipline. Significantly, reinvigoration of the field has occurred through the marriage of empirical research with methodological, theoretical and conceptual innovation. Leading researchers who have contributed to this reinvigoration include Arnaldo Bagnasco, Alessandro Pizzorno, Emilio Reyneri, Massimo Paci, Giuseppe Bonazzi, Chiara Saraceno, Marino Regini, Ida Regalia, Enrico Pugliese, Aris Accornero, Luciano Gallino, Federico Butera and Michele La Rosa, to note just a few amongst the most ambitious and productive sociologists working in the field. Their interventions have led to a new reflective process through which a more engaged and enlivened body of work in the field of the sociology of work has emerged. It has allowed for the generation of a broader intellectual space in which a new sociology of work can develop whereby sociologists are able to reflect critically on the transformations occurring in work, and society more generally. Moreover, it can promote a richer understanding of these transformations and their relationships to the other aspects of social life.

The evolution of this process has been accompanied by a dynamic integration of the practices of sociologists of work with those of economists and political scientists interested in work. Moreover, this process has intensified

and developed new channels of integration within the discipline sociology itself and amongst its different (sub)-disciplines, such as family, culture and education. In addition, such a focus has allowed for the inclusion of greater attention to issues which have traditionally been neglected by the country-based sociology of work. These include the themes of social inclusion and social mobility in relation to work as well as the social construction of economic categories such as labour markets. Indeed, it can also be argued that this process acted as a stimulus to further research in the area, in particular the call for the study of employment, labour markets structures, income inequalities and job regulations from the cultural perspective. This has also offered the scope of combining the tradition of the microsociology of the workplace with a thoughtful analysis of the nature of work beyond the workplace.

In contrast to the claim by some of a perceived problematic disciplinary fragmentation characterizing the trajectory of the sociology of work in Britain (see Chapter 1 by Stephenson et al.), the Italian tradition highlights an early celebration of diversity. Moreover, inter-disciplinarity did not (de)generate (into) sociological specialisms. On the contrary, it represented the basis for a further enrichment of the discipline while providing the scope for a broader openness to contemporary developments in society. Why has this happened? In the first place, arguably, the sociology of work in Italy developed in a context characterized by the absence of disciplinary fragmentation, as was the case in the Anglo-Saxon countries where conversely sociologists became a dispersed and fragmented community as the result of the clustering of a significant number of sociologists of work within Business Schools, for example. In Italy, disciplinary distinctions are rarely based on coherent and logical divisions within knowledge that reflect essential forms of understanding. By contrast, they have to be considered as historically contingent products of the development of educational systems within particular national contexts (Scott 2005). Secondly, in Italy, the critical character of the sociology of work, internationally known through debates such as those concerned with the Labour Process, was quite weak. This allowed for a diversified and more inclusive definition of the field of enquiry, which was necessitated by theoretical and empirical developments in the study of work. Thirdly, despite the tendency to focus on the macro-level of the firm and of the economy in the study of work, patterns of culture and the community of work were certainly not neglected. More specifically, in Italian sociology of work, questions about the study of variations in income inequality, poverty and labour market structures were developed with the recognition of diverse workers' attitudes and cultural values and the link between these and the much wider cultures.

The intellectual continuity which characterized the way in which the sociology of work in Italy historically evolved also fostered such developments. For example, a number of *Operaismo*'s key theorists of the 1960s and 1970s, such as Antonio Virno or Antonio Negri, who attempted to theorize the process of de- and (eventually) re-composition, triggered by the social struggles of the working class during this period, went so far as to describe the period of restructuring and the emergence of post-Fordism which emerged in the 1990s as a 'counter-revolution' against the movements of the 1960s and 1970s (Virno 1996, 2004, p. 99). The central argument was that the decentralization and flexibilization of working practices were said to decompose both the technical structure of the mass worker's labour process and the political organizations which expressed their demands (Murphey 2005, p. xxxv). Later, since the globalization of the 2000s, as production escaped the confines of the factory walls, creating what Tronti had earlier called a 'social factory' (1963), the whole society was said by the same scholars to become a potential (or actual) site of struggle. It is in this context indeed that Negri began theorizing the emergence of *operaio sociale* (or the 'socialized worker') (Negri 2005a, b), in a line of analysis that he was later to develop with Michael Hardt in their discussions of immaterial labour and the multitude.

In particular, Hardt and Negri argued that the processes of economic and cultural globalization of the 2000s have been accompanied by "a transformation of the dominant productive processes (…) with the result that the role of industrial factory labour has been reduced and priority given instead to communicative, cooperative and affective labour" (2001, p. xiii). In other words, a shift has taken place in which 'immaterial' forms of labour now occupy a position of hegemony within the global political economy previously held by industrial labour. Hegemony, here, is understood as the ability of one form of production to inform and influence "other forms of labour and indeed society as a whole" (Hardt and Negri 2004, p. 65). Hardt and Negri's claim as to the hegemony of immaterial labour provided a useful theoretical framework within which post-modernist theoretical arguments in the sociology of work further developed in Italy during the first decade of the 2000s. This post-modern sociological argument was drawn from early Foucauldian thoughts concerning the mechanisms of power shaping individual's practices in society (see, for example, the school of thought which developed around these ideas in the Department of Sociology at the University of Calabria) (among the names of these scholars we mention Ada Cavazzani, Giordano Sivini and Laura Fiocco). In so doing, these theoretical reflections sought to make sense of the processes of transformation which have taken place throughout the global political economy since 2000.

Conclusions

The leitmotif running through this chapter is that of societal transformations and theoretical dynamism. As indicated in the previous section, the conditions producing specific outcomes for the sociology of work in Italy need to be carefully explored in order to account for the historical evolution of the sub-discipline. This includes the circumstances and specificities of a particular academic community as well as the wider social, political and cultural features typical of the national context. Regarding the first of these, it can be argued that the particular pattern of inter-disciplinarity which developed in Italy has to be seen as an interactive, enriching process, which respected the division of scientific labour across diverse disciplines. It is the negotiated outcome of a particular balance of power among socially organized academics, each discipline laying claim to its particular intellectual territory. From this perspective, the sociology of work in Italy has been able to follow contemporary international developments without losing its specificity and thus falling prey to stagnation, or extinction. This offers an intriguing contrast with the British context defined by short-term, market-driven capitalism, which widely differentiates itself from the Italian one.

As a result, the sociology of work in Italy was able to maintain its intellectual autonomy. Italian sociologists were engaged in the development of an independent and inter-disciplinary study of work that could fully generate synergies across (and within) the diverse discipline(s) while bringing to bear their sociological approach on the intersections between class, inequality, gender, race and age. Thus, the sociology of work in Italy evolved in such a way as to overcome the concerns raised by the transformations which have accompanied capitalism and which have contributed to undermining the orthodox evolution of the discipline as, for example, in other European contexts. In this respect, while revitalizing the subject without the loss of intellectual autonomy, Italian sociologists of work have reinforced a sense of group identity resisting the new forces hindering the discipline in other parts of the world.

References

Ambrosini, M. (2001). *La fatica di integrarsi. Immigrati e lavoro in Italia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Andreotti, A., & Benassi, D. (2014). Italian Sociology and European Sociology. In S. Koniordos & A. Kyrtsis (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of European Sociology*. London: Routledge.

Baccaro, L., & Pulignano, V. (2015). From Concessionary Corporatism to Government Unilateralism: Industrial Relations Developments in Italy. In G. Bamber, R. Lansbury, & N. Wailes (Eds.), *International & Comparative Employment Relations. Globalisation and Change*. London: Sage.

Baglioni, G. (1995). *Democrazia Impossibile? I modelli collaborativi nell'impresa; il difficile cammino della partecipazione*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Bagnasco, A. (1994). *Fatti sociali formati nello spazio. Cinque lezioni di sociologia urbana e rurale*. Milano: Franco Angeli.

Ballarino, G., & Bratti, M. (2009). Fields of Study and University's Graduates Early Employment Outcomes in Italy During 1994–2004. *Labour, 23*(3), 421–457.

Banfield, E. (1958). *The Moral Basis of a Backward Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.

Barbano, F., & Viterbi, M. (1959). *Bibliografia della Sociologia Italiana (1948–1958)*. Torino: Giappichelli.

Barbieri, P. (1997). Non c'è rete senza nodi. Il ruolo del capitale sociale nel mercato del lavoro. *Stato e mercato, 49,* 60–96.

Barca, F., & Magnani, M. (1989). *L'industria tra capitale e lavoro: piccole e grandi imprese dall'autunno caldo alla ristrutturazione*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Bernardi, F., & Nazio, T. (2005). Globalisation and Transition to Adulthood in Italy. In H.-P. Blossfeld, M. Mills, E. Klijizing, & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, Uncertainty and Youth in Society*. London: Routledge.

Billari, F., & Ongaro, F. (1998). The Transition to Adulthood in Italy. Evidence From Cross-Sectional Surveys. *Espace, Populations, Sociétés, 2,* 165–179.

Bimbi, F. (1999). The Family Paradigm in the Italian Welfare State (1947–1996). *South European Society & Politics, 4*(2), 72–88.

Bologna, S., & Fumagalli, A. (Eds.). (1997). *Il lavoro autonomo di sedconda generazione. Scenari del post-fordismo in Italia*. Milano: Feltrinelli.

Bonazzi, G. (1993). *Il tubo di cristallo. Modello Giapponese e fabbrica Integrata alla Fiat Auto*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Bonazzi, G. (2002). Perché i sociologi italiani del lavoro e dell'organizzazione, pur essendo pro-labour, non sono post-bravermaniani e meno ancora foucaultiani. *Sociologia del lavoro, 86–87,* 11–16.

Bordogna, L., & Provasi, G. C. (1989). La conflittualità. In G. P. Cella & T. Treu (Eds.), *Relazioni Industriali. Manuale per l'Analisi dell'esperienza Italiana*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Calvanese, F., & Pugliese, E. (1988). Emigration and Immigration in Italy: Recent Trends. *Labour, 2*(3), 181–191.

Carrieri, M. (1995). *L'incerta rappresentanza. Sindacati e consenso negli anni 90*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Carrieri, D. (1997). *Seconda Repubblica: Senza Sindacati?* Rome: Ediesse.

Castillo, J. J. (1997). Looking for the Meaning of Work. *Work and Occupation, 24*(4), 413–425.

Castillo, J. J. (1999). Which Way Forward for the Sociology of Work? An Introduction. *Current Sociology, 47*(2), 1–4.

Catanzaro, R., & Colombo, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Badanti & Co*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Cleaver, H. (2000). Introduction. In *Reading Capital Politically*. Leeds: Anti-Thesis and Edinburgh and San Francisco: AK Press.

Da Roit, B. (2007). Changing Intergenerational Solidarities Within Families in a Mediterranean Welfare State. *Current Sociology, 55*(2), 251–269.

De Decker, P. (2000). *Onderzoek naar de mogelijkheden voor de integratie van de particuliere huurmarkt in het Vlaams Woonbeleid - startnota*. Antwerpen: UFSIA - OASeS.

De Lillo, A., & Schizzerotto, A. (1985). *La valutazione sociale delle occupazioni*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Del Boca, D., & Saraceno, C. (2005). Le donne in Italia tra famiglia e lavoro. *Economia e lavoro, XXXIX*(1), 125–140.

Di Nicola, P. (Ed.). (1998). *Telelavoro tra legge e contratto*. Roma: Ediesse.

Friedmann, G. (1955). *Industrial Society: The Emergence of the Human Problems of Automation*. Glencoe: Free Press.

Friedmann, G. (1978). *The Anatomy of Work: Labour, Leisure and the Implications of Automation*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

Golden, M. (1988). *Labor Divided: Austerity and Working-Class Politics in Contemporary Italy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2001). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA and London, England: Harvard University Press.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2004). *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Press.

Ivaldi, I. (Ed.). (1999). *Ergonomia e lavoro*. Napoli: Liguori.

Lama, L. (1976). *Intervista sul sindacato*. Bari: Laterza.

Lange, P., & Vannicelli, M. (1982). Strategy Under Stress: The Italian Union Movement and the Italian Crisis in Developmental Perspective. In P. Lange, G. Ross, & M. Vannicelli (Eds.), *Unions, Change, and Crisis* (pp. 95–206). Boston: George Allen and Unwin.

Letherby, G. (2005). Current Issues and Future Trends in Sociology: Extending the Debate in Sociological Research Online. *Sociological Research Online, 10*(1). http://www.socresonline.org.uk/10/1/letherby.html.

Locke, J. (1995). *Remaking the Italian Economy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Morlicchio, E. (2005). Challenging the Family. The New Urban Poverty in Southern Europe. In Y. Kazepov (Ed.), *Cities of Europe. Changing Contexts, Local Arrangements and the Challenge to Urban Cohesion*. New York: Francis & Taylor.

Murphey, T. S. (2005). Editors Introduction: Books for Burning. In A. Negri (Eds.), *Books for Burning: Between Civil War and Democracy in 1970s Italy* (T. S. Murphy et al., Trans., pp. ix–xxxvii). London and New York: Verso.

Naldini, M. (2003). *The Family in the Mediterranean Welfare States*. London: Frank Cass.

Negri, A. (2005a). From the Mass Worker to the Socialized Worker—And Beyond. In *Books for Burning: Between Civil War and Democracy in 1970s Italy* (T. S. Murphy et al., Trans., pp. 75–88). London and New York: Verso.

Negri, A. (2005b). The World Economy of the Socialized Worker. In *Books for Burning: Between Civil War and Democracy in 1970s Italy* (T. S. Murphy et al., Trans., pp. 102–114). London and New York: Verso.

Paci, M. (1973). *Mercato del lavoro e classi sociali in Italia: ricerche sulla composizione del proletariato*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Pisati, M., & Schizzerotto, A. (2004). The Italian Mobility Regime: 1985–1997. In R. Breen (Ed.), *Social Mobility in Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pizzorno, A. (1978). Political Exchange and Collective Identity in Industrial Conflict. In C. Crouch & A. Pizzorno (Eds.), *The Resurgence of Class Conflict in Western Europe Since 1968* (pp. 277–298). London: Macmillan.

Pugliese, E. (1993). *Sociologia della Disoccupazione*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Pugliese, E., & Rebeggiani, E. (1997). *Occupazione e disoccupazione in Italia (1945–1995)*. Roma: Edizioni Lavoro.

Pulignano, V. (2005). Rappresentanza del sindacato e spazio europeo: uno studio comparato sull'esperienza dei Cae in due settori. *Giornale di Diritto del Lavoro e Relazioni Industriali, 105*(1).

Regalia, I. (1992). *Al posto del conflitto. Le relazioni di lavoro nel terziario*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Regalia, I. (2007). *Territorial Pacts and Local Level Concertation in Europe, New Modes of Governance*. http://www.eu-newgov.org/.

Regini, M. (1995a). La varietà italiana di capitalismo. Istituzioni sociali e struttura produttiva negli anni 80. *Stato e Mercato, XV*(43).

Regini, M. (1995b). *Uncertain Boundaries. The Social and Political Construction of European Economies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Regini, M. (1997). Social Institutions and Production Structure. The Italian Variety of Capitalism in the 1980s. In C. Crouch & W. Streeck (Eds.), *Political Economy and Modern Capitalism: Mapping Convergence and Diversity*. London: Sage.

Reyneri, E. (1996). *Sociologia del Mercato del Lavoro*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Reyneri, E. (1998). The Role of the Underground Economy in Irregular Migration to Italy: Cause or Effect? *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 24*(2), 313–331.

Reyneri, E. (2005). *Il mercato del lavoro tra famiglia e welfare*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Reyneri, E. (2010). *Offerta di lavoro e occupazione femminile*. In *CNEL, Il lavoro delle donne*. Rome: CNEL.

Romagnoli, U., & Treu, T. (1981). *I sindacati in Italia dal '45 ad oggi: Storia di una strategia*. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Salvati, M. (1984). *Economia e politica in Italia dal dopoguerra ad oggi*. Milano: Garzanti.

Saraceno, C. (1991). Changing Women's Life Course Patterns in Italy: Gender, Cohort and Social Class Differences. In W. R. Heinz (Ed.), *The Life Course and Social Change: Comparative Perspectives*. Weinheim: Deutscher Studien Verlag.

Scaglia, A. (2007). *25 Anni dell'associazione Italiana di sociologia. materiali per scriverene una storia*. Dipartimento di Sociologia e di Ricerca Sociale, Trento, Quanderno 39.

Schizzerotto, A., & Lucchini, M. (2004). Transitions to Adulthood. In R. Berthoud & M. Iacovou (Eds.), *Social Europe. Living Standards and Welfare States*. Cheltenham, Northampton, MA: Elgar.

Scott, J. (2005). Sociology and Its Others: Reflections on Disciplinary Specialisation and Fragmentation. *Sociological Research Online, 10*(1). http://www.socresonline.org.uk/10/1/scott.html.

Solow, R. (1980). *The Labour Market as a Social Institution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Speranza, L. (1992). Professioni, potere ed autorità: sei tesi sullo sviluppo del professionismo. *Rassegna Italiana di Sociologia, XXXIII*, 1.

Strangleman, T. (2005). Sociological Futures and the Sociology of Work. *Sociological Research on Line, 10*(4). http://www.socresonline.org.uk/10/4/lstrangleman.html.

Treves, R. (1959). Sociological Study and Research in Italy. In *Transactions of the Fourth World Congress of Sociology* (pp. 73–94). International Sociological Association.

Trifiletti, R. (1998). Restructuring Social Care in Italy. In J. Lewis (Ed.), *Gender, Social Care and Welfare State Restructuring in Europe*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Tronti, M. (1963). *Social Capital*. www.geocites.com/cordobakaf/tronti_social_capital.html.

Tronti, M. (1964). *Lenin in England*. http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/it/tronti.htm.

Trott, B. (2007). Immaterial Labour and World Order: An Evaluation of a Thesis. *Ephemera, 7*(1), 203–232.

Vaciago, G. (1993). Exchange Rate Stability and Market Expectations: The Crisis of the EMS. *Review of Economic Conditions in Italy, 1*(January–April), 11–29.

Veltz, P. (2000). European Cities in the World Economy. In A. Bagnasco & P. Le Galès (Eds.), *Cities in Contemporary Europe* (pp. 33–47). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Virno, P. (1996). Virtuosity and Revolution: The Political Theory of Exodus (E. Emery, Trans.), in M. Hardt and P. Virno. (1996). Do You Remember Counter-Revolution? (M. Hardt, Trans.), in M. Hardt & P. Virno (eds.). (1996). *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics* (pp. 240–258). Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Virno, P. (2004). *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of* Life (I. Bertoletti et al., Trans.). Los Angeles and New York: Semiotext[e] Foreign Agents Series.

Williamson, O. (1985). *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism*. New York: Free Press.

Zan, S. (1992). *Organizzazione e rappresentanza. Le associazioni imprenditoriali e sindacali*. Roma: la Nuova Italia Scientifica.

5

The Politics of Sociology and the Challenges of Transitions, Formalisation and Fragmentation: The Study of Work and Employment in Spain

Miguel Martínez Lucio and Carlos J. Fernández Rodríguez

Introduction

In dealing with the history of the study of work in any one national context from a broadly sociological and critical perspective, it is important to cast one's analytical net as wide as possible without omitting to look at underlying currents and dynamics. Specific characteristics, foci and trends must be delineated with an eye to the political and institutional frameworks of any one context. A critical perspective—in broad terms—must be able to look at how ideas and thoughts within the process of academic study are shaped not just by ideational factors but by the academy's organisational framework, how other actors such as private or corporate foundations and state agencies have developed, and the political structure and context of the country concerned. The critical approach concerns questions both of power and of how the problems and dynamics of work are determined and become terrains of intellectual and practical struggle. It is an examination of the underlying political, institutional and economic drivers that constitute a tradition of study and analysis.

M. Martínez Lucio (✉)
University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
e-mail: Miguel.MartinezLucio@manchester.ac.uk

C. J. Fernández Rodríguez
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain
e-mail: carlos.fernandez@uam.es

153

We argue that such an approach consists of three dimensions: (i) the disciplinary and sub-disciplinary structure of the subject within the academy and the relations of power that have historically configured these boundaries; (ii) the relationship between the academy and external interests such as state and private-sector organisations; and (iii) how learning and discussion about national issues of concern are framed politically, through the media and by, or for, the public, and the consequent influence on debates taking place inside the academy. A critical approach is mindful of other organic intellectuals and social activists playing their role in research and independent forms of academic activity (Stewart and Martínez Lucio 2011). It is also sensitive to hierarchical relations within the academy and the society it reflects or studies, looking closely at the nature and orientation of dominant or subordinate groups (for example, the gender and class composition of the academic profession). This contributes to actual meanings of work and competing approaches to its study—and to how boundaries are formed between so-called 'sociological' dimensions and others such as the economic, business and legal aspects of work- and employment-related study. The professionalisation of the Spanish tradition of sociology in relation to work has been the subject of debates and interventions largely external to the functioning of the academy over time, even though the formal boundaries of the study of the sociology of work are relatively clear.

The chapter will focus on Spain, which has experienced a series of profound political and social changes during and since the 1940s. We start by considering how the right-wing authoritarian Francoist regime from the late 1930s through to the 1970s not only framed the formal study of work and employment but also limited sociological approaches, preferring to focus on more legalistic—and constrained—approaches to the subject. We consider the curious development of certain managerialist, organisational and occupational psychological perspectives within the regime and its institutional allies (Rodríguez Ruiz 2014). We also examine how a more independent study of work emerged and how counterpoints within the academy, left networks and overseas universities as well as state bodies such as the ILO contributed materials and approaches. The chapter next focuses on the transition to democracy and the first 10–15 years of the new constitutional monarchy, looking at how debates emerged between different schools of thought—especially between a Marxist and leftist tradition, on the one hand, and a more functionalist and analytically oriented sociology mapping the 'real' interests and attitudes of workers, on the other. While the debate developed into an interest in employment regulation and the growing influence of American/Anglo-Saxon ideas of labour and workplace relations,

there was also the challenge of a dualist and fragmented labour market producing a range of sociological studies of the labour market and employment experience. The past 15 or so years have seen the emergence of a new set of critical engagements with the concept of precariousness—and the 'other'—in the study of work. Questions of youth and age generally, gender and migration, have become a more systematic focus of study. However, the Europeanisation of the Spanish academy and its links with the European Union have increased the prominence of these interests within the framework of comparative and cross-national studies, albeit financed by the state (especially the European state system) and positioned with a more formal policy narrative. In addition, ongoing Americanisation with the emergence of neoliberal-oriented management studies and a more quantitative analytical approach led to fragmentation in employment studies and a lack of dialogue between sociology, law, economics and management, compounded by the impact of austerity and, ironically, the precariousness of new generations of academics themselves. This economic context, coupled with the hierarchies within the Spanish academy, has led to the emigration of academics, the consequences of which are only briefly discussed as its effects on the study of work are not yet clear.

Where possible the chapter follows a chronological approach so we can see how debates and interests develop over time, although the authors accept such an approach is not always straightforward and requires certain leaps of faith. In our analysis of the context of debates we try to highlight key events and individuals but due to space restrictions we cannot do justice to the complex array of interventions.

Hard Times: Studying Work in an Authoritarian Context

While some scholars have emphasised that the origins of the sociology of work date back to the end of the nineteenth century (Castillo et al. 2000), a significant research output does not consistently emerge until the 1960s in what is a difficult context. The study of work from a sociological perspective in Spain and the underdeveloped nature of analysis in the 1950s and 1960s were obviously constrained by the political context of a right-wing military dictatorship. After the Civil War (1936–1939) the academic scene in Spain was literally crushed (with the death or exile of its most prominent intellectuals), and both Franco's government and its close ally the Catholic

Church exercised tight control over universities and education in general, imposing 'national-catholic' ideas that were detached from developments in the sciences and humanities elsewhere. Sociological work itself was scarce and underdeveloped, and grounded in the Catholic views (with occasional Opus Dei influences) prevalent in the social and economic realm, avoiding Marxist and many other critical approaches.

It was only in the late 1950s, with the beginning of military and economic cooperation with the USA, that collaboration with US universities helped to create more modern, research-oriented institutions. Sociology took on a more prominent role during the 1960s and the first professorships in sociology were established, helping to institutionalise the discipline. A new generation of Spanish social scientists were subsequently trained in the USA, mostly through Yale University where Juan José Linz, a well-known political theorist, played a key role in inviting young sociologists to the USA to study recent developments in the field. Functionalism and empirical sociology (with Merton and Lazarsfeld as key references) were to be hegemonic, but with little interest for the world of work. However, some of those scholars turned their attention to industrial sociology, focusing on debates between scientific management and human relations from a functionalist perspective (see, e.g., Castillo 1976; López Pintor 1976). The early work of sociologist José María Maravall was also very influential. His first books (1967, 1970, 1972), whose theoretical framework drew on Dahrendorf's and Coser's theories of conflict, researched the role of industrial conflict and the political participation of workers: they represented some of the first serious efforts to study empirically issues that were uncomfortable for the political regime, such as strikes and conflicts in the workplace (while remaining subtly close to functionalism). It also added a new dimension to the Spanish sociological scene, with a pronounced Anglo-Saxon influence in terms of style and focus.

Various Marxist analyses were being published in Spain by the beginning of the 1970s, when the later Franco regime faced growing political unrest and the prospect of a political transition. Outlets such as *Cuadernos para el Diálogo* managed to provide a space (under constant threat of censorship) for different political options and helped more radical approaches to be published by different publishing companies. The study of sociology was still curtailed and controlled, but works inspired by a radical student tradition—partly predated by student revolts—emerged in the late 1960s. There was a strong structuralist Marxist tradition coupled with some influence from the Frankfurt School. However, few of those critical analyses were focused on the world of work. Among them was work by Ignacio Fernández de Castro

(see, e.g., 1973), a pioneer of studies of the labour force with a Marxist background (and outside the academy), and a range of Catalan researchers who published empirical and quantitative works describing the reality of working conditions in Spain (see Estivill et al. 1973).

Interestingly enough, later revisions of the history of sociology of work in Spain (see, e.g., Castillo et al. 2000; Martín Artiles et al. 2007) tend to obscure these contributions and situate the origins of sociology of work in the late 1970s, when the key figures of the discipline (J. J. Castillo, Prieto, Miguélez and others) started their research careers and built the foundations of the sociology of work in Spain. This could be due to some of those authors focusing on different sociological themes with no school or tradition being firmly established. Various leading academics influenced by political sociology began to engage with rational choice theory, pushing for the 'Americanisation' of Spanish sociology, which was seen to be associated with greater professionalism and rigour. The role of Maravall in creating spaces for reflection outside the traditional academy through his leadership of the privately run Juan March Institute is an example of the developments during the 1980s that generated a new form of professionalism within the study of work.[1]

Breaches in the Wall: The Steady Emergence of More Independent Studies of Work During the Late 1970s and Early 1980s

The latter years of the Francoist regime saw a new institutional framework emerge, driven in part by the steady opening up of the regime—the acceptance of pseudo-collective bargaining within the state system of regulation and representation, the growing role of educational and research functions within various state agencies such as in the bodies that oversaw publicly owned industrial entities (the Instituto Nacional de Industria, INI), and

---

[1]It is important to highlight the role that the Juan March Institute has played in the creation of a newer generation of sociologists in Spain. The Institute began to map more formal academic careers with a focus on publications in higher-quality *Journal of Citation Reports* journals: a desire for multi-method approaches and not just qualitative or case study-based research has also influenced the approach to labour and work-related studies. Therefore, there are developments in sociology of work that are focused on labour market, pay and social stratification (e.g., Bernardi and Garrido 2008). Other figures who have published important texts are the Juan March alumnus Javier Polavieja (with a focus on the insiders-vs-outsiders theme, see e.g., 2003) and Luis Ortiz (with a key study on trade unions, 1999), and analytic sociology scholars (not necessarily linked to the Juan March Institute) who have attempted to apply rational choice to workers' discourses (e.g., León 2009).

various private research foundations which in the 1970s were to become more important, especially those linked to the banks and the building societies (*cajas de ahorros*). These foundations created a parallel space for research agendas and projects, yet drew on individuals within the academy. Moreover business schools such as Deusto or EOI would focus, from a managerial perspective, on problems and issues related to industrial production as well as industrial psychology. The study of the main forms of work and the importance of the emerging body of pseudo-collective bargaining in the 1960s after the partial opening of 1958 means that there was a limited view of the state and regulation in terms of employment and the workplace. This, we would argue, frames much of the research within public bodies and ministries—as well as the nature of the journals being developed, such as the *Revista Internacional de Sociología.* Within the academy, the main focus for the study of work emerging from this period is the dominance of the legal tradition and the ritualisation of formal regulation. Hence there was very little ethnographic or even survey-based work about the workforce during this period. Case studies and study of the dynamics of workplaces were not developed to any significant degree and over the longer term—until recently—this has meant the absence of a strong micro-level sociological and ethnographic dimension to the study of work and employment. What predominated was the legal tradition in the form of labour law and a more formalistic approach to the study of work and employment regulation, visible especially during the first 20 years of the political transition.

Moreover, within the state, according to Rodríguez Ruiz (2014), public educational and regulatory/political institutions such as the National Institute of Employment (INE) propagated the role of management philosophies, e.g., human relations and the study of the work of Elton Mayo, as a way of 'humanising' management. There is very little study of—or concern with—the history of management education but what is noticeable is the emergence of non-critical and managerial psychological traditions. This means that there were vital gaps in the empirical study of work and employment and a very weak ethnographic tradition. Some of those works focused on attempts to blend management psychology with some sort of Christian ethics, showing the influence of the Catholic Church among the cadres of management (Fernández Rodríguez and Gantman 2011).

As a counterpoint however, a literature re-emerges in relation to labour history and political activism. The role of academics from the USA, UK and Germany in the study of labour and its history was an important feature of this period (for example, Ellwood's history of the Spanish labour movement in 1976). Hispanists beginning to extend their interest in Spain beyond the

Spanish Civil War, and the sixteenth or nineteenth centuries especially, saw various studies of modern Spanish industry and society published, but they were constrained by problems of access and the lack of documentation. The International Labour Organisation's research departments provided studies and annual reports of Spain, and acted as an important reference point; however, these drew mainly on formal data from the Spanish state, and related bodies, and were based on a series of high-level elite visits. Alongside the more institutional dimensions of the 1960s a body of non-empirical work by political networks emerged, based on a critical sociology and linked to groups of communists, anarchists and autonomists. A great many pamphlets and booklets on work and conflict were published during the mid to late 1970s which have not been given the credit they deserve.

A number of important international works also proved very influential in the Spanish sociological scene. The translation in Mexico of Friedmann and Naville's classic work *Le Traité de sociologie du travail* was very influential among Spanish scholars. France was very much the intellectual source for left-wing scholars as a counterpoint to the US references of mainstream academics (as we will show, the UK would begin to displace radical French thought). Publications by French and Italian authors such as André Gorz, Alain Touraine and Toni Negri were widely read. At a time of political transition and turmoil, Latin American sociologists and economists also had an important influence in Spain. The Cuban Revolution had been followed by political unrest, revolts among students and a proliferation of guerrillas throughout Central and South America. Class struggle, neo-colonialism and the theory of dependence became highly influential, leading to the expansion of critical works by scholars in different countries. Figures such as Cardoso, Prebisch and others had their books published in Spain during the 1970s by publishers such as Siglo XXI, FCC and Ariel, making an impression on Spanish researchers associated with the political left.

Understanding and Framing Labour Struggle After Franco: The Uneven Emergence of a Democratic Sociology of Work During the 1980s

The transition to the new democratic system in the 1970s saw the emergence of various observers and a new generation of labour sociologists in the form of Juan José Castillo, Carlos Prieto, Andrés Bilbao, Fausto Miguélez and Jordi Estivill, among others. This generation established a new approach

to the sociology of work in Spain that would take into account the new social and economic conditions of labour in post-authoritarian Spain as one of the main challenges for a democratic society. Many of these sociologists drew their influences mostly from regulation theory: authors such as Aglietta, Boyer, Freyssinet and particularly Benjamin Coriat had an enormous influence and were often invited to workshops and seminars. Some British sociologists (Michael Burawoy, Paul Edwards) were also important references, particularly in the Barcelona group. This emergence of the sociology of work took place in a context of de-industrialisation and a shift in sociology whereby the attraction of post-industrial values within (especially social-democratic) political elites seemed to imply a weakening of the main identity of organised labour and industrial working-class communities. While in most of the Western world this shift towards post-industrialism was evident in one form or another (Lash and Urry 1987; Harvey 1990; Alonso and Martínez Lucio 2006; Koch and Fritz 2013), in Spain the change was particularly dramatic, with the restructuring and collapse of key parts of industry and an exceptionally high level of unemployment from the early 1980s (Koch 2006). This radically changed both the Spanish economy and society, propagating a model of 'bad jobs' in the service sector associated with high levels of vulnerability and precariousness even before the term became academically fashionable (Sola et al. 2013). This led to a growing interest in working conditions, fragmenting labour markets and the quality of working lives. The most relevant publications of the era tried to define the themes of this new sociology of work by focusing on working conditions, quality of work or management strategies (Castillo and Prieto 1983). From this point of departure these new sociologists of work, based primarily in Madrid (the Complutense University of Madrid) and Barcelona (Autonomous University of Barcelona) with collaborations in other spaces such as the University of Valencia, developed highly productive and innovative research groups, including the Charles Babbage group, led by J. J. Castillo in Madrid, the EGECO group (*Empleo, Género y Cohesión Social*) around the figure of Carlos Prieto in Madrid, and the QUIT group (*Grupo de Estudios Sociológicos sobre la Vida Cotidiana y el Trabajo*) in Barcelona around Fausto Miguélez. Such groups involved dozens of researchers, grants and research projects funded, among others, by public authorities. Academics at the Autonomous University of Barcelona were major drivers of the International Working Party on Labour Market Fragmentation—a network of European and American scholars within which Spanish and especially Catalan scholars have been key.

The encounter with the 'mobilising' working class and the challenge of the left in relation to that mobilising period during the transition also became major themes for discussion. The nature, orientation and politics of the emergent working class organised and formed within the industrialising strategies of the dictatorship framed a series of key debates. Early case studies on the state-owned car manufacturer SEAT were among the first studies of the workplace politics and controls of the 1970s (Miguélez Lobo 1977). Academics linked with key majority and minority trade unions began to look at alternative forms of workplace organisation and representation such as assemblies, as well as at their community and urban dimensions. During this period many studies of the development by the Spanish labour movement, especially the Workers Commissions, of more socio-political organisational forms were published by left-leaning publishers (for a discussion of that period see Martínez Lucio 1992). A range of independent publishers linked to Fourth Internationalist, anarchist and broader social movements collated critical and anti-system texts and materials, giving rise to a rich literature of politically focused research.

This political reality and series of narratives was met with responses that had a curious set of political agendas. First, studies emerged from a range of private research institutes and foundations normally funded by financial institutions.[2] This more formal and institutionalised approach—which normally used larger surveys or expert focus groups and roundtables—pointed to the more contradictory nature of the worker mobilisations and actions of the period, as well as the more instrumental attitudes of workers. The early studies of Pérez Díaz, a leading sociologist of the early 1980s, on mobilisation and worker attitudes within a democratic context was pivotal in revealing a more complex and less political orientation among workers (Pérez Díaz 1980). His work evolved into an interesting body of commentaries and studies on the more pluralistic nature and diverse tapestry of civil society and the greater democratic sensibilities of the Spanish national context

---

[2]The study of work and employment in many national contexts is normally influenced and determined by organisations outside the academy, not just those within it. During the 1970s and 1980s in particular, such spaces were crucial due to the constraints of heavy teaching loads and the chronic lack of research resources and even documentation within the academy. Limited promotion for early-career academics in the hierarchical and older male-dominated Spanish academy also inhibited progress for new academics. A range of academics engaged with private or public entities, including state-owned agencies or corporations such as the Telefónica research agency or trade union research departments, even establishing networks and small research consultancies that carried out subcontracted research. This phenomenon has recently also been found among the bodies of precarious academic workers who do interviews and surveys, and offer transcription services for academics and public institutions, adding to the complexity of mapping research and its traditions and politics.

(Pérez Díaz 1993). Second, German social-democratic research centres (the Friedrich Ebert Foundation and others), with their focus on corporatism/social dialogue, opened offices in Madrid to assist the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party and their allied General Workers Unions (the UGT): they forged a more social-dialogue and 'collective bargaining' view of work and its regulation, creating a counter to the state and legalistic approach of the academy on the one hand and more radical emergent traditions on the other. They sponsored small-scale projects on particular industrial sectors and activities and held a series of workshops whose proceedings were published by their own publishing networks along with both empirical and non-empirical reflections on the nature of labour market changes. These were in effect research and social spaces for the expert exchange of ideas which were central not only to the development of individual networks and discussions on Spanish labour issues, but also in the propagation of specific types of dialogue between key individuals who by the mid-1980s would be in positions of authority. This genre draws from a more Weberian and less Marxist tradition of study, forming a counterpoint to the more radical independent texts emerging from various non-social-democratic trade union and political sources during that period.

Notable also was the individual work of the socialist academic and first democratic-socialist education minister in the 1980s, José María Maravall. Maravall was also part of this sociological response to the left-wing mythologising of the working class and its politics, and drew on a broader view of labour and political relations (Maravall 1978, 1984). What is more, during the early to mid-1980s there was a general shift in the spirit of optimism that had marked the political transition. There was much talk of a political and intellectual disenchantment and this became a de facto political discourse that began to frame, close and limit the space for alternatives, creating a less transparent private space of political discourse based on avoiding conflict and supporting the new elites within power (see del Águila and Montoro, 1984, for a critique of this process from a Frankfurt School perspective). In effect, there was a political closure which coincided with a push to the centre within key social-democratic circles and elites; and an eventual opening up to a neoliberal set of tendencies within the state.

Nevertheless counter-currents and narratives remained through the work of economists, social researchers and labour lawyers at the CCOO trade union especially and in other explicitly left-leaning trade unions at that time. The employment and social departments of the larger trade unions had resources—sometimes but not always derived from the state—to publish a range of research reports that challenged the perceived wisdom of the

government and its ministries (highlighting high levels of unemployment, the dubious rationales of some industrial restructuring, the growing dualism within the workforce and the greater degree of fragmentation within work). The collation of statistics and studies about collective bargaining and labour market developments would constitute a major and vast literary counterpoint to the official discourses and statistics of the state during that period. The CCOO's research institute the Fundación Primero de Mayo emerged in 1988 under the direction of Jorge Aragón in parallel to the UGT's Fundación Largo Caballero. Within the smaller anarcho-sindicalist networks, similar alternative research initiatives played a vital role. These bodies with their wider social and historical remit brought together economists, sociologists and historians whose engagement with European counterparts through European Union funding was able to raise the profile and role of such organisational spaces. The British labour movement had no equivalent space for alternative intellectual reflection beyond social-democratic policy formulations, but in Spain there were edited texts on a range of social and political issues, not to mention economic/industrial relations-related ones. Moreover critical sociologists focused on the nature and imbalances of industrial relations in Spain, plus the perverse effects of labour market reforms (Bilbao 1995, 1999; Miguélez and Prieto 1999; Castillo 2005).

During this critical and highly contested time, the more market-leaning socialist government (1982–1996) began to push for a greater focus on two specific aspects of the study of the sociology of work. There was a significant push towards more publicly funded research in sociology but also a new set of policy interests (for a discussion of the French and Spanish social-democratic tradition of that period and its more employer- or market-oriented understanding of social democracy, see Smith 1998). The first policy push was to start fusing interest in new forms of work and new dynamics within the economy such as new technology and the supposed advent of Post-Fordism. In a significant move in the early 1980s, the Spanish government invited the Spanish sociologist Manuel Castells, who was based in the USA and had dealt with broader social issues and change, to build a centre for the study of new technology at the Autonomous University of Madrid. This high-profile project, with its strong interest in the transformative aspects of technology and its impact in a range of areas of work and employment, led to a range of publications (see Castells 1986). The negative aspects of change in terms of quality of work and questions of exploitation were somewhat lower down the formal research agenda. At this key moment the opinions of French exponents of the post-industrial thesis were sought on high-level policy issues. This formed an important part of the socialist government's

industrial restructuring agenda and its view of the way a new post-industrial Spain should be supported; although it was a time when relations with trade unions and even the socialist UGT were beginning to suffer under the pro-restructuring and 'modernising' agenda of the government. The second feature of this public policy, explored in the next section, is state sponsorship of a more liberal or pluralist industrial-relations approach to the study of work concerned more with regulation and with an emphasis on social dialogue.

The Study of Regulation and Labour in the 1980s and 1990s: The Emergent Dominance of the Anglo-Saxon Paradigm

With the decline of the far left and the Communist Party, and the emergence of market-facing social democracy, the political influence of labour declined, and trade union membership, which had risen in the late 1970s, fell to 10–20% of the workforce. The crisis of representation and the challenges of collective bargaining and national neo-corporatist relations brought a new set of industrial relations studies concerned with political transition and economic change. An empirical British- and Germanic-inspired approach to the labour relations tradition developed within and beyond Spain (Köhler 1999), influenced by the study of political economy, the decline of autonomist and 'assemblyist' approaches, and the fractured nature of employment regulation. A more formal and systematic mapping of labour regulation and labour markets emerged from the Barcelona universities, particularly UAB and later Pompeu Fabra, with a specific interest in trade union strategies and the development of industrial relations in Spain. QUIT, led by Fausto Miguélez, became the biggest research group in sociology of work in terms of number of academics (Fausto Miguélez, Antonio Martín Artiles, Albert Recio, Teresa Torns, Carlota Solé and many others). In the 1990s Works Sciences developed in universities linked to more formal understandings of regulation. In Madrid, the Escuela de Relaciones Laborales (an institute linked to the Complutense University of Madrid and the CCOO union) and its related journal *Cuadernos de Relaciones Laborales* sought to reflect the British approach represented by journals like the *British Journal of Industrial Relations* and *Work Employment and Society*. A key collection of books linking the study of work to northern currents was the series edited by the Ministry of Labour during the

late 1980s and early 1990s. They translated and published key sociological standards such as Burawoy (1979) and more mainstream industrial relations texts, especially from the industrial relations group at Warwick University in the UK.[3]

Sociología de Trabajo, the journal based at the Complutense University of Madrid, has taken a more ethnographic and historical view, acting as a space for greater engagement with the qualitative aspects of work and employment (e.g., health and safety, working conditions and the impact of lean production). *Sociología del Trabajo* went through two different stages: first as an independent academic journal supported by subscriptions and with the involvement of Prieto, Castillo, Alonso, Miguélez and so on, and later under the leadership of J. J. Castillo, when worker discourse and the fragmentation and the deteriorating quality of working lives became important. The journal has continued to play an important role in linking case-study analysis with a labour-history perspective on industry and Post-Fordist debates, among others, and in engaging with networks such as GERPISA which has studied the automobile sector and related work issues. These spaces were important for early studies of new technology and work in the 1990s that went beyond the more formulaic state-led studies referenced earlier. European Commission funding and support was provided for a range of comparative empirical studies. The impact of globalisation and social change on work (Guillén Rodríguez and Gutiérrez Palacios 2008) has led to concerns over the quality of working life. The more grounded and empirical orientation of many studies has enabled the development of more systematic international comparisons.

A critical interest in alternative sociological approaches and methods remains within circuits that link consumption, citizenship, labour identity and employment change. This tradition has blended several theoretical sources, from regulation theory through to the work of Bourdieu, especially the Escuela de Madrid qualitative research school whose main references (Jesús Ibáñez, Alfonso Ortí, Ángel de Lucas) have introduced interesting insights on methods such as focus groups. It is the work of Luis Enrique Alonso (e.g., 1999, 2007) that merged all these traditions, with a focus on the crisis of labour citizenship and the centrality of work in Post-Fordist societies. The French neo-Marxist tradition thus sustains itself in various currents and schools of thought.

---

[3]Regardless of such institutional efforts, the stigma associated with labour relations, trade union studies and work-oriented research at a time of worsening trade union–state relations during the 1980s and early 1990s meant that the study of work was not consistently prioritised even with the emerging interest in 'social dialogue'.

The Impact of Labour Fragmentation and Precariousness: The Study of Labour Markets

Alongside this emerging yet uneven interest in the workplace and social dynamics sit socio-economic approaches to labour market analysis (Toharia and Albert 1998; Recio 1986) that are supported by a rise in state funding and enable a critical and left-leaning school to engage with critical heterodox economic perspectives. Orthodox neoliberal economics schools are increasingly dominant and the emergent highly Americanised or mangerialised human resource management (HRM) tradition is less concerned with social and political contexts. This has led to significant debate on the *causes* of labour market dualism in Spain (high levels of unemployment and temporary contracts) between right- and left-wing labour market and labour economics constituencies (indeed one right-wing attempt to undermine the left position referenced the lower number of academic citations of leading academics from the latter). The main reason for this imbalance and 'victory' was that leading US journals tend to prefer quantitative research of an orthodox economic nature.

These debates about the labour market and its workings emphasise statistical analysis at the expense, at times, of a deeper qualitative case-study approach. They also frame much of the politics of work and employment interventions as the political right and centre emphasise questions of rigidity (Fernández Rodríguez and Martínez Lucio 2013). Economists and social scientists linked to key figures of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (PSOE) have supported deregulation policies to tackle the problems of the labour market. In this sense, the debate in sociology of work has emphasised the divisions between precarious and stable workers.

However, there remained during this period, as mentioned above, a substantial number of publications linked to key figures of the sociology of work and its followers who have focused on more critical views of work and its problems. The Spanish socio-economic model of the 1980s and 1990s promoted by different right-wing Partido Popular and social-democratic PSOE governments was partly based on liberalisation, the steady deregulation of markets, and the extensive development of the construction and service sectors as the pillars of the economy. This 'new economy' generating substantial growth was based on a workforce increasingly reliant on temporary contracts and low salaries. Despite deregulation, unemployment levels remained high except during the economic boom of 1997–2007. This led to more progressive perspectives on the study of labour fragmentation and its uneven economic context, with French sociological

traditions (such as Castel or Bourdieu) and British scholars (such as Hyman or the Warwick School) continuing to influence many, notably researchers associated with QUIT. Examples include case studies on working conditions in retailing (Agulló 2010), industry (Lahera 2006), information technologies (Castillo 2007) and the leisure sector (Castellanos and Pedreño 2005). With widespread use of subcontracting and a particularly difficult labour market for young people, precariousness has become a key subject of study, with different theoretical approaches from post-operaismo (Precarias a la Deriva 2004) to regulation theory (many authors), and new discussions about the nature of labour and employment (García López et al. 2003) or the quality of employment (Prieto et al. 2009). The work of Ana Guillén Rodríguez and colleagues on the quality of working life and on the welfare state has extended the remit of the debate on work with a greater comparative sensibility (see Guillén and Dahl 2009; Guillén and León 2011).

The research committee at the Federación Española de Sociología has summarised the main lines of research of the discipline (Martín Artiles et al. 2007; Comité de Investigación de Sociología del Trabajo 2010) including the challenges sociology of work is facing in teaching (fewer students taking sociology degrees) and research (reduced funding). Other issues linked to this vulnerable labour market include training, workplace harassment, individualisation in working lives or the quality of work, and contextual factors such as the shift to post-industrialism and the financialisation of the economy. This makes for a more critical space for the labour studies tradition and is linked to left-wing currents around specific unions and the role of more co-ordinated work. Studies of political representation and transnational work include various other dimensions drawn into these networks (especially in Oviedo and Valencia—Holm Detlev Köhler, Miguel García Calavia, Pere Beneyto and others). There has also been a growing concern with labour relations, the main themes of which were summarised by Miguélez and Prieto (1999). Other areas for re-focusing are trade union membership (see Jódar et al. 2011; Beneyto 2004, 2016), new forms of worker participation (González Menéndez 2011) and de-mobilisation (López Calle 2007), and new EU policies and practices such as flexicurity (Serrano Pascual 2007; Keune and Serrano Pascual 2014; Fernández Rodríguez and Serrano Pascual 2014; Fernández Rodríguez et al. 2016) or corporate social responsibility (Maira Vidal 2015). Finally, many academics have been involved in widespread debate on neo-corporatism. González Begega and Luque Balbona (2014), for example, highlight the complexities of political exchange in Spain, calling for a more nuanced approach that understands changes but also continuities. These approaches have attempted to locate the debate on Spanish regulation and social dialogue in the context of the uneven development of the state

and the nature of the southern European context of industrial relations (Molina 2005, 2007). Such arguments are concerned with the challenges of developing an articulated and coordinated system of industrial relations given the competing pressures on the state and system of regulation in social and economic terms.

Engaging the 'Outsiders': Gender, Youth and Race in the Study of Work Since 2000

During and immediately after the transition years the study of gender and race was fairly limited, possibly due to the nature of the academy and work itself—and the trade union movement—which were primarily male oriented. However, the main trade unions have had dedicated women's sections and research programmes since the late 1970s. In terms of race and ethnicity Spain was a relatively closed economy, with race and identity issues mainly focused around Spain's historic nationalities. Even the indigenous Roma population was not a main focus of study. Although there was some sensitivity to emigration within the trade union movement this did not generate systematic research until much later (see Martínez Lucio et al. 2012).

More recently, various factors have contributed to a greater sensitivity to these issues. First is the flexibility and dualism which has configured the Spanish labour market during and since the 1980s. This has raised awareness of the challenges facing older workers and the effects on them of extensive industrial restructuring, women's access to the labour market and their exclusion from it for long periods, and the dilemmas of labour market entrance for younger workers and others (see López and Rodríguez 2011 for a more general discussion). There are more studies devoted to young people and precarious experiences (e.g., Santos Ortega 2003). Second, a newer generation of academics have experienced temporary and precarious contracts as women and younger workers. Third, these have fused with an interest in new waves of sociological sensitivity to questions of equality and diversity. Fourth, public institutions have taken these emerging issues into account in their agendas, not only highlighting their importance in calls for research projects, but also supporting them in other ways although the austerity policies of the past ten years have not helped consolidate this tradition. For instance, public bodies such as the Instituto de la Mujer (Women's Institute) have funded research projects around gender issues and helped to disseminate gender equality recommendations and policies despite constraints on research funding.

Finally, the political climate has also changed due to women's changing political and economic roles, and the increasing levels of immigration

which in 20 years have seen Spain move from one of the lowest to one of the highest levels of immigration in Europe. Alternative networks of sociologists, lawyers and economists within radical and minority-based movements have been much more sensitive to these new forms of exclusion and segregation in employment. Many of these groups have both led mobilisations and configured research around these dynamics. A significant research focus going beyond labour market and collective bargaining analysis has developed within the main majority trade unions as well.

Much work has therefore been done recently on migration, for example, although this is concerned primarily with questions of inclusion and labour market change. In particular, the impact of new forms of disorganised migration in a context of increasing deregulation and dualism has given rise to concerns about hyper-exploitation and vulnerable work. The work of key scholars has brought a major degree of sensitivity to these issues: for example see Cachón (2007), Cachón and Vallés (2003) and Solé and Parellá (2003). The work of Colectivo IOÉ has been key in developing a new set of insights into work and employment which has in turn contributed to a growing interest in minority ethnic workers.[4] A range of studies framed in terms of precariousness concern younger workers and the peripheral economy. There has also been a growing interest in gender studies in the workplace with authors such as Cristina Carrasco, Teresa Torns or Carlota Solé and associated researchers, among others (see Carrasco 1999; Carrasco et al. 1997; Carrasco and Mayordomo 2000; Torns 2005; Solé and Parellá 2004), but also studies on the immigrant workforce where gender issues play a key role (e.g., Oso and Ribas-Mateos 2012). Concern over unpaid work (Durán 2000) and invisible and emotional work has also led not only to new research trends but also to a growing interest in the disciplinary and exploitative dimensions of working time and work patterns both inside and outside the workplace (Torns 2008; Prieto et al. 2008; Martín Criado and Prieto 2015). The First of May Foundation of the CCOO trade union has also been a vital hub for the study of migration, work and society as they relate to historical memory and social change.

Furthermore, in these diverse, albeit fragmented spaces, we see a greater interest in new forms of labour representation and labour politics. Work on new independent unions and new forms of labour conflict and labour

---

[4]It should also be noted that interest in immigration has helped to revitalise the interest in agrarian work that had been marginalised with the rise of, and interest in, post-industrialism in Spain (see, e.g., the work of Andrés Pedreño and others such as de Castro et al. 2014; Pedreño Cánovas 2014).

representation has been important in highlighting new dynamics and themes in labour relations and social relations at work (de Guzmán et al. 2016). The emergence of Podemos in Spain, which is linked to a radical and innovative new political generation, has also galvanised alternative forms of research.

The Problem of Methods and Boundaries: The New Neo-imperialism in the Study of Work and the Struggle Around Methods

A major challenge historically for Spanish researchers, even those close to the labour movement, is access to workplaces and workers such that detailed case studies of companies, workplaces and communities have not been that extensive until recently. There has also been a tendency to rely on surveys organised and led by state agencies in a range of areas—mostly the unemployment statistics from INE (EPA particularly but also other specific studies) as well as other relevant sources such as Encuesta de Calidad de Vida en el Trabajo and occasional surveys from the Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas. Yet many surveys do not consistently include workers and their opinions, let alone managers (and line managers especially).

Despite this we have seen a growing interest in quantitative studies, partly due to the growing perception of the need to publish in English-speaking journals which are seen to prefer a numerical and statistical approach to research (Rodríguez Ruiz and Martínez Lucio 2010). Within the HRM aspects of workplace and organisational research this means that the Spanish context is normally played down, with universalistic and managerial interests in generic issues such as motivation and commitment being prioritised (ibid.).

Alternative forms of research such as group discussions have been used in various sociological circles, but participant observation and more direct forms of researcher involvement are rarely seen in mainstream academic research. Once more it tends to fall to more radical and politically networked researchers to develop these forms of work. The UK labour process tradition is less present in the Spanish context, though there are exceptions (see, e.g., Köhler 1996; Ortiz 1999; Del Bono 2002; Castillo and López Calle 2003). Workplace studies are still not as common as in the UK or France, and workers are normally interviewed in social or community contexts (Ortiz's work has been significant in this respect in dealing with the

nuances of debates on organisational change within workplaces and trade unions, see Ortiz 1999, 2002).

A highly noticeable development is the fundamental disconnect in Spain between various disciplines involved in the study of work, although some would argue this is not a bad thing. There is little dialogue between law and sociology even in the labour sphere, although legal skills and understanding of regulation are noticeable among sociologists due to the centrality of law as an instrument of regulation. There is also greater tension between the labour-economics and labour-sociology traditions. While key individuals such as the late Luis Toharia developed a more heterodox approach to labour market studies of employment fragmentation, Post-Fordism and dualism, there have been major disagreements over the causes of labour market 'rigidities'. The division between the study of HRM and the study of labour relations or the sociology of work is not unique to Spain although the debates are more closely linked to those in the UK and the USA. This means that large tranches of research in Spanish business schools and management departments are oblivious—literally—to debates on work and employment from a labour-relations or labour-sociology perspective. It also means that the space for the latter in the academy is more constrained although perhaps not so politically compromised as in the USA and UK. However, a further negative spin-off from this division is the absence of dialogue between organisational theorists of a critical nature (broadly speaking) and the sociology of work and labour relations (Fernández Rodríguez 2007a). Although scholars have attempted to generate interest in the broader debates and discussions in the UK, Nordic countries and the USA through translations and edited texts of alternative views of HRM and organisational behaviour (ibid; González Menéndez et al. 2011), organisational behaviour and the sociology of the organisation is not really a feature of the critical study of work—and vice versa. This ideological debate and schism has created a predominantly neoliberal perspective on the labour market in labour economics and business schools for the past 15 years, a lack of references to the Spanish social and political context, and the sociology of organisations being dominated by pro-business views and functionalist perspectives. Interesting work on organisational culture, however, has led to the emergence of new studies linked to a new type of critical school of organisations, with links to labour process theory or critical management studies, in which organisational culture is seen as a tool used by management to increase labour productivity and as vehicle for the degradation of workplace rights (see Lahera 2006; Fernández Rodríguez 2007b).

Context, Politics and Challenges: The Curious Impact and Reminder of Precarious Existence

The blurred boundaries between public, private and social interests and the oppressed nature of the academy determined how the sociology of work was constrained during the 1940s to 1970s in the Spanish context and how oppositional networks and key individuals had to overcome this through various strategies. The impact of the more open and robust study of work and employment that developed coincided in the 1980s with a political turn to the social-democratic left and a decline in the communist and revolutionary movements. The trade unions continued with their research but counter-spaces were limited by the economic crisis of the time and the assimilation of key individuals into an emergent neoliberal or social-market view of society and the economy. The sociological counter-mobilisation movement (or in their view counter-idealism) of the 1980s had major effects although public funding increased and the Spanish university steadily regained its role in Europe. Resources and supports developed with a more formal and rigorous study of work, with regional governments nurturing key groups of study in, for example, Madrid, Oviedo, Barcelona and Valencia. Tied to the main trade unions, the networks between these centres engendered a more credible and increasingly innovative sociology of work and these circuits have sustained critical approaches in the form of neo-Marxist, regulation theory and even autonomist views. The post-1970s context saw the emergence of quite a robust approach to the study of work, and radical and critical academics networking and developing alternative agendas. The sociology of work was able to develop a greater social and emancipatory sensibility clearly visible in the transition years of the 1970s and early 1980s. Yet the 1980s and 1990s saw distinctly evolving traditions caught between a more institutionalist US-influenced approach organised around broader policy agendas linked to European Union funding, on the one hand, and a continuing independently and radically oriented research tradition with a distinct view of questions of social inclusion and emancipation on the other. The last two decades have seen negotiation and cross-overs related to this gap (which was much more explicit in the early years of Spanish democracy), but tensions and alternative trajectories remain.

Many positive, emancipatory and progressive developments have continued: the emergence of more systematic analysis within critical approaches

and the increasing use of alternative methodologies (biography, group discussions); an important and supportive role for trade union researchers and institutes; increasing ethnography; new and broad communities of radical and networked scholars; growing internationalisation and integration, which though prompted by state funding and forced emigration due to the absence of new academic posts has led to new networks and communities of Spanish sociologists and a greater southern European diaspora and interest prompted by common experiences of change; increasing concern with labour market disadvantage and a greater sensitivity to the complex and ambivalent nature of regulation in Spain; and a greater sensitivity to and interest in radical transnational currents (key French texts are translated into Spanish before they are in English in many cases). Thus we still see radical agendas in the academy with links to social movements, trade unions and progressive foundations in various social organisations, and some ongoing interest in the study of work in terms of opposition, resilience and autonomy. The interface between radical and critical academics, and trade unions and their research foundations, is interesting. The growing focus on individual work experiences and precariousness has become more significant although this comes, on occasions, with less emphasis being placed on political discourse and on the politics of employers, and a limited interest in the state beyond the law. Ironically, questions of labour fragmentation and then precariousness—along with the economics and politics of austerity—have been important in reorienting the formalisation of the research agenda and creating new voices, methods and politics within research agendas, along with new sensibilities.

Numerous challenges remain from a progressive and critical point of view. The economic crisis of the Great Recession has affected employment and resources for a new generation of researchers, even if this has led to a curious external network of academics linked across different traditions. The research community is heavily biased in favour of male scholars, and overseas scholars are mainly from an EU or North American background. Ethnic minorities have not been able to emerge systematically within various debates, although the high level of migration is a recent phenomenon. The academy remains highly fragmented with a traditionally structured hierarchy and boundaries, and there are signs of further fragmentation and lack of dialogue across the disciplines of sociology, law, HRM and labour market studies, reflecting how intellectual boundaries in the university are framed in Spain. Some might applaud this—especially the absence of a link with organisational and management studies—but given the relative lack of labour sociologists there appears little room for manoeuvre inside the academy. There is still a relative absence of systematic case-study and context-based analysis, workplace

observation or worker engagement. The study of the labour movement is still limited and relies on a small range of scholars. It is difficult for a new generation of sociologists to establish academic careers at a time of strong public-sector cuts: research funding is limited, job opportunities are decreasing and universities may face reforms if pro-austerity policies and neoliberal views of education continue to become entrenched. Worker representation is not always studied in more dynamic terms and the remit is quite institutional: there also appears to be a stigma around the study of workers' organisations although this is, unfortunately, common in various parts of Europe. However, a new generation of radical and independently oriented academics is working mainly on the edges of the academy on precarious or non-civil service contracts, in overseas institutions, producing counter-discourses (even if not hegemonic) and new progressive spaces and narratives curiously reminiscent of the counterpoints of the 1970s and early 1980s but with a new set of flexible and emancipatory approaches. Alternative political movements are generally linked strongly with younger, radical university academics, and today's more robust network of scholars of work are concerned with emancipation and alternative forms of participation. The problems of the last ten years have not only provided source material for a new generation but also revived an earlier generation of intellectually and politically resilient work-related scholars.

Bibliography

Agulló, I. (2010). Formas de ver y hacer el trabajo: el caso de las trabajadoras de grandes cadenas de moda. *Sociología del trabajo, 70,* 47–63.

Alonso, L. E. (1999). *Trabajo y ciudadanía*. Madrid: Trotta.

Alonso, L. E. (2007). *La crisis de la ciudadanía laboral*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Alonso, L. E., & Martínez Lucio, M. (2006). *Employment Relations in a Changing Society: Assessing the Post-fordist Paradigm*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beneyto, P. (2004). La afiliación sindical en España: evolución reciente y factores determinantes. *Arxius de sociologia, 11,* 89–106.

Beneyto, P. (2016). Trabajo y sindicalismo en la globalización. *RES. Revista Española de Sociología, 25*(1), 61–87.

Bernardi, F., & Garrido, L. (2008). Is There a New Service Proletariat? Post-industrial Employment Growth and Social Inequality in Spain. *European Sociological Review, 24*(3), 299–313.

Bilbao, A. (1995). *Obreros y ciudadanos: la desestructuración de la clase obrera*. Madrid: Trotta.

Bilbao, A. (1999). *El empleo precario: seguridad de la economía e inseguridad del trabajo*. Madrid: Los libros de la Catarata.

Burawoy, M. (1979). *Manufacturing Consent*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Cachón, L. (2007). Diez notas sobre la inmigración en España 2006. *Vanguardia Dossier, 22*, 68–74.

Cachón, L., & Valles, M. S. (2003). Trade Unionism and Immigration: Reinterpreting Old and New Dilemmas. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research, 9*(3), 469–482.

Carrasco, C. (Ed.). (1999). *Mujeres y economía*. Barcelona: Icaria.

Carrasco, C., Alabart, A., Mayordomo, M., & Montagut, T. (1997). *Mujeres, trabajos y políticas sociales: una aproximación al caso español*. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo y Seguridad Social.

Carrasco, C., & Mayordomo, M. (2000). Los modelos y estadísticas de empleo como construcción social: la encuesta de población activa y el sesgo de género. *Política y Sociedad, 34,* 101–112.

Castellanos, M. L., & Pedreño, A. (2005). *Los nuevos braceros del ocio*. Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila.

Castells, M. (1986). *Nuevas tecnologias, economia y sociedad en España: volumen 1* (Vol. 1). Madrid: Alianza editorial.

Castillo, J. (1976). *Sociología de la empresa*. Madrid: MEC.

Castillo, J. J. (Ed.). (2005). *El trabajo recobrado: una evaluación del trabajo realmente existente en España*. Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila.

Castillo, J. J. (2007). *El trabajo fluido en la sociedad de la información*. Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila.

Castillo, J. J., Lahera, A., Castillo, C., & Barañano, M. (2000). La sociología del trabajo en España entre dos siglos. *Sociología del Trabajo, 39,* 111–134.

Castillo, J. J., & López Calle, P. (2003). *Los obreros del polo: una cadena de montaje en el territorio*. Madrid: UCM.

Castillo, J. J., & Prieto, C. (1983). *Condiciones de trabajo: hacia un enfoque renovador de la sociología del trabajo*. Madrid: CIS.

Comité de Investigación de Sociología del Trabajo. (2010). *La investigación y la enseñanza de la sociología del trabajo: un balance de la situación en España*. Alzira: Germania.

de Castro, C., Gadea, M. E., & Pedreño, A. (2014). Inmigración, crisis del sur de Europa y sostenibilidad social de las estrategias de desarrollo. El caso de los enclaves productivos de agricultura intensiva. *Revista Trabajo, 11,* 89–113.

De Guzmán S. P., Roca, B., & Diaz-Parra, I. (2016). Political Exchange, Crisis of Representation and Trade Union Strategies in a Time of Austerity: Trade Unions

and 15M in Spain. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research*, *22*(4), 461–474.

Del Águila Tejerina, R., & Montoro, R. M. (1984). *El discurso político de la transición española*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas (CIS).

Del Bono, A. (2002). *Telefónica. Trabajo degradado en la era de la información*. Madrid: Miño y Dávila.

Durán, M. A. (2000). *La contribución del trabajo no remunerado a la economía española: alternativas metodológicas*. Madrid: Instituto de la Mujer.

Estivill, J., Pons, I., Homs, O., & Sánchez, J.-E. (1973). *Apuntes sobre el trabajo*. Barcelona: Nova Terra.

Fernández de Castro, I. (1973). *La fuerza de trabajo en España*. Madrid: Cuadernos para el Diálogo.

Fernández Rodríguez, C. J. (2007a). *Vigilar y organizar: una introducción a los Critical Management Studies*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Fernández Rodríguez, C. J. (2007b). *El discurso del management: tiempo y narración*. Madrid: CIS.

Fernández Rodríguez, C. J., & Gantman, E. (2011). Importers of Management Knowledge: Spain and Argentina in the 20th Century (1955–2008). *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 28*(2), 160–173.

Fernández Rodríguez, C. J., Ibáñez Rojo, R., & Martínez Lucio, M. (2016). The Reform of Collective Bargaining in the Spanish Metal and Chemicals Sectors (2008–2015): The Ironies and Risks of De-regulating Employment Regulation. In A. Koukidaki, I. Tavora, & M. Martínez Lucio (Eds.), *Joint Regulation and Labour Market Policy in Europe During the Crisis*. Brussels: ETUI.

Fernández Rodríguez, C. J., & Martínez Lucio, M. (2013). Narratives, Myths and Prejudice in Understanding Employment Systems: The Case of Rigidities, Dismissals and the Question of Flexibility in Spain. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 34*(2), 310–333.

Fernández Rodríguez, C. J., & Serrano Pascual, A. (2014). *El paradigma de la flexiguridad en las políticas de empleo españolas: un análisis cualitativo*. Madrid: CIS.

García López, P., Meseguer, P., Lago, J., & Riesco, A. (2003). Introducción a una sociología de las relaciones salariales. *Cuadernos de Relaciones Laborales, 21*(2), 13–21.

González Begega, S., & Luque Balbona, D. (2014). ¿Adiós al corporatismo competitivo en España? Pactos sociales y conflicto en la crisis económica. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas, 148,* 79–102.

González Menéndez, M. (2011). The Determinants of Workplace Direct Participation: Evidence from a Regional Survey. *Work, Employment & Society, 25*(3), 397–416.

González Menéndez, M., Gutiérrez Palacios, R., & Martínez Lucio, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Gestión de Recursos Humanos: Contexto y Políticas*. Madrid: Thompson.

Guillén, A. M., & Dahl, S. Å. (Eds.). (2009). *Quality of Work in the European Union: Concept, Data and Debates from a Transnational Perspective* (No. 67). Bern: Peter Lang.

Guillén, A. M., & León, M. (Eds.). (2011). *The Spanish Welfare State in European Context*. London: Ashgate.

Guillén Rodríguez, A., & Gutiérrez Palacios, R. (2008). Treinta años de pactos sociales en España: un balance. *Cuadernos de Información Económica, 203,* 173–180.

Harvey, D. (1990). *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jódar, P., Alós-Moner, R., & Vidal, S. (2011). Why Do Workers Leave Unions? Group Differences Between Workers in CCOO-Catalonia. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research, 17*(4), 471–484.

Keune, M., & Serrano Pascual, A. (2014). *Deconstructing Flexicurity and Developing Alternative Approaches: Towards New Concepts and Approaches for Employment and Social Policy*. London: Routledge.

Koch, M. (2006). *Roads to Post-Fordism*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Koch, M., & Fritz, M. (Eds.). (2013). *Non-standard Employment in Europe: Paradigms, Prevalence and Policy Responses*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Köhler, H. D. (coord.). (1996). *Asturias: el declive de una región industrial*. Gijón: Trea.

Köhler, H. D. (1999). Las relaciones laborales españolas en el marco europeo. In F. Miguelez & C. Prieto (Eds.), *Las relaciones de empleo en españa*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Lahera, A. (2006). *Diseño tecnológico y proceso de trabajo. Mutaciones organizativas en empresas de ingeniería mecánica*. Buenos Aires: Miño y Dávila Editores.

Lash, S., & Urry, J. (1987). *The End of Organized Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity.

León, F. (2009). La lógica de los trabajadores. Un estudio sobre la racionalidad, la autonomía y la coherencia de las prácticas y los significados de los trabajadores. *Revista Internacional de Sociología, 67*(1), 135–160.

López, I., & Rodríguez, E. (2011). The Spanish Model. *New Left Review, 69*(3), 5–29.

López Calle, P. (2007). *La desmovilización general. Jóvenes, sindicatos y reorganización productiva*. Madrid: La Catarata.

López Pintor, R. (1976). *La sociología industrial y de la empresa*. Barcelona: Vicens Vives.

Maira Vidal, M. (2015). *La dimensión internacional de la Responsabilidad Social Empresarial*. Albacete: Bomarzo.

Maravall, J. M. (1967). *Trabajo y conflicto social*. Madrid: Cuadernos para el Diálogo.

Maravall, J. M. (1970). *El desarrollo económico y la clase obrera un estudio sociológico de los conflictos obreros en España*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Maravall, J. M. (1972). *La sociología de lo possible*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Maravall, J. M. (1978). *Dictadura y disentimiento político: obreros y estudiantes bajo el franquismo*. Madrid: Alfaguara.

Maravall, J. M. (1984). *La política de la transición* (Vol. 247). Madrid: Taurus.

Martín Artiles, A., Miguélez, F., & Prieto, C. (2007). Sociología del trabajo. In M. Pérez Yruela (Ed.), *La sociología en España* (pp. 189–212). Madrid: CIS.

Martín Criado, E., & Prieto, C. (2015). *Conflictos por el tiempo*. Madrid: Universidad Complutense/CIS.

Martínez Lucio, M. (1992). Spain: Constructing Institutions and Actors in a Context of Change. In S. Ferner & R. Hyman (Eds.), *Industrial Relations in the New Europe* (pp. 482–523). Oxford: Blackwell.

Martínez Lucio, M., Marino, S., & Connolly, H. (2012). Broadening and Reimagining Regulation: Trade Unions, 'Active Servicing' and Immigration in Spain since the Early 1990s. *Journal of Industrial Relations, 55*(2), 190–211.

Miguélez, F., & Prieto, C. (Eds.). (1999). *Las relaciones de empleo en España*. Madrid: Siglo XXI.

Miguélez Lobo, F. (1977). *Seat, la empresa modelo del régimen*. Barcelona: Dopesa.

Molina, Ó. (2005). Political Exchange and Bargaining Reform in Italy and Spain. *European Journal of Industrial Relations, 11*(1), 7–26.

Molina, Ó. (2007). State and Regulation of Industrial Relations in Spain: Old Wine in a New Governance Bottle? *South European Society & Politics, 12*(4), 461–479.

Ortiz, L. (1999). *Convergencia o permanencia de los sistemas de relaciones laborales: reacción sindical a la introducción del trabajo en equipo*. Madrid: Fundación Juan March.

Ortiz, L. (2002). The Resilience of a Company-Level System of Industrial Relations: Union Responses to Teamwork in Renault's Spanish Subsidiary. *European Journal of Industrial Relations, 8*(3), 277–299.

Oso, L., & Ribas-Mateos, N. (2012). De la sorpresa a la incertidumbre: abriendo etapas en el estudio de la temática sobre género y migración en el contexto español. *Papers, 97*(3), 511–520.

Pedreño Cánovas, A. (Ed.). (2014). *De cadenas, migrantes y jornaleros: los territorios rurales en las cadenas globales agroalimentarias*. Madrid: Talasa.

Perez Díaz, V. (1980). Actitudes obreras y estrategias sindicales y políticas antes la crisis actual. *Papeles de Economía Española, 4,* 38–54.

Perez Díaz, V. (1993). *The Return of Civil Society: The Emergence of Democratic Spain*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Polavieja, J. (2003). *Estables y precarios*. Madrid: CIS/Siglo XXI.

Precarias a la Deriva (Ed.). (2004). *A la Deriva: Por los Circuitos de la Precariedad Femenina*. Madrid: Traficantes de Sueños.

Prieto, C., Arnal, M., Caprile, M., & Potrony, J. (2009). *La calidad del empleo en España: una aproximación teórica y empírica*. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración.

Prieto, C., Ramos, R., & Callejo, J. (Eds.). (2008). *Nuevos tiempos del trabajo*. Madrid: CIS.

Recio, A. (1986). Trabajadores desiguales: I. Segmentación de la clase obrera y estrategias laborales. *Mientras tanto, 28,* 69–85.

Rodríguez Ruiz, O. (2014). The History of Human Resource Management in Spain: An Autocratic Legacy Beyond the Waves of Rational and Normative Control. *Management & Organizational History, 9*(3), 256–271.

Rodríguez Ruiz, O., & Martínez Lucio, M. (2010). The Study of HRM in Spain: The Americanization of Spanish Research and the Politics of Denial? *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21*(1), 125–143.

Santos Ortega, J. A. (2003). «Jóvenes de larga duración»: biografías laborales de los jóvenes españoles en la era de la flexibilidad informacional. *RES. Revista Española de Sociología, 3,* 87–97.

Serrano Pascual, A. (2007). Reshaping Welfare States and Activation Regimes in Europe. In A. Serrano Pascual & L. Magnusson (Eds.), *Reshaping Welfare States and Activation Regimes in Europe* (Vol. 54, pp. 11–34). Brussels: Peter Lang.

Smith, W. R. (1998). *The Left's Dirty Job: The Politics of Industrial Restructuring in France and Spain.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Sola, J., Alonso, L. E., Fernández Rodríguez, C. J., & Ibáñez Rojo, R. (2013). The Expansion of Non-standard Employment in Spain (1984–2010): Neither Socially Fair, Nor Economically Productive. In M. Koch & M. Fritz (Eds.), *Non-standard Employment in Europe: Paradigms, Prevalence and Policy Responses* (pp. 67–83). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Solé, C., & Parellá, S. N. (2003). The Labour Market and Racial Discrimination in Spain. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 29*(1), 121–140.

Solé, C., & Parellá, S. N. (2004). Nuevas expresiones de la maternidad: las madres con carreras profesionales ¿exitosas? *RES. Revista Española de Sociología, 4,* 67–92.

Stewart, P., & Martínez Lucio, M. (2011). Collective Narratives and Politics in the Contemporary Study of Work: The New Management Practices Debate. *Work, Employment & Society, 25*(2), 327–341.

Toharia, L., & Albert, C. (1998). *El mercado de trabajo en España.* Madrid: McGraw-Hill Interamericana de España.

Torns, T. (2005). De la imposible conciliación a los permanentes malos arreglos. *Cuadernos de Relaciones Laborales, 23*(1), 15–33.

Torns, T. (2008). El trabajo y el cuidado: cuestiones teórico-metodológicas desde la perspectiva de género. *Empiria, 15,* 53–73.

6

Swedish Sociology of Work

Bengt Furåker

Introduction

In depicting Swedish sociology of work, several demarcation problems need
to be dealt with. The first is what we mean by work. This concept is fre-
quently left undefined in working life studies or, rather, researchers com-
monly just assume that it stands for gainful employment. Still, in the
Swedish literature we find attempts to offer a definition. One of them is
provided in a dissertation by Jan Ch. Karlsson (1986). The starting point
is that work should be treated as an ontological concept. It is not a matter
of certain activities, but is defined as man's doing in the sphere of neces-
sity. Various forms of work are then outlined such as wage labour under an
employer and independent work as self-employed. Another attempt in the
literature proposes an ostensive definition (Furåker 1991). Work is treated
as a process in which an actor uses tools to transform an object into a pre-
defined product. This concept is applicable to material production—let
us say a forest worker who employs his saw and ax on a tree to produce a
log. It can also be applied on immaterial production; an illustration could be
a researcher who utilises a statistical formula on a dataset to obtain a correla-
tion coefficient.

B. Furåker (✉)
Department of Sociology and Work Science, University of Gothenburg,
Gothenburg, Sweden
e-mail: bengt.furaker@socav.gu.se

Both these definitions leave certain gaps. With regard to the definition, 'man's doing in the sphere of necessity', it remains to specify 'the sphere of necessity'. Karlsson's concept apparently implies that work is something people do for a living. It does not include activities in the household, unless they are paid for.[1] This problem is avoided in the ostensive definition, but it is not therefore indisputable how to separate work from other forms of human action. My conclusion is that we cannot develop a concept that unambiguously distinguishes work from non-work. Most researchers concentrate on gainful employment—activities carried out for the purpose of getting an income—which is good enough. This is also the case in the current chapter, although unpaid domestic work at home is touched upon here and there in the text.

A second issue is how to distinguish sociological research on work from other work-related social research. It is a question about the borders of sociology. Researchers from other disciplines may adopt the same kind of approach. In fact, sociological perspectives quite frequently appear in other disciplines in Sweden. Political sociology can be observed in political science, organisational sociology in business administration, etc. This might be interpreted as both success and failure; the discipline has both broken new ground and lost ground. Moreover, sociologists do not only work in departments of sociology but in other institutions as well. There were, for example, a number of them in the now closed National Institute for Working Life (NIWL). Their identity as sociologists may then have been less obvious. We also see a great deal of multidisciplinary collaboration across academic departments. As a consequence, stricter disciplinary divisions become blurred. This chapter mainly discusses work-related research by professional sociologists, but contributions by colleagues from other disciplines come into sight in some places.

Third, there is the problem how to define sociology of work in relation to other intra-disciplinary subcategories. For example, part of medical sociology might be included insofar as it deals with what doctors, nurses and other staff do in their workplaces. The same thing can be said about the sociology of education, as teaching is unquestionably a kind of work. Sociology of work is often supposed to focus on manufacturing, although that use implies a too limited meaning. In the following, industrial work plays an

---

[1]More recently, Karlsson (2017) has outlined a new version of the forms of work (first presented in Jakobsen and Karlsson 1993), including various unpaid activities at home (mostly carried out by women) which are structurally linked to the main forms of work previously identified.

important role, but attention will also be paid to service sector work and to gainful employment more generally.

Finally, even if we have determined what kind of research might be included in an overview, we face the problem of what to cover if not everything can be covered. There is a wealth of studies that might be taken in, but some sort of selection is necessary. What is most weighty or most illustrative? Although certain pieces of research cannot reasonably be circumvented, others are more open for discussion. There are no impartial criteria to apply; my selection is subjective, but I try to be sensitive to both width and quality in presenting different kinds of research.

The Issue of Periodisation

Another issue is whether we can find a meaningful periodisation of Swedish sociology of work after the World War II. Some such attempts have been made and let us look at two of them, both made several years ago. In their dissertation, Torsten Björkman and Karin Lundqvist (1981, Chapter 2) distinguish three periods. The first runs from the early 1950s to the mid-1960s. It is described as dominated by an adjustment paradigm emphasising employees' adaptation to their work and their workplace. Next comes a period of re-evaluations (1966–1971) and the years in the end of the 1960s are characterised as 'Sturm und Drang', that is, almost everything possible to re-evaluate was re-evaluated. Perhaps more importantly, at that time sociologists found new partners among the trade unions (for example, the LO[2] and the Metal Workers' Union) which employed them to investigate various issues related to working conditions and work content. This period was followed by a phase (1972–1979), in which sociology of work became working life research, implying that the disciplinary boundary of sociology lost much of its previous role.

Almost two decades later, Jan Ch. Karlsson (2000) also suggested that Swedish sociology of work could be divided into three periods, although he stressed that it is difficult to draw distinct boundary lines. The first period is essentially the same as distinguished by Björkman and Lundqvist, roughly covering the 1950s and the first part of the 1960s. It is described as being oriented toward individual adjustment to work. Then there is what is called the reform period, approximately lasting to the end of the 1980s. In these

---

[2]LO is the acronym for *Landsorganisationen*, the Swedish confederation of blue-collar worker unions.

years we find a great deal of collaboration between sociologists and trade unions. The 1970s was a period during which a large number of labour market reforms were initiated by the Swedish labour movement and several sociologists were engaged in evaluations of them. The third period is portrayed by Karlsson as a period of disorientation, inferring that sociologists no longer had any distinct approach and that they had lost much of their earlier role and influence. This label seems to me a bit overhasty. One thing to note is that the sociologists active in the field in the 1990s were to a large extent people who were trained in the 1960s and 1970s and they kept much of their previous orientations. Notably, Karlsson acknowledged that gender studies do not follow his periodisation; they cut across the proposed trisection.

It is correct to claim that periodisation of Swedish sociology of work is a problematic task. To bring some kind of order into a large material, it may nonetheless be fruitful with some classification, but this endeavour requires several reservations. Above all, we must keep in mind that all researchers do not necessarily have the same approach even if they are active during the same period. For example, with the developments of Swedish sociology in the 1970s, several researchers were inspired by one or other version of Marxism, others preferred a Weberian approach and others again did not have any such leaning at all. Likewise, some defined themselves as action researchers, whereas the majority did not. This means that all divisions into periods must be taken with great caution.

Basically for heuristic reasons, I make use of three headings in my description of Swedish sociology of work. 'The early sociology of work' is the first and it coincides with the first period identified by the authors mentioned above. Many sociologists were then occupied with individual adjustment to work, often from a consensus perspective on workplace relations. The period stretches from the commencement of sociological departments in Sweden in the late 1940s/early 1950s (see below) up to the mid-1960s. Although there has been much more research done in the field in recent decades, it should be observed that studies in this first period, mainly dealing with industrial work, received a lot of attention in Sweden (Gunnarsson 1980, Chapter 3).

Beginning in the mid-1960s, the adjustment approach was questioned and sociologists went in new directions, inspired by conflict- and power-oriented theories. I use the heading 'New currents – and reassessments'. As mentioned above, in this second period researchers established closer links with trade unions. The 1970s was a time when the labour movement in Sweden carried out several important labour market reforms and made funding available for evaluations and research. It is unclear when the radical

wave ebbed, but it was no doubt over by the mid- or perhaps late 1980s. Hence, I talk about a longer phase than Björkman and Lundqvist—by incorporating the period of re-evaluation under a broader heading (largely corresponding to Karlsson's 'reform period').

Under the next heading 'In calmer water – differentiation and specialization' I describe the development of sociology of work in the last few decades. 'In calmer water' refers to the atmosphere at the sociology departments; it markedly quieted down. During this period, which is by far the longest, academic criteria were strengthened. Reaching out to an international audience and readership—through international peer review journals and publishing houses—became imperative. In the second half of the 1980s neoliberal ideology began to win considerable terrain in Sweden. Some sociologists may eventually have become less keen to contribute to improvements in working life, but they hardly became neoliberals, although they lived in a neoliberal epoch. Another characteristic is that there was a growing differentiation and specialisation within the field.

The Early Sociology of Work

Swedish sociology is a young discipline. The first department was established at the University of Uppsala in 1947. Other universities followed suit, Lund a little later and Stockholm and Gothenburg in the 1950s (Fridjónsdóttir 1987a). However, this is not the full story. Already in the early part of the twentieth century there was a professorship at Gothenburg College (today University of Gothenburg) in economics and sociology, held by Gustaf Steffen 1903–1929. This professorship belonged to an economics department and sociology did not become an independent discipline. Steffen actually carried out some studies on working life issues (Lilliestam 1960; Eriksson 1994).

At the start, Swedish sociology had close links to philosophy, but came to the fore due to its potential of providing empirical descriptions of social conditions in Sweden. There was a demand for such an orientation of the subject, since the knowledge of how people lived and experienced their situation was clearly limited. Empirically oriented American sociology was then a model. Employers were hoping for sociology to contribute to better job satisfaction and more worker dedication, which might lead to higher productivity (Fridjónsdóttir 1987c, pp. 254–256).

The development of Swedish sociology coincided to a great extent with the expansion of the welfare state (Fridjónsdóttir 1987b, pp. 260–268).

Undoubtedly, a prerequisite for the expansion of sociology was that the state had resources to dispose of and was prepared to provide funding for academic social science education and research. After World War II, the Social Democrats were in power, although during a large part of the 1950s in coalition with the Farmers' Party. Production capacity was intact in the country as Sweden had stayed outside the war and export-oriented companies thus had a competitive advantage in the markets of the fast recovering countries in Europe. Structural change accelerated and people left the countryside and more remote regions for jobs in the expanding export industries. Employers were willing to accept significant wage rises, because the demand for consumer and producer goods was huge. Prosperity rose at high speed and helped to keep industrial relations peaceful. It was a practical class compromise. In spite of high inflation rates, workers substantially increased their standard of living.

Two LO economists, Gösta Rehn and Rudolf Meidner, began a discussion on the role of unions in a high inflation economy. Should the unions abdicate from their traditional task of trying to obtain as much as possible for workers or was there any other alternative? The economists' answer was that unions should stay with their traditional objectives—otherwise there would be no role for them—but the state should, through taxation, withdraw purchasing power to hold back demand. Gradually the Rehn-Meidner model was developed, delivering some of the key elements in what became known as the Swedish model. These elements can be briefly summarised as follows. Equal work should be paid equally without regard to companies' viability (the so-called solidaristic wage policy). Wage differentials could be tolerable, but then had to be associated with differences in job tasks and skills. Workers should not subsidise inefficient industries by accepting low pay. This policy required centralised bargaining and put pressure upon companies with low productivity and smaller margins to rationalise in order to be able to pay adequate wages. If they did not succeed, they would have to close down. Workers who lost their jobs due to closures or rationalisation would have to transfer to workplaces with demand for labour. To accomplish these goals, active labour market policy needed to be developed, including public employment services, retraining programmes and support for geographic relocation. It took until the late 1950s before the active labour market policy started to expand, but eventually Sweden received some fame for it.

From the beginning sociologists had an interest in work-related issues. The early sociology of work was very much concentrated on industrial work. Research was basically following various theoretical and empirical strands of

American sociology, including for example the Human Relations School. It should also be noticed that private research institutes were established in this period, for example SNS (*Studieförbundet Näringsliv och Samhälle*) and PA-rådet (*Personaladministrativa rådet*) (Gunnarsson 1980, pp. 18–30). They provided funding for empirical investigations of industrial work by psychologists and sociologists.

The most comprehensive piece of research in the early period was funded by SNS and was a study of man in industrial society by Torgny Segerstedt and Agne Lundquist (1952). These authors published two books and the first of them was about working life and it is the one that I pay attention to here. The theoretical introduction was written by Segerstedt who was inspired by American sociology and social psychology with key concepts such as attitude, behavior, norm, norm source, frame norms, role and social field. He gave a brief account of Sweden's development from agrarian to industrial society, emphasising a significant change in the role of the family. This social unit could no longer be a work community when people were employed in industrial companies. A crucial assumption was that adjustment to industrial work takes time.

Turning to the company level, other concepts were considered relevant—such as communication between and within the different levels in organisational hierarchies. A crucial conceptual distinction was that between job satisfaction and morale. Job satisfaction refers to individuals' experience of various aspects of their job, for example the physical-technical environment, the length of working time and the company's management at various levels. Morale is a group phenomenon; it is about the team spirit, individuals' adjustment to the collective of employees in the company. Some interplay between the two dimensions could be expected and the question was raised which of them would be most important.

The data in Segerstedt and Lundquist's investigation were collected in 1949–1950 in five manufacturing companies in two middle-sized Swedish towns. The two towns were selected to represent, on the one hand, a community with a longer industrial tradition and, on the other, a community with more recently established industries. An overriding hypothesis was that workers in the former case would be better adjusted to industrial work. More than 1800 employees, both white- and blue-collar workers, and more than 900 wives to these employees were interviewed.

There is a myriad of data reported in the book, basically in the form of rather simple cross-tabulations. To some extent the results confirm the assumption of better adjustment among workers in the town with longer industrial tradition. These workers were more satisfied with their physical

environment, their working hours, their closest boss, and working conditions in general and they had less interest in changing to another job. Still, a larger proportion among them conveyed negative attitudes to time studies, an outcome that the researchers thought would need some further inquiry. Interestingly, the workers in the older industrial community were also more often negative to their children's employment in the same company. The explanation suggested was that these workers had discovered the limitations to social advancement and therefore envisioned other opportunities for their children, whereas those in the newer industrial community had not yet spotted these limitations. Moreover, the researchers interpreted their data as generally indicating a shift of the centre of gravity from the issue of job satisfaction to that of morale.

In line with expectations, male white-collar employees were commonly more positive in their attitudes than other categories of staff—female white collars and blue-collar workers of both sexes. A concluding discussion of the relationship between job satisfaction and morale repeated that the two categories interact with one another, but in the end morale was assumed to be the most important factor. In part, Segerstedt and Lundquist's study was replicated in the 1980s in a project led by Rune Åberg (1990), to which I come back below.

Typical topics for Swedish sociology of work during the 1950s and the early 1960s were formal and informal working groups in industry (Boalt 1954), job satisfaction (Pfannenstill 1955), information in the workplace (Dahlström 1956), supervisors and working groups (Lundquist 1957) and employees' attitudes and behaviour when companies are being relocated (Gardell 1963). However, even during this period there was research on workplace conflicts and wildcat strikes (Törnqvist 1956; Israel 1964). In other words, we should not ignore the diversity that actually existed.

Issues around gender roles became an early interest also for the sociology of work. Edmund Dahlström and a number of colleagues published a book in 1962 on women's lives and work. Three Norwegian researchers supplied chapters, above all the sociologist Harriet Holter. Gender role was the essential concept for the authors. The volume paid attention to the ideologies that dominated the contemporary enlightened debate concerning men and women's roles in society and in working life. Two principal ideologies were identified—the moderate and the radical—which in turn comprised variations. Empirically, the book dealt with a number of issues, for example employment rates among women and in particular married women, taking length of marriage and number of children into account. It also examined the time spent on various kinds of domestic work at home such as cooking,

cleaning, dish washing, washing and sewing. Data showed expected differences between employed and non-employed women and, among the former, between part-timers and full-timers. One question was whether husbands contributed any effort; it was shown that it varied with women's labour market participation.

New Currents—and Reassessments

The interest in sociology grew in Sweden during the 1960s. More and more students came to the courses and the number of teachers/researchers expanded. Sometime during the mid-1960s, the adjustment approach in sociology of work began to be questioned. Inspiration came from conflict and power-oriented theories such as Marxism or Neo-Marxism. Sociology became more oriented toward class struggle issues: combatting monotonous elements in jobs, increasing employment security, developing codetermination in the workplace, etc. Many researchers established stronger links with trade unions for the purpose of providing empirical foundations for improving employees' working conditions. It was above all a new generation that took on another approach; others carried on in the old way(s). Accordingly, there was a great deal of conflict within the discipline.

A review of the Swedish Sociological Association's journal *Sociologisk forskning* from 1964 (when the journal started) through 1985 found that general sociology was the most common topic for the articles during the 20 year period (Jonsson and Tåhlin 1989, pp. 110–111). Nearly 40% of the articles fell under the heading of general sociology, which means that they primarily concerned general methodology, science theory and sociological theory. Sociology of work came second with 16% and political sociology in third place with 15%. This indicates that work-related studies made up a weighty subfield within the broader discipline.

Many factors together created the conditions for reassessments. The student radicalism and the broader political radicalisation of the second half of the 1960s had a major impact. An important event was the wildcat strike in 1969–1970 at LKAB (*Loussavara-Kirunavaara Aktiebolag*), a large state-owned mining company. Although there had been some wildcat strikes earlier during the 1960s, this event represented a clearer break with the pattern of peaceful industrial relations in Sweden and the Social Democratic government and the LO were taken with surprise. It demonstrated the need for better working conditions and codetermination in the workplace. Moreover, the forced structural rationalisation of the Swedish economy during the

1950s and 1960s created problems for some workers. It became obvious that labour in shrinking sectors was not easily transferred to expanding industries. No doubt, many workers got new jobs with better pay, but there was often a residual category that could not move geographically or retrain for another occupation. The solution could then be early retirement, long periods of sickness leave or participation in various labour market programmes. In particular, the problems were great for older and disabled workers. This raised questions about employment protection and codetermination in the workplace.

Hand in hand with the largest unions, the Social Democratic government implemented a series of working life reforms in the 1970s. For example, the Employment Protection Act, the Codetermination Act and the Work Environment Act were introduced, active labour market policy was expanded and the Swedish Center for Working Life (later replaced by the NIWL) was established. As a result, preconditions were created for evaluations which involved social scientists of various kinds, including sociologists. In 1980, there were no less than 28 ongoing studies of the Codetermination Act (Björkman and Lundqvist 1981, p. 59). Many researchers also became involved in evaluations of the efforts to fight unemployment and boost employment by means of labour market policy.

During the late 1960s and the 1970s, it was commonly asked who benefits from research—a question most relevant not least in connection with studies on working life issues. Does research serve the interests of employers or trade unions or employees (or two or all three of them)? Regardless of how one prefers to describe the degree of employer orientation of the early phase of Swedish sociology of work—this was in part a controversial question (cf., e.g., Björkman and Lundqvist 1981, Chapter 2; Dahlström 1982; Fridjónsdóttir 1987c; Gunnarsson 1980, Chapter 3)—many sociologists began to lean more toward the perspectives of the trade unions.

Edmund Dahlström was attached to the LO as an expert on technical change and workers' adjustment. In the mid-1960s he published—together with colleagues—a book on these issues (Dahlström et al. 1966). Its background was the rapid transformation and structural rationalisation of the Swedish economy and the consequences of these processes for individuals. The concept of adjustment was even now used and it later became more or less appropriate in the sociology of work. Well to notice, Dahlström and his colleagues' analysis emphasised that adjustment involves many different dimensions and can be regarded both from the viewpoint of the company and from that of the individuals. Various factors were discussed, for example the role of aspirations and expectations. The book was still rather much in line with

the studies carried out during the earlier period, but represented a new and stronger awareness of the problems related to adjustment.

A dramatic example of how things could develop is the events that took place at LKAB in 1969–1970. It began with the LKAB management inviting researchers to carry out a project aimed at 'deepening corporate democracy' (Dahlström et al. 1971). After negotiations, a project on consultation and participation was set up. LKAB took responsibility for the costs and several researchers were recruited to the project under the leadership of Edmund Dahlström. In a first phase, the researchers would study the negotiation and consultation relationships at the company through a review of protocols, interviews with key people and observations at meetings. They had been in place for a couple of months when the big mining strike broke out in December 1969 and their work could therefore not be completed as planned. Instead, the causes of the strike became the focal point for the researchers' interest. A difficult situation developed for the team members when they ran into conflict with management who reproached them for supporting the strikers and the strike committee.

In 1970 Walter Korpi published a small book on the causes behind workers' strikes, partly based on a study for the Metal Workers' Union. Sweden had had very low levels of industrial conflicts during the whole period after the World War II, but some had occurred and they were often wildcat strikes. In international comparison, the loss of working time due to stoppages was very low. Korpi made a distinction between wage and control issues. Workers had the right to negotiate wages but could not do the same in control matters (this was before the Codetermination Act had been implemented). They were legally obliged not to take action when a collective agreement had been concluded and were therefore in an unfavourable position. Employers had an advantage by having the power to decide over hiring and firing and how work should be organised. They could hence change working conditions at any time. Moreover, a large part of wage negotiations took place during existing contract periods when workers were bound by central collective agreements. In other words, the uneven balance of power could explain workers' combative actions.

Bertil Gardell's (1971) dissertation on production technology and job satisfaction is another contribution to the sociology of work in the 1970s. Its main focus is not worker adjustment but job satisfaction or its opposite: alienation. The main dataset in Gardell's study came from surveys with more than one thousand industrial workers. These were employed at four different plants: two within the engineering industry and two within the pulp and paper industry. The key assumption was that the nature and content

of work would be crucial for the satisfaction of workers' needs. Two aspects were emphasised: the degree of discretion the individual is given to influence working conditions and the level of skills required by the individual to fulfill work tasks. The analysis showed that technology restricting this kind of discretion and the exercise of skills was associated with feelings of lack of freedom, boredom, futility and mental strain. Of course, also other factors—inside and outside the workplace—had to be taken into account. It was, for example, stressed that levels of aspiration must be considered.

The 1966 book by Dahlström and his collaborators was followed by another report to an LO congress, written by Gardell (1976). It provided a summary and a discussion of social research regarding people's working conditions and their subjective relationship to their job. To some extent it was based on the author's own work within the field. Key topics were the character of jobs and job satisfaction, self-determination, levels of mechanisation, psychosomatic ill-health, monotony at work, stress and automation and workplace democracy. Gardell also outlined the contours of a Swedish research programme on these issues.

One of the most influential books in the 1970s by a Swedish sociologist was Walter Korpi's *The Working Class in Welfare Capitalism* (1978).[3] It includes a discussion of various perspectives (by such authors as Karl Marx, Max Weber, Ralf Dahrendorf and Anthony Giddens) on class, conflicts and social change and it presents a brief history of the Swedish labour movement. The main reason why the book received so much attention is probably its analysis of how this movement came to power and took the lead in developing Swedish welfare state arrangements. Additionally, Korpi drafted his theory of differences in power resources—further elaborated in later publications (e.g., Korpi 1980, 1983, 1985)—referring to assets making it possible for an actor to remunerate or punish a counterpart.

The book is also a piece of conventional sociology of work. A sizeable part of it is devoted to a study of metal workers in Sweden—through a large survey and through interviews. The survey was directed to blue-collar workers in the metal and engineering industry. Answers were given by nearly 4000 respondents in workplaces with at least 50 workers. Several topics were covered, for example the character of jobs, job satisfaction, the structure of pecuniary rewards, group affiliation and group cohesion in the workplace, social relationships in free time, assessments of the employer, views of the

---

[3]The book was published in Swedish the same year under the title *Arbetarklassen i välfärdskapitalismen. Arbete, fackförening och politik i Sverige* (Stockholm: Prisma/Institutet för social forskning).

trade union, participation in union activities, and political interest and political activism. Several types of data from other sources (on voting behavior, political sympathies, union membership, etc.) were also included in the analyses.

Among the many empirical results, a few can be mentioned. The first is related to the findings in a well-known British study, in which John Goldthorpe et al. (1968)—surveying an automotive plant in Luton—did not find support for the idea of the working class's embourgeoisement. However, the authors called attention to a tendency toward increasing instrumentalism among blue-collar workers. A job would then merely be regarded as a means of getting an income to obtain other goals. Korpi concluded that there was no tendency toward a pronounced instrumental attitude among the investigated Swedish metal workers, although such an attitude could be observed in certain subgroups: immigrants, migrants from the countryside and young fathers in certain weak labour market circumstances. Most workers showed quite a lot of job satisfaction and in this connection Korpi emphasised the role of aspirations and expectations. Moreover, job satisfaction turned out to be affected by various characteristics of the work situation: demands for skills, machine-driven workload, freedom of movement, piece-rate wages, independence and stress.

It was also possible to have an instrumental attitude toward trade unions. Workers may join a union because they regard it as beneficial for them. Other workers can be members as they think it is important to express solidarity with the labour movement. The latter category made up the largest proportion of respondents in Korpi's study. The second largest proportion of respondents consisted of those having an instrumental attitude. A smaller third category was non-members or members only because they thought they had to be. The solidarity view, as well as another indicator of faithfulness to the labour movement, was relatively stronger among older workers. Could this perhaps be taken as evidence of a change toward embourgeoisement or instrumentalism among younger workers? After some further analysis and reflection, Korpi suggested that the post-war strategy of the trade unions with collaboration with employers to increase productivity was a key factor behind the differences between the generations. The older workers became union members in a period with greater open conflicts in the labour market and therefore had a stronger loyalty to the labour movement.

The study showed that active participation in trade union activities involved rather few members, even though most workers thought that the possibilities of influencing the local union were quite good. There were clear differences between workplaces in terms of negotiating strength, but Korpi

stressed that also strong collective action in the workplace has its limits. An effective organisation for change in the interests of all wage-earners would require collaboration with white-collar employees.

A case worth mentioning in this period is the reception of Harry Braverman's (1974) book *Labor and Monopoly Capital*. It had an immense impact on the Swedish discussion. Based on Marx's analysis of capitalism, it argued that what had happened during the twentieth century was a general degradation of work. Hence, Braverman provided a strong criticism of the common belief that work would be successively upgraded. The upgrading thesis was primarily associated with Robert Blauner (1964), often referred to by Swedish working life researchers. He stated that with increasing automation, jobs would get increasing knowledge content and a new freedom would follow. In contrast to this thesis, Braverman claimed that capitalist development was heading in the opposite direction. He asserted that Taylorism was by no means dead but had rather expanded from the production of goods into the service sector. For quite some time, his analysis received great tribute among Swedish researchers, but eventually the approach became more balanced through the identification of both strengths and weaknesses (e.g., Berggren 1982).

Braverman's book has several merits, but a remarkable aspect of the reception of it is that, at least initially, very few seemed to challenge the empirical evidence of the degradation thesis. This may not be characteristic for sociology of work at large, but sometimes such tendencies come to light. Much of Braverman's own evidence of the degradation of labour must be branded as anecdotal. Nonetheless, it appeared uninteresting to test the notion empirically. When this was done on a nationally representative Swedish data material, the thesis in *Labor and Monopoly Capital* did not receive much support (Åberg 1984). Of course, one can make tests of this kind in different ways, but it was striking that the lack of systematic empirical evidence was not a problem for those who easily took the degradation-of-work thesis for granted.

In their previously mentioned dissertation from 1981 Björkman and Lundqvist analysed data from case studies of four companies within manufacturing. A survey was conducted in 1977 and was directed to about 1000 employees, providing 946 answers from employees in both factories and offices. Theoretically the so-called mirror thesis in workplace studies was questioned. In its strictest sense, it assumes that people's answers on survey or interview questions reflect their work environment in a reasonable manner. One obvious problem is that people may experience the same work environment very differently. Conversely, some may feel roughly the

same about their job, although their working conditions are quite different. The authors admitted that hardly anyone believes in the mirror thesis to 100%, but they still found it important to reject it. In line with this, they were also very sceptical of job satisfaction studies, emphasising that such subjective phenomena have to do with aspirations and expectations. We should note, however, that serious researchers were well aware of that (e.g., Dahlström et al. 1966, pp. 35–53; Gardell 1971, Chapter 3; Korpi 1978).

A powerful illustration of the problem of the mirror thesis is the pattern in Björkman and Lundqvist's (1981, p. 289) study regarding wage dissatisfaction. Well-paid employees showed more dissatisfaction than employees with lower pay. The explanation suggested is that the former tend to compare themselves with others who are also well paid. It is more problematic for the researcher when there are no objective criteria—such as wages—to compare answers on survey questions with. Even if the mirror thesis cannot be rescued, Björkman and Lundqvist (1981, pp. 288–309) maintained that it might be helpful to look at levels of aspiration. Higher such levels were assumed to be associated with less satisfaction with working conditions and vice versa.

In this period, we furthermore find an investigation of healthcare carried out by Bertil Gardell and a number of his colleagues (1979). Yet, the shadow of industry was present even in this case. The analysis made use of a survey in a hospital and interviews in several hospital wards as well as a healthcare center. A principal conclusion was that healthcare, or more precisely emergency healthcare, was organised in ways similar to assembly-line work. Models of hierarchy and efficiency had been taken over from industrial production.

Both the public service sector and the private manufacturing sector were the center of interest in a study on working-class women published by Rita Liljeström and Edmund Dahlström (1981). It was an inquiry in cooperation with the Swedish Municipal Workers' Union and the Swedish Metal Workers' Union. Nearly 900 men and women in the municipal and metal sectors answered a questionnaire and 80 persons were interviewed. In the personal interviews people were asked to provide their life histories. The authors also utilised official statistics and data from other surveys. They showed the differences between men and women's relationship to paid and unpaid work and additionally they discussed the development through which work earlier done in the family was transferred to the public sector.

The background to this transformation was a number of reforms in Sweden. In 1971 joint taxation of families was abandoned in Sweden and family members were taxed individually. A few years later maternal leave

was altered to parental leave, allowing also males to be on leave to care for children—although they would do so to a much lesser degree. The parental insurance was made more generous as well. Public sector employment in education, healthcare, elderly care and childcare was rapidly expanded. Female employment rates increased and the two-breadwinner family came into being. One topic related to this development was the gender division of labour. Most women were recruited to so-called human services, while men were overrepresented in manufacturing, construction and the like. Reform programmes were introduced to break up the traditional segregation between male and female jobs. An evaluation of these efforts at a large manufacturing company—which had recruited many women—revealed that what was first achieved did not last that long (Fürst 1985). During some years, positive results were obtained, but after further time women tended to end up in typically female jobs. One argument was that they needed to have lighter work, but the evaluation found that it was rather a matter of who would have the most attractive jobs in a shrinking organisation.

In another study, interviews were repeatedly conducted with a number of female blue-collar workers—both in the public and the private sector and both natives and immigrants—over a period of three years (Davies and Esseveld 1988). The authors described their hopscotching between temporary jobs, participation in labour market policy programmes, sickness absence, unemployment and other provisional statuses.

With the new currents in sociology of work came an orientation toward action research, which for some period got rather strong support in terms of funding. The methodology of this approach differs from traditional ways of doing research in several ways. Inspired by the work of Kurt Lewin and scholars in the sociotechnical tradition such as Fred Emery and Einar Thorsrud, researchers pay attention to workplace problems in their local settings, trying to find solutions together with the concerned employees, trade unions and management. In other words, the working method is interactive; a project should include a more or less continuous dialogue with other actors. We find varying approaches to action research, putting emphasis on different aspects, but sometimes the role of the researcher comes close to that of consultants or that of activists.

Some large action research programmes were developed in Sweden, for example the so-called *LOM* program[4] starting in the mid-1980s. It was

---

[4]The Swedish acronym stands for *Ledning, Organisation, Medbestämmande* (Leadership, Organization, Codetermination).

initiated in connection with the development agreement by the SAF (the then employers' federation), the LO and the PTK (representing white-collar employees in the private sector) and was funded for several years and with considerable amounts of money. One specific characteristic of LOM was that it attempted to link several workplaces into networks of development projects (Engelstad and Gustavsen 1993). According to the evaluation, this programme entailed 72 research and development projects conducted by 64 researchers in 148 organisations (Naschold 1992, p. 23). About one-third of these projects accomplished communicative innovations and about 15% achieved innovations in regard to technology, organisation and personnel; the public sector showed more positive results than the private sector (Naschold 1992, pp. 99–103). These achievements do not seem that impressive. It is also a recurrent criticism of action research that it often does not accomplish very much (e.g., Tåhlin 2001, pp. 132–133; for an earlier and more extensive discussion, see the contributions to the thematic issue of *Sociologisk forskning* 1982).

In 1976 the Social Democrats lost power after having led Swedish governments during 44 years. A three-party centre-right coalition took over, but soon after this shift a crisis hit important industrial sectors (above all shipyards and steel mills). The newly installed government was so afraid to be blamed for increasing unemployment that it started to subsidise private industries and eventually to nationalise some of them. This intervention probably went far beyond what the preceding government might have dared to do, although no one knows what it might have done had it remained in power. Anyway, 'bourgeois' rule had obvious problems to set out a separate road and the political-ideological domination of Social Democracy endured.

It is not so clear when the new currents ebbed and ceased to affect work-related sociological research. The implementation of the most weighty labour market and working life reforms occurred in the 1970s and the early 1980s, but the new orientations in the sociology of work lasted longer. A major reason for this is that research is a slow process. It takes time to acquire novel theoretical insights and the collection and analysis of empirical data are time-consuming processes. As mentioned before, many of the sociologists who have been active in the last decades got their training in the 1960s and 1970s. Besides, funding for sociological studies on working life issues was ample.

After six years, the Social Democrats returned to power in 1982. The following year, after great anxiety within the party, the parliament finally voted for the proposal of wage-earner funds. It was the most advanced Social Democratic reform ever, although by then it had been watered out.

This reform aside, some improvements in various welfare arrangements were implemented and public sector growth continued until the mid-1980s. However, things had started to change. The worldwide processes of liberalisation and globalisation also affected Sweden. Certain crucial restrictions regarding movement of capital out of the country were abandoned. In 1991 the fight against inflation was given priority over the fight against unemployment. This meant a significant change, as the commitment to combat unemployment had stood out as a fundamental priority in Swedish policies during the whole period after the World War II. Additionally, after a long era with decreasing wage differentials in society, they started to increase again.

In Calmer Water—Differentiation and Specialisation

The Social Democrats lost the 1991 election and a centre-right coalition government took office. It implemented several changes coloured by neoliberal ideology. An immediate decision was to dissolve the wage-earner funds which had then been in operation for less than a decade. Another decision was to permit temporary work agencies, which meant that the monopoly of the public employment service was terminated.

High taxes and inefficiency in the public sector were also common themes in the debate. Some argued that it would be better if private actors took over many of the tasks fulfilled by above all municipal organisations. In order not to go that far attempts were made to develop the idea of planned markets that could be applicable to publicly operated healthcare systems (Saltman and von Otter 1992). Actually planned market models already existed in several countries and it was claimed that they would become increasingly important in healthcare throughout Europe.

After some years with economic crisis and a disastrous labour market development, when unemployment rose from less than two per cent in 1990 to over nine per cent in 1993, the Social Democrats returned to power in 1994. The principal task was then a matter of restoring public finances. The party also gave up its previous skepticism to the European Union. A referendum was held and Sweden became a member state in 1995. Unemployment fell after the peak in the mid-1990s, but never came down to the earlier low levels. In 2006 the Social Democratic government lost power once more and was replaced by a four-party right-center coalition. One of this new

government's first steps was to close down the NIWL with approximately 200 researchers. The decision was an expression of ideological dislike for the research done in the institute. As a consequence, funding for working life studies was substantially reduced. It was argued that this kind of research should be carried out within the universities, but there was less money available for it. Undoubtedly, many among the personnel found university jobs, but work-related studies got a setback.

From the late 1980s, or perhaps the early 1990s, certain reorientations became visible in Swedish sociology, including sociology of work. Four aspects are relevant to mention. First, academic criteria successively became stricter in research, which among other things meant a stronger emphasis on publishing in international peer review journals. This is not to say that research was largely below normal scientific standards during the previous years, but there was a change as to what was considered important. Second, it seems that—above all relative to economists—sociologists became less in demand for evaluations of labour market and working life reforms. The most reform-intensive period was over, but it may yet be asked whether sociologists had not proven sufficiently skilled in carrying out such analyses. Third, the interest in the sociology of work slowly decreased, which may be a result of decreasing demand for research in the field. Many sociologists became attracted by issues such as discourse analysis, social constructivism, identity formation and the like. These perspectives no doubt affected working life research as well, but they frequently meant that researchers turned to other topics. Nevertheless, many researchers within the field continued as they had done before. Fourth, sociology of work underwent increasing diversification; people became specialists in various subfields. In the following I describe some of these. I use a number of subheadings, but there is considerable diversity under each of them and some studies may suit under more than one subheading.

Workplace Studies

A replication of Segerstedt and Lundquist's study, mentioned above, was conducted in 1987–1988, almost 40 years later (Åberg 1990). It was carried out in one of the towns in the original investigation, the one with newer industries. The working life dimension was analysed by Mats Johansson (1990) who used interview data from the same three manufacturing companies included in the first study. Fewer individuals were interviewed, but the response rate was high. As the replication was limited to only one of the two

towns certain analyses could not be done. It is also difficult to make comparisons across such a long period of time, but it turned out that, with a few exceptions, there had been clear improvements in the physical work environment. Another outcome was that, in all three companies, the proportion of blue-collar workers with qualified work had risen. However, rather many, and in particular women, had unqualified jobs in the study. Blauner's (1964) vision that automation would lead to upgrading for everyone was not supported by the evidence. On the other hand, the proportion with an instrumental attitude to work—defined by Johansson as good incomes being considered a major factor for enjoying a job—seemed to have decreased except for female white-collar workers among whom it had increased.

In Segerstedt and Lundquist's analysis the two concepts job satisfaction and morale played a crucial role. Johansson hypothesised that positive attitudes to supervisors and higher management (an element of job satisfaction) would be associated with stronger team spirit (morale). The various indicators used in these respects did not suggest that the team spirit had generally become stronger. Relatively large proportions of blue-collar workers did not feel that their work was appreciated by management and/or that their career opportunities were good. Negative answers of that kind were rather more widespread in the end of the 1980s than 40 years earlier. There was thus hardly any evidence of common company cultures in the three establishments. Most blue-collar workers felt a sharp distinction between 'those up there' and 'us down here'.

A notable approach to the sociology of work is a study of Swedish workplaces, presented in a book by Carl le Grand et al. (1996a). The empirical basis was a survey to a sample of workplaces with at least 10 employees. Data were collected from about 2000 units in both the private and the public sector. Respondents were the head of the workplace and/or the personnel manager. Among the many results, it can be mentioned that workplaces where the possibilities for an internal career were good also tended to provide good opportunities for development within a job (le Grand 1996). There was, accordingly, no contradiction between the two strategies for expanding employees' skills. In another analysis, it was asked why certain employers pay more than others for apparently similar work (le Grand et al. 1996b). Generally, this was due to strong relations of dependence, which in turn had to do with difficulties of controlling performance and with the relative segregation of the internal labour market, that is, a situation in which it is difficult to replace the already employed with employees from outside.

Concerning workplace analyses, it is noteworthy that quite a few Swedish sociologists have dealt with the automotive industry (e.g., Berggren 1990,

1992; Blomquist et al. 2013; Boglind 2013; Jonsson et al. 2004; Sandberg 1995). There have been some remarkable developments in Swedish automotive plants, including several attempts to reform and even abandon assembly-line work, also called single-product flow. The probably most well-known changes took place at Volvo's establishments in Kalmar and Uddevalla. These two factories were characterised by non-traditional ways of assembly of cars. The first plant had a semi-parallel product flow and the second had a parallel-product flow. However, Kalmar was closed in 1994 after 20 years and, the Uddevalla model was in operation between 1988 and 1993. However, the latter was reopened a couple of years later but with a semi-parallel product flow system and in 2002 the assembly line was reintroduced. Car production continued until 2013 when the factory was closed again.

In the best-seller *The Machine that Changed the World* (Womack et al. 1990) it was argued that the Japanese automotive industry (in particular Toyota) had a great advantage in world markets due to its model of assembly-line work: lean production—a method for creating an efficient product flow. The authors depicted production at the Uddevalla plant as 'neo-craftsmanship', although the plant had not been completed when the book was published (Blomquist et al. 2013, pp. 233–235). Dan Jonsson (1995) scrutinised the empirical indicators used in the best-seller, identifying a large number of weaknesses in the comparisons with American and European automotive production units. One weakness was the treatment of productivity. For Womack and his colleagues, this was merely assembly-plant productivity, which excluded other significant parts of value-adding activities in the industry. Another problem was that paid and unpaid overtime—common in Japan—was not included. Jonsson concluded that there were differences between Japanese and Western automobile factories in regard of economic success, but that these differences were exaggerated as well as distorted. Serious comparisons must also consider how product design affects quality and productivity.

Three main reasons were given to justify the closure of the Uddevalla plant in 1993 and the decisions thereafter leading to the reintroduction of the assembly line (Blomquist et al. 2013; Engström et al. 1996; Jonsson et al. 2004). They had to do with man-hour productivity, product quality and ergonomic conditions. By means of video recordings it could be shown that it took 2–6 hours less to finish a car at the Uddevalla plant compared to a similar car at another Volvo plant (Torslanda) with traditional assembly lines (Blomquist et al. 2013, pp. 235–236). It was likewise found that the quality of the products in Uddevalla was mostly better—

although with some variation—than in comparable assembly-line production within Volvo, probably because small parallel work groups with a longer work cycle have greater opportunities to make adjustments. Finally, the argument that assembly-line work would be better ergonomically neglects the problems that a high degree of repetitiveness can create. However, one should not deny that problems also appeared in the parallel-product flow systems, not least in connection with so-called working-up (extreme working hours and work pace allowing workers to leave earlier). On the other hand, this phenomenon could be found on Swedish assembly lines as well.

With this rather favourable picture of non-traditional ways of assembling cars in mind, one must ask why Volvo's leadership made the decisions it did with respect to the Kalmar and Uddevalla plants (Blomquist et al. 2013, pp. 242–247). First, Volvo's decisions had to do with a drive for international adjustment and standardisation of production systems—a more or less unavoidable outcome of globalisation. Second, management had insufficient knowledge about the non-traditional assembly systems. Experiences and insights had not been well documented. Third, the Swedish model for working life development has been based on cooperation between employers and workers. If employers found that non-traditional assembly systems implied a shift of the balance of power to their disadvantage, it was rational for them to return to traditional systems. Fourth, the rapid increase in unemployment rates in the first half of the 1990s made it much easier to recruit workers to assembly-line jobs. In contrast, in the 1970s and 1980s when the Kalmar and Uddevalla plants opened there was a shortage of blue-collar workers in industry.

Lean production is the label for a method of rationalisation and it has an impact that goes beyond the automotive industry. We see strategies of rationalisation based on 'lean' not only in manufacturing but also in the service sector—and in both the public and the private service sector (e.g., Sederblad 2013). Other management models have the same overriding purpose and there is an abundance of them; Björkman (2013) even found reason to talk about a 'fashion industry'. Still, lean seems to have been the most influential scheme in Sweden. It has been around for a rather long time and has also been developed and broadened (e.g., Björkman and Lundqvist 2013). As a consequence, there are 'harder' and 'softer' versions—more or less inclusive in terms of culture and other aspects.

A very different approach to workplace issues is the Norwegian sociologist Sverre Lysgaard's (1961) theory of workers' formation of an unofficial collective body as a counterweight to employer power. It has quite often been paid

attention to in Swedish sociology of work (e.g., Bengtsson 2008; Bergman 1995; Karlsson 2008; Korpi 1978; Lindgren 1985, 1992). Through interviews conducted in a pulp and paper plant in Norway in the 1950s Lysgaard discovered how subordinate workers developed a kind of defense organisation in relation to the demands of the so-called technical-economic system, that is, the company. Human beings were said to be limited, many-sided and security-seeking, while the technical-economic system was regarded as insatiable, one-sided and inexorable. Similarity between workers (increases the chance for identification), proximity between them (helps communication) and common interpretations of problems were considered key factors behind the rise of a workers' sense of, and commitment to, 'collectivity'. In 2010 a research team, including two Swedish sociologists and a Norwegian colleague, returned to the same pulp and paper plant in Norway to see whether the workers' collectivity was still present (Karlsson et al. 2015). The number of interviews conducted in the new study was clearly lower than in Lysgaard's study, but the researchers had full access to the plant. Significant changes had taken place with respect to technology and work organisation, but it could be concluded that a workers' collectivity still existed.

In yet another publication, the same researchers recommended modifications of Lysgaard's theory (Axelsson et al. 2016). What they had observed was that the technical-economic system was not one single unit but two. Therefore, they preferred conceptually to separate the two systems from one another. They found that workers in the 2000s had a collective influence on the technical but not on the economic system. This conclusion was in line with the results in an earlier Swedish dissertation studying several workplaces in the steel and petrochemical industries (Bergman 1995). The Swedish investigation also linked to Lysgaard's theory. Empirically it focused on work teams and was based on interviews, observations and secondary data. It found that workers could have considerable collective control of the production process, in essence due to their knowledge and practical handling of various aspects of the technical system.

The Future of Work and Commitment to Work

One general issue that has been discussed both in Sweden and in other countries is what will happen to gainful employment in the future. Several researchers have proposed that it will peter out. Such predictions have repeatedly been brought forward during the last decades. Book titles like *Krise der Arbeitsgesellschaft?* (Matthes 1983), *Paths to Paradise: On the Liberation*

from Work (Gorz 1985), *The End of Work* (Rifkin 1995) and *Just around the Corner: The Paradox of Jobless Recovery* (Aronowitz 2005) suggest that dramatic changes might be in sight. The reason is supposed to be that technological development makes work less necessary. We should therefore expect higher unemployment, unless working hours are shortened and jobs are shared. At least two Swedish analyses—with more than 20 years in between—have rejected this 'end-of-work thesis' (Therborn 1987; Furåker 2009). Available data do not provide any convincing evidence that the end of work is near, either in Sweden or elsewhere in the advanced capitalist nations. Jobs are undoubtedly disappearing all the time, but others are coming instead. Employment rates have continued to be high and a crucial factor is women's increased participation in working life. Even though unemployment in the developed Western world in recent years has exceeded what it was some decades ago and has proved difficult to be pushed back, it is still far from the levels that some observers have predicted.

One type of research is about commitment to work (e.g., Furåker et al. 2012). A crucial question is then whether the advanced welfare state in Sweden and other countries with similar welfare arrangements makes people less eager to take on paid work. The assumption is sometimes that the generosity of benefits (in case of unemployment, sickness, etc.) diminishes the interest for job searching and the willingness to accept job offers. In order to throw light on this issue, researchers have defined the concept of non-financial employment commitment, referring to a willingness to work regardless of the pecuniary remunerations involved. It is the opposite of instrumentalism, which—as we have seen—stands for the attitude of working more or less only for the money. Several studies have shown that non-financial employment commitment is not lower in the generous welfare nations than in the less generous ones (e.g., Esser 2005; Hult 2004; Svallfors et al. 2001). The idea that the welfare state destroys people's motivation to engage in paid work cannot be proved by means of available data. One factor is naturally that various benefit systems tend to favour those who work and those who work a lot or have done so before.

Additional research has thrown further light on these issues (Furåker 2012). In a comparison between Anglo-Saxon countries (with less generous welfare systems) and Nordic countries (with more generous systems) it turned out that the employees in the latter score higher or at least as high regarding non-financial employment commitment. This is in line with previous studies and might be explained by generally better jobs in the Nordic cluster (cf. e.g., Esser and Olsen 2012). However, if we look at work mobilisation, that is, the amount of work performed in a society (in princi-

ple the proportion of employed times hours worked) a different picture emerges. There is generally more work done in the Anglo-Saxon than in the Nordic countries. Two comments can be made in relation to this result. First, non-financial employment commitment does not have to entail being interested in working a great deal. It may simply mean that people want to have a job, but prefer part-time or at least not very long hours. The second comment is that there may be two rather different explanations why the employed in the Anglo-Saxon world work more. One is that they desire the money to keep up or increase their consumption. In modern society there is always more to wish for. Another possibility is that they are forced to work a lot to be able to pay their bills. With low wages and high living costs it may be necessary to work long hours or overtime or even to have more than one job.

Flexibility Issues

In the current neoliberal epoch, the question of flexibility has become fundamental (e.g., Furåker et al. 2007). The topic is not really new on the Swedish scene, but during a time when conditions were very different it was called mobility. It is most likely that the Rehn-Meidner model with its emphasis on labour mobility would today be seen as dealing with flexibility. In the rapid structural rationalisation of the Swedish economy in the 1950s and 1960s jobs disappeared in certain regions and industries, whereas there was an expansion in other areas with strong demand for labour. This put pressure on workers to adapt to existing vacancies. Labour market policy became directed toward increasing mobility, both geographic and occupational, for the purpose of helping people who lost their jobs to become re-employed. The issues involved in this policy have some obvious similarities—although the general situation was then quite different—with the contemporary discussion on 'flexicurity' (cf. Jørgensen and Madsen 2007).

The discourse on flexibility has been criticised for frequently assuming that in principle everybody has something to gain from flexible solutions (Grönlund 2004; Karlsson 2007). To go beyond this assumption, we must keep asking for whom flexibility is beneficial. A crucial problem is that the concept itself is often left undefined and can therefore be interpreted in different ways. Dan Jonsson (2007) has come up with an interesting solution to this theoretical challenge. His starting point is that the word flexibility is not value-neutral but has positive connotations that are difficult to avoid. The overriding concept in Jonsson's approach is variability, covering both

change and diversity. Change is variation from one point in time to another (for example, when a person has learnt new skills), while diversity stands for a set of responses that an actor can provide at a given time (for example, a person with multi-skills). Furthermore, variability may mean actual or potential change/diversity and it can be desired or not by a given actor. If it is desired, the label 'flexibility' is relevant and if it is undesired, 'instability' is appropriate. Absence of variability can also be desirable ('stability') or not ('inflexibility' or 'rigidity').

This typology can be illustrated by a couple of examples. An employer may desire variability ('flexibility') as to the size of the workforce—in order to be able quickly to adapt to fluctuations in demand—and therefore prefers to hire people on time-limited job contracts. Such an arrangement may be undesired variability ('instability') for those who are employed. If the latter would obtain more 'stability' in their job contracts, there would be more 'inflexibility' for the employer. As another example, we can take employees' opportunities to vary the beginning and end of the workday according to their own needs ('flexibility'), perhaps adjusting the time at work to their childcare situation. The consequence is conceivably a degree of 'instability' for the employer, because workers may be absent when wanted. In contrast, with fixed work schedules the employer gets more 'stability' and the employees get more 'rigid' circumstances.

In her dissertation, concentrating on healthcare, manufacturing and finance, Anne Grönlund (2004) has highlighted a number of flexibility issues. Her empirical data consist of two surveys (one with more than 1800 employees and the other with more than 600 managers or supervisors), collective agreements in the 3 sectors mentioned and a series of interviews with representatives of the social partners. The picture that emerged involves nuancing of the widespread assumptions about employers' need for numerical flexibility and about their view of labour market regulations as impediments to this. It was more common in manufacturing than in healthcare and finance to express a need for adapting the workforce after fluctuations in demand, but labour law was not seen as the foremost obstacle to changes. Finding workers with appropriate skills turned out to be more critical in all three sectors. Another conclusion was that a degree of flexibility in working hours could mitigate the work-family conflict among higher-level white collars, but those with unlimited flexibility experienced more conflict. The latter result could be explained by the fact that it was a matter of employees in higher positions. Moreover, the study did not find it very likely that flexible working hours lead to more equal gender roles at home. Males with flexible

work schedules did not generally share home tasks—like shopping, cooking, laundering and cleaning—more equally with their partner.

Some publications more directly focus on so-called boundary-less work, which can be seen as an aspect of flexibility (Allvin et al. 1999, 2011). Boundary-less work means that traditional rules and norms regarding work and working time are loosened or even abolished. Although it entails a high degree of freedom, the necessity to draw the border oneself between one's work and one's private sphere is often intricate and may be associated with mental stress and loss of well-being.

For the purpose of examining the impact of regime differences on forms of flexibility a comparison was made between Sweden and Canada (van den Berg et al. 1997). The former country is known as the nearest embodiment of institutionalist theory with extensive state intervention, active labour market policy, strong trade unions and a great deal of protection for workers, while the latter comes closer to the ideal of neo-classical theory with more room for market forces and less protection of workers. The comparison showed that very different policies could be associated with rather similar configurations of labour market flexibility. There were obvious resemblances between the two countries in many relevant respects, although some differences could be seen. One example of similarities is that the patterns of job creation and job destruction were quite alike. In the 1970s and 1980s, unemployment was much higher in Canada, but during the research period in the 1990s it rose dramatically in Sweden. There was still a difference, but it became considerably smaller. Survey data indicated that, in comparison, blue-collar workers in manufacturing in Canada were more inclined both to move geographically to get a job and to accept a pay cut to save their current job. A follow-up study in Sweden after unemployment had risen did not reveal any significant change in workers' attitudes in this regard. Interviews with personnel managers and trade union officials in three industries—telecommunications, pulp and paper and steel—suggested that Swedish trade union officials were more positive to technological change and even brought forward proposals how such change could be implemented. In Canada union representatives were more likely to be negative, but resistance was not very great in any of the countries. The most notable difference was between telecommunications and the other two industries; managers in telecommunications were more worried about any measures that could undermine flexibility. In conclusion, none of the main theories—neo-classical and institutionalist—got any clear support by the empirical evidence.

Another aspect in relation to flexibility is the expansion of temporary work agencies after they became permitted in 1993. It illustrates how

liberalisation has led to new topics for researchers. Those hired by staffing agencies make up only a small proportion of all employees in Sweden—about 1.6%—but there is a sizeable increase over time. We should observe that formally their employment conditions are the same as for other employees. Agency workers may thus have permanent job contracts, but their assignment with the user is of course time-limited. There are several questions that researchers have started to explore in connection with this new development. Kristina Håkansson and Tommy Isidorsson (2004, 2016) have shown that employers hire agency workers for various reasons. One motive is to have numerical flexibility—a motive that seems to have become more important in recent years. Another essential drive for employers is that they want to have stability, that is, they need to fill vacancies. They may also look for a buffer in case of changes in market developments. Temporary agency workers are a very heterogeneous category in terms of occupations. In spite of having the same formal employment conditions as other employees, they relatively often feel insecure and are overrepresented in occupations with larger health risks (e.g., Håkansson et al. 2012, 2013). Another notable aspect is that agency workers tend to be more loyal with the user organisation than with their formal employer, the temporary work agency (Håkansson and Isidorsson 2012, p. 191).

There are several other studies related to various aspects of the flexibility and flexicurity discussions. One question is whether temporary work is a stepping stone to permanent employment or whether it entails more or less permanent uncertainty (Berglund et al. 2017). Data on more than 30,500 individuals from the Labour Force Surveys 1992–2009 were used to show that on average 38% of the workers on temporary contracts had got permanent contracts after two years. This is a quite big proportion, but about 60% were temporary employees, self-employed, unemployed or outside the labour force—and many of these remained in an insecure position. There were significant differences between people due to the type of temporary contract they had—if they were substitutes, seasonal workers, project employees, on-call employees, etc. Above all probationary employees but also substitutes and people on internship appeared more likely than others to obtain permanent employment. Rather similar results were found in a previous study covering a more limited period of time (Håkansson 2001).

Temporary work can be expected to be linked to job insecurity, conceived of as a subjective phenomenon. We may ask whether such feelings can be compensated for by the income security provided by the welfare state and the employment security that lies in perceiving good opportunities of finding another job. Swedish survey data from 2010–2011 indicate that this was

the case (Berglund et al. 2014). It has similarly been asked how individuals' perceived job insecurity and well-being are associated with the components of the flexicurity ideal: liberal employment protection, generous unemployment benefits and active labour market policy (Berglund 2015). A comparison of survey data from 26 European countries showed no significant impact of strictness of employment protection legislation on subjective job insecurity or on well-being. At the same time, both generous unemployment benefits and active labour market policies turned out to entail positive effects with respect to these two dimensions.

Gender and Ethnicity

Gender issues have been further explored in the last decades. One reason why Sweden has often been considered a positive example as regards gender equality is the high employment rates among women—although still lower than the corresponding male figures—and the well-established role for the two-breadwinner family (Grönlund and Magnusson 2016). There is also the male-female division of labour, an aspect dealt with in quite a few studies (e.g., Bygren 2013; Hansen 2003; Kumlin 2010; Nermo 1996, 1999, 2000). They show significantly different proportions of men and women in various occupations. Males are overrepresented in jobs requiring technical skills, while the same goes for females in caring and other human services jobs. Recruitment patterns appear to have a crucial part in gender segregation (Bygren 2013; Bygren and Kumlin 2005). One reason why there is a wage gap between men and women is that women are more frequently located in lower positions in workplace hierarchies and less often in the top. With adjustment for length of education and number of years in gainful employment, this gap was found to decrease between 1968 and 1991, but was again slightly higher in 2000 (le Grand et al. 2001b, pp. 149–151). It should be noted that by the latter year women on average had longer education than men. The gender differences were greater in the private as compared with the public sector.

Occupations are thus more or less gendered. There are certain differences across countries in this matter, but the general configurations are similar (Hansen 2003; Nermo 1999, 2000). A comparison between Denmark and Sweden on the one hand and Canada and the United States on the other showed some interesting differences; gender segregation was somewhat lower in the latter two countries (Hansen 2003). This could be attributed to the large Danish and Swedish public service

sectors in which women are strongly overrepresented. However, certain changes have taken place over the years (see also Kjellsson et al. 2014, pp. 152–156). One striking development is the strongly augmented proportions of women in several professional occupations (e.g., Brante et al. 2015).

In the early 1990s, immigration to Sweden increased sharply. Many of the new arrivals were refugees from the Balkan wars. After these years, a period with somewhat lower levels of immigration followed. More recently there was a new huge wave of immigration, this time clearly more dramatic than before. People came from Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan as well as from other parts of the Middle East and North Africa. Relative to the size of the population the number of asylum seekers was extremely high in Sweden, but in 2015 stricter policies were introduced and the number of new arrivals decreased substantially.

With the large inflows of immigrants to Sweden in recent decades we find a greater interest among sociologists in studying the role of ethnicity in the labour market. Foreign-born individuals have lower employment rates than native Swedes, but these rates tend to rise with the length of people's stay in the country (le Grand et al. 2013). It is also important which region in the world immigrants come from. People originating from Africa and Asia have relatively lower employment rates. Immigrants' limited chances in the labour market are—needless to say—reflected in lower incomes (le Grand and Szulkin 1999). Social capital and social contacts are vital determinants behind the existing patterns (e.g., Behtoui 2006, 2008, 2015; Bygren 2013). Discrimination is another factor to be taken into account (le Grand et al. 2004). Some studies deal with the ethnic division of labour. An investigation at an automotive plant in Sweden showed that immigrants tended to be losers in competing for qualified jobs (Schierup and Paulson 1994). By means of a large dataset for the Stockholm area one investigation demonstrated that gender segregation was greater than ethnic segregation (Bygren 2013). The same study concluded that patterns of segregation were above all related to recruitment, thus providing support for the assumption that homosocial processes affect segregation.

Demand-Control, Stress and Well-Being

A theoretical approach used by many Swedish sociologists is the so-called demand-control model, eventually complemented by the introduction of a third factor: social support (Karasek 1979; Karasek and Theorell 1990;

Johnson 1986). From the beginning it was an analysis of the relationship between job demands and workers' control of their work situation, but it was also found that social support—from bosses and/or workmates—was essential. The most negative combination of these factors consists of high demands, low control and low social support. This mixture has been labelled 'isolated high-strain' jobs (Eriksson and Karlsson 2013, pp. 376–370). High demands, high control and high social support conversely stand for a much more favourable combination, characterised as 'collective active' work. The latter type is less common among unskilled blue-collar workers than among white collars—the difference is especially great compared to higher white-collar workers—but also than among skilled blue collars. With regard to isolated high-strain jobs the outcome is basically the opposite.

In different versions the demand-control-social support model has been employed in several Swedish studies (e.g., Allvin et al. 2011; Eriksson and Karlsson 2013; Eriksson et al. 2012; le Grand et al. 2001a). It has been shown—by means of survey data—that low self-control and low social support are two factors making it more likely that employees have a 'non-committed'—or instrumental—attitude to work, whereas demands do not seem to be decisive (Eriksson et al. 2012, pp. 135–136). Another study using the Level of Living Surveys (LNU) from 1981, 1991 and 2000 defined negative stress as the combination of high mental demands and little space for decision-making (le Grand et al. 2001a, pp. 101–108). It uncovered that the proportion experiencing negative stress had increased significantly in the Swedish working population in roughly two decades.

Sickness-absence has long been high in Sweden by international comparison. We find certain variations across time with, for example, declining figures in the period 2002–2010 but an increase again after that. One notable aspect is that mental diagnoses have become more common. Analyses of LNU data from 1974–2010 indicate that the quality of jobs is an important factor behind ill-health and sickness-absence (Kjellsson et al. 2014; Tåhlin 2013). In this case, job quality was defined through weighting of three factors: qualification content, physical demands and mental stress. Compared to men, women had higher levels of mental as well as physical ill-health. There was great improvement of women's qualification content across time, but a clear deterioration of their mental stress. The most positive health outcome emerged for gender-integrated occupations in contrast to both male- and female-dominated occupations.

There should be no doubt that working conditions have an impact on health and sickness absence, but the Swedish picture is a bit puzzling, given that the country has a rather healthy population and workplaces are known

to provide comparatively good working conditions. However, many other factors must likewise be taken into account: the rules regarding sickness insurance, the levels of sickness benefits, family circumstances, the development of norms in society, etc. Sociologists have paid attention to these issues, often in collaboration with researchers from other disciplines, such as medicine, psychology, and economics (e.g., Hogstedt et al. 2004; Marklund et al. 2005).

Educational Levels and Demands for Skills

An important issue is what happens with educational levels among the employed and with the demand for skills in the labour market. This question is also related to the development of high- and low-pay jobs. Between 1968 and 2000 there was a continuous upgrading of employees' educational level in Sweden (le Grand et al. 2002). Another change in this period was that the differences between males and females decreased. At the same time, demand for skills in working life increased, due to a growth of jobs requiring more education and a decline in jobs requiring less education.

Nevertheless, this was not sufficient to match the upgrading of workers' educational levels. From the mid-1970s to 2000, there was an increase in the proportion of employed who were overqualified for the jobs they had (le Grand et al. 2001a, pp. 140–141; Åberg 2002). Recently, it has been suggested that we face a new development. According to a study by Åberg (2013, 2015), the proportions of high- and low-wage jobs have both increased since the late 1990s. This implies a break with the previous Swedish picture; it involves a polarisation in contrast to the general elevation of jobs that had taken place for a long period of time. The new pattern is in agreement with what we can observe in, for example, the United States. In any case, the upper part of the job hierarchy has continued to grow. It has to do with the great expansion of professionals in Sweden, similar to what has happened in other advanced countries (Brante et al. 2015).

Trade Unionism

Trade unions are secondary associations in relation to work organisations; they would not be there if the latter did not exist. Besides the research presented above there are also studies on union density and on union collaboration. Over the years, Anders Kjellberg has closely followed the development

of trade union membership in Sweden. In his dissertation he made a comparison with 11 other countries (Kjellberg 1983). Sweden had the highest union density in 1980, but Denmark also scored high—with Norway and Austria a bit behind (Finland was not included). On the whole this pattern has remained across time, but density figures have declined in most economically advanced countries, including the Nordic (Kjellberg 2001, 2017). Regardless of the trends for union membership, it was shown—by means of survey data from 2001—that most employees in Sweden and in particular blue-collar workers regarded trade unions as necessary to obtain positive results in negotiations with employers (Furåker and Berglund 2003). This was confirmed in later studies based on newer survey data (Bengtsson 2008, pp. 134–144; Bengtsson and Berglund 2011).

A key aspect in connection with the Swedish union movement is the unemployment insurance. Most of the system is administered by funds linked to the trade unions (so-called Ghent model). After the four-party centre-right government came to power in 2006, the member fees for the unemployment insurance were increased, above all for those in industries with high risk for unemployment. Kjellberg (2011) has demonstrated the huge flight of members from the system. Although it was possible to leave the unemployment insurance fund without leaving the trade union, the willingness to be unionised was also affected. In other words, this was a crucial factor behind the decline in union membership, especially among the young. However, the differentiation of membership fees in the unemployment insurance funds did not have the expected effects and the government basically returned to the old order in 2014. We should keep in mind that there are also other factors influencing people's interest in union membership such as temporary employment—which is indeed common among youth—and tendencies toward individualisation (Bengtsson 2008; Bruhn 1999; Kjellberg 2017).

In recent years there has been some Swedish research on trade union cooperation in Europe (Larsson 2012, 2014, 2017; Larsson et al. 2012; Lovén Seldén 2014). Survey data indicate that trade unions consider the main obstacles to be lack of resources and differences in industrial relations systems. Cultural and linguistic factors also have an impact, but they seem to be secondary. Industrial sector appears to be more important than national regime with respect to actual cooperation. One noteworthy aspect is that the Nordic trade unions obviously differ from most other European unions by being markedly negative to statutory minimum wages (Furåker 2017; Furåker and Lovén Seldén 2013).

Conclusion

Sociology of work has been a vital subfield of Swedish sociology ever since the subject became an independent university discipline about 70 years ago. It was a time of significant economic growth, peaceful industrial relations and increasing standards of living in the country. In international comparison, sociology arrived late, but already from the beginning we encountered a preoccupation with work-related research. Theoretical and empirical inspiration was taken from American sociology and social psychology. Several investigations were made, although the number of researchers was limited. A major characteristic of Swedish sociology of work has ever since been its emphasis on empirical studies. During the early period, it was rather typical to have a focus on individuals' adjustment to their jobs and their workplace.

The interest in sociology accelerated among students as well as more generally in society in the 1960s and early 1970s. Subsequently, the departments expanded by recruiting more teachers and researchers. In the mid-1960s the dominant paradigm of sociology of work began to be questioned. New theoretical perspectives—especially conflict- and power-oriented approaches—made their way into the field. In the course of revaluation, the discipline itself became more conflict-ridden. Another development was that many sociologists now approached the trade unions, thereby to some extent distancing themselves from employers. For about a decade, starting in the early 1970s, a series of labour market reforms were adopted by parliament, dominated by the Social Democrats. This provided both sociologists and other social scientists with opportunities to evaluate the effects of political interventions.

After some years, things calmed down, but the period of reorientation left its imprint on the sociology of work. Substantial resources for research were available—in the form of funding for both data collection and personnel. The well-off years lasted for quite a while. Neoliberal ideology obtained a stronger foothold in Sweden toward the end of the 1980s, but this did not mean that sociologists became neoliberals. Most of them remained within the paradigms they had taken on board during their academic training. Eventually, however, another kind of reorientation occurred. Academic criteria became stricter, international publishing became increasingly important, and differentiation and specialisation took some steps forward.

With the liberalisation of the Swedish society and economy, sociologists met certain new topics concerning, for example, flexibility, temporary work agencies and large inflows of immigrants to the labour market. There was

also a renewed interest in attitudes to work and job satisfaction, but without implicit assumptions about harmonious relations in the workplace. In recent decades one problem confronting those interested in work-related issues has been that of funding. There are many researchers and they meet one another in fierce competition for limited resources. In addition, and partly as a consequence of the difficulties with funding, we see a diminished interest in the sociology of work among younger researchers. To some extent, this may be a reaction against the subfield's strong position within the wider discipline for several decades. Nonetheless, the sociology of work continues to be strong in Sweden, which can be seen in the impact it has and has had internationally.

References

Åberg, R. (1984). Teorierna om arbetets degradering och arbetsmarknadens dualisering – ett försök till empirisk prövning. *Sociologisk forskning, 21*(2), 50–68.

Åberg, R. (Ed.). (1990). *Industrisamhälle i omvandling. Människor, arbete och socialt liv i en svensk industristad från femtiotal till åttiotal*. Stockholm: Carlssons.

Åberg, R. (2002). Överutbildning – ett arbetsmarknadspolitiskt problem? In K. Abrahamsson, L. Abrahamsson, T. Björkman, P.-E. Ellström, & J. Johnsson (Eds.), *Utbildning, kompetens och arbete* (pp. 41–61). Studentlitteratur: Lund.

Åberg, R. (2013). Tjugohundratalets arbetsmarknad: Fortsatt uppkvalificering eller jobbpolarisering? *Ekonomisk debatt, 41*(2), 6–15.

Åberg, R. (2015). Svensk arbetsmarknad mot polarisering efter millennieskiftet. *Arbetsmarknad & Arbetsliv, 21*(4), 8–25.

Allvin, M., Aronsson, G., Hagström, T., Johansson, G., & Lundberg, U. (2011). *Work Without Boundaries. Psychological Perspectives on the New Working Life*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Allvin, M., Wiklund, P., Härenstam, A., & Aronsson, G. (1999). *Frikopplad eller frånkopplad. Om innebörder och konsekvenser av gränslösa arbeten*. Arbete och hälsa 1999:2. Stockholm: Arbetslivsinstitutet (National Institute of Working Life).

Aronowitz, S. (2005). *Just Around the Corner. The Paradox of Jobless Recovery*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Axelsson, J., Karlsson, J. Ch., & Skorstad, E. J. (2016). Arbeiderkollektivet i dag – replikasjon og teoretisk utvikling. *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning, 57*(2), 105–134.

Bengtsson, M. (2008). *Individen stämplar in. Arbetet, facket och lönen i sociologisk belysning*. University of Gothenburg, Sweden: Department of Sociology.

Bengtsson, M., & Berglund, T. (2011). Negotiating Alone or Through the Union? Swedish Employees' Attitudes in 1997 and 2007. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 32*(2), 223–241.

Bengtsson, M., & Berglund, T. (Eds.). (2017). *Arbetslivet*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

van den Berg, A., Furåker, B., & Johansson, L. (1997). *Labour Market Regimes and Patterns of Flexibility. A Sweden-Canada Comparison*. Lund: Arkiv.

Berggren, C. (1982). Braverman – och sedan? *Sociologisk forskning, 19*(1), 2–25.

Berggren, C. (1990). *Det nya bilarbetet. Konkurrensen mellan olika produktionskoncept i svensk bilindustri 1970–1990*. Lund: Arkiv.

Berggren, C. (1992). *The Volvo Experience. Alternatives to Lean Production in the Auto Industry*. London: Macmillan.

Berglund, T. (2015). Flexicurity, Job Insecurity and Well-Being in European Labor Markets. In J. Vuori, R. Blonk, & R. H. Price (Eds.), *Sustainable Working Lives—Managing Work Transitions and Health Throughout the Life Course* (pp. 145–167). Dordrecht: Springer.

Berglund, T., Furåker, B., & Vulkan, P. (2014). Is Job Insecurity Compensated for by Employment and Income Security? *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 35*(1), 165–184.

Berglund, T., Håkansson, K., Isidorsson, T., & Alfonsson, J. (2017). Temporary Employment and the Future Labor Market Status. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies, 7*(2), 27–48.

Bergman, P. (1995). *Moderna lagarbeten. Studier av arbete, teknik och organisation i högteknologisk processindustri*. Lund: Arkiv.

Behtoui, A. (2006). *Unequal Opportunities: The Impact of Social Capital and Recruitment Methods on Immigrants and Their Children in the Swedish Labour Market*. Linköping University, Sweden: Department of Social and Welfare Studies.

Behtoui, A. (2008). Informal Recruitment Methods and Disadvantages of Immigrants in the Swedish Labour Market. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 34*(3), 411–430.

Behtoui, A. (2015). Beyond Social Ties: The Impact of Social Capital on Labour Market Outcomes for Young Swedish People. *Journal of Sociology, 52*(4), 711–724.

Björkman, T. (2013). Management: Still a Fashion Industry. In Sandberg (Ed.), op. cit., 91–125.

Björkman, T., & Lundqvist, K. (1981). *Från MAX till PIA. Reformstrategier inom arbetsmiljöområdet*. Lund: Arkiv.

Björkman, T., & Lundqvist, K. (2013). Lean ur historiskt perspektiv. In Sederblad (Ed.), op. cit., 18–47.

Blauner, R. (1964). *Alienation and Freedom. The Factory Worker and His Industry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Blomquist, B., Engström, T., Jonsson, D., & Medbo, L. (2013). Assembly Systems and Work in the Swedish Automotive Industry. In Sandberg (Ed.), op. cit., 225–254.

Boalt, G. (1954). *Arbetsgruppen: en undersökning av formell och informell gruppbildning i industrin.* Stockholm: Tidens förlag.

Boglind, A. (2013). Volvo and a Swedish Organisation and Management Model. In Sandberg (Ed.), op. cit., 189–224.

Brante, T., Johnsson, E., Olofsson, G., & Svensson, L. G. (2015). *Professionerna i kunskapssamhället. En jämförande studie av svenska professioner*. Stockholm: Liber.

Braverman, H. (1974). *Labor and Monopoly Capital. The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Bruhn, A. (1999). *Individualiseringen och det fackliga kollektivet. En studie av industritjänstemäns förhållningssätt till facket*. Uppsala University: Department of Sociology.

Bygren, M. (2013). Unpacking the Causes of Ethnic Segregation Across Workplaces. *Acta Sociologica, 56*(1), 3–19.

Bygren, M., & Kumlin, J. (2005). Mechanisms of Organizational Sex Segregation. Organizational Characteristics and the Sex of Newly Recruited Employees. *Work and Occupations, 32*(1), 39–65.

Dahlström, E. (1956). *Information på arbetsplatsen*. Stockholm: SNS.

Dahlström, E. (1982). Review of Björkman and Lundqvist 1981, op. cit. *Sociologisk forskning, 19*(1), 74–79.

Dahlström, E., Eriksson, K., Gardell, B., Hammarström, O., & Hammarström, R. (1971). *LKAB och demokratin. Rapport om en strejk och ett forskningsprojekt*. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand.

Dahlström, E., Gardell, B., Rundblad, B. G., Wingårdh, B., & Hallin, J. (1966). *Teknisk förändring och arbetsanpassning. Ett sociologiskt bidrag till forsknings- och planeringsdebatten*. Stockholm: Prisma.

Dahlström, E., Holter, H., Brun-Gulbrandsen, S., Tiller, P. O., Dahlström, G., & Thyberg, S. (1962). *Kvinnors liv och arbete*. Stockholm: SNS.

Davies, K., & Esseveld, J. (1988). *Att hoppa hage i den svenska arbetsmarknaden. En studie av arbetslösa fabrikskvinnor*. Stockholm: Rabén & Sjögren.

Engelstad, F., & Gustavsen, B. (1993). Swedish Network Development for Implementing National Work Reform Strategy. *Human Relations, 46*(2), 219–248.

Engström, T., Jonsson, D., & Medbo, L. (1996). Production Model Discourse and Experiences from the Swedish Automotive Industry. *International Journal of Operation & Production Management, 16*(2), 143–161.

Eriksson, I. (1994). Den svenska sociologins dolda historia – fallet Gustaf Steffen. *Sociologisk forskning, 31*(3), 44–56.

Eriksson, B., & Karlsson, J. Ch. (2013). Flexibility in Practice. In Sandberg (Ed.), op. cit., 371–383.

Eriksson, B., Karlsson, J. Ch., & Bergqvist, T. (2012). The Development of Attitudes to Work in Sweden. In Furåker, Håkansson, & Karlsson (Eds.), op. cit., 126–138.

Esser, I. (2005). *Why Work? Comparative Studies on Welfare Regimes and Individuals' Work Orientations*. Stockholm University, Sweden: Swedish Institute for Social Research.

Esser, I., & Olsen, K. M. (2012). Perceived Job Quality: Autonomy and Job Security Within a Multi-Level Framework. *European Sociological Review, 28*(4), 443–454.

Fridjónsdóttir, K. (Ed.). (1987a). *Om svensk sociologi. Historia, problem och perspektiv*. Stockholm: Carlssons.

Fridjónsdóttir, K. (1987b). Den svenska sociologin och dess samhälle. In Fridjónsdóttir (Ed.), op. cit., 250–282.

Fridjónsdóttir, K. (1987c). Social Change, Trade Union Politics, and the Sociology of Work. In S. Blume, J. Bunders, L. Leydesdorff, & R. Whitley (Eds.), *The Social Direction of the Public Sciences. Causes and Consequences of Co-operation Between Scientists and Non-scientific Groups. Sociology of Sciences. A Yearbook XI* (pp. 249–276). Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Furåker, B. (1991). Vad är arbete? In B. Furåker (Ed.), *Arbetets villkor* (pp. 11–31). Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Furåker, B. (2009). Arbetssamhällets reträtt? Samhällsanalys på villovägar. *Arbetsmarknad & Arbetsliv, 15*(2), 11–26.

Furåker, B. (2012). 'Work Attitudes, Employment and Work Mobilization. A Comparison Between Anglo-Saxon and Nordic Countries' In: Furåker, Håkansson, & Karlsson (Eds.), op. cit., 67–85.

Furåker, B. (2017). The Issue of Statutory Minimum Wages: Views Among Nordic Trade Unions. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*. https://doi.org/10.1177/0143831X17711769.

Furåker, B., & Berglund, T. (2003). Are the Unions Still Needed? Employees' Views of their Relations to Unions and Employers. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 38*(4), 573–594.

Furåker, B., Håkansson, K., & Karlsson, J. Ch. (Eds.). (2007). *Flexibility and Stability in Working Life*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Furåker, B., Håkansson, K., & Karlsson, J. Ch. (Eds.). (2012). *Commitment to Work and Job Satisfaction: Studies of Work Orientations*. New York: Routledge.

Furåker, B., & Lovén Seldén, K. (2013). Trade Union Cooperation on Statutory Minimum Wages? A Study of European Trade Union Positions. *Transfer, 19*(4), 507–520.

Fürst, G. (1985). *Reträtten från mansjobben. En studie av industriarbetande kvinnor och arbetsfördelningen mellan könen på en intern arbetsmarknad*. University of Gothenburg, Sweden: Department of Sociology.

Gardell, B. (1963). *Anställdas attityd och beteende vid omlokalisering av företag. Industrisociologisk case-studie*. Stockholm: PA-rådet.

Gardell, B. (1971). *Produktionsteknik och arbetsglädje. En socialpsykologisk studie av industriellt arbete*. University of Gothenburg, Sweden: Department of Sociology.

Gardell, B. (1976). *Arbetsinnehåll och livskvalitet: en sammanställning och diskussion av samhällsvetenskaplig forskning rörande människan och arbete*. Stockholm: Prisma/LO.

Gardell, B., Gustafsson, R. Å., Brandt, C., Tillström, I., & Torbjörn, I. (1979). *Sjukvård på löpande band. Rapport från ett forskningsprojekt om sjukhusets vård- och arbetsorganisation*. Stockholm: Prisma.

Goldthorpe, J. H., Lockwood, D., Bechhofer, F., & Platt, J. (1968). *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gorz, A. (1985). *Paths to Paradise: On the Liberation from Work*. London: Pluto Press.

le Grand, C. (1996). Karriär- och utvecklingsmöjligheter på de interna arbetsmarknaderna. In le Grand, Szulkin, & Tåhlin (Eds.), op. cit., 52–87.

le Grand, C., & Szulkin, R. (1999). Invandrarnas löner i Sverige. Betydelsen av vistelsetid, invandrarland och svensk skolgång. *Arbetsmarknad & Arbetsliv, 5*(2), 89–110.

le Grand, C., Szulkin, R., & Ekberg, J. (2004). Kan diskriminering förklara skillnader i position på arbetsmarknaden mellan invandrare och infödda? In J. Ekberg (Ed.), *Egenförsörjning eller bidragsförsörjning? Invandrarna, arbetsmarknaden och välfärdsstaten* (pp. 185–220). Rapport från Integrationspolitiska utredningen. SOU 2004:21. Stockholm: Fritzes.

le Grand, C., Szulkin, R., & Tåhlin, M. (Eds.). (1996a). *Sveriges arbetsplatser – organisation, personalutveckling, styrning* (2nd ed.). Stockholm: SNS.

le Grand, C., Szulkin, R., & Tåhlin, M. (1996b). Arbetsplatsstruktur och löneskillnader. Varför betalar vissa arbetsgivare mer än andra. In le Grand, Szulkin, & Tåhlin (Eds.), op. cit., 210–235.

le Grand, C., Szulkin, R., & Tåhlin M. (2001a). Har jobben blivit bättre? En analys av arbetsinnehållet under tre decennier. In *Välfärd och arbete i arbetslöshetens årtionde*, op. cit., 79–119.

le Grand, C., Szulkin, R., & Tåhlin M. (2001b). Lönestrukturens förändring i Sverige. In *Välfärd och arbete i arbetslöshetens årtionde*, op. cit., 121–173.

le Grand, C., Szulkin, R., & Tåhlin, M. (2002). Har jobben blivit mer kvalificerade? En analys av kvalifikationskravens förändringar under tre decennier. In K. Abrahamsson, L. Abrahamsson, T. Björkman, P.-E. Ellström, & J. Johansson (Eds.), *Utbildning, kompetens och arbete* (pp. 159–182). Lund: Studentlitteratur.

le Grand, C., Szulkin, R., Tibajev, A., & Tåhlin, M. (2013). *Vid arbetslivets gränser: sysselsättning, matchning, barriärer 1974–2010*. Underlagsrapport 12. Stockholm: Parlamentariska socialförsäkringsutredningen.

Grönlund, A. (2004). *Flexibilitetens gränser. Förändring och friktion i arbetsliv och familj*. Umeå: Boréa.

Grönlund, A., & Magnusson, C. (2016). Family-friendly Policy and Women's Wages—Is There a Trade-off? *European Societies, 18*(1), 91–113.

Gunnarsson, L. (1980). *Att förändra arbetsprocessen. Volvo i Olofström och svensk industrisociologi*. Lund University, Sweden: Department of Sociology.

Håkansson, K. (2001). *Språngbräda eller segmentering? En longitudinell studie av tidsbegränsat anställda*. Report 2001:01. Uppsala: IFAU.

Håkansson, K., & Isidorsson, T. (2004). Hyresarbetskraft. Användning av inhyrd arbetskraft på den svenska arbetsmarknaden. *Arbetsmarknad & Arbetsliv, 10*(3), 187–205.

Håkansson, K., & Isidorsson, T. (2012). Temporary Agency Workers and Organizational Commitment. In Furåker, Håkansson, & Karlsson (Eds.), op. cit., 181–198.

Håkansson, K., & Isidorsson, T. (2016). Användningen av inhyrd arbetskraft i Sverige. *Arbetsmarknad & Arbetsliv, 22*(3), 47–67.

Håkansson, K., Isidorsson, T., & Kantelius, H. (2012). Temporary Agency Work as a Means of Achieving Flexicurity? *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies, 2*(4), 153–169.

Håkansson, K., Isidorsson, T., & Strauss-Raats, P. (2013). *Arbetsmiljö för hyresarbetskraft – inhyrdas fysiska och psykosociala arbetsmiljö*. Rapport 2013: 10. Stockholm: Arbetsmiljöverket (Swedish Work Environment Authority).

Hansen, L. (2003). Occupational changes and education. In T. P. Boje & B. Furåker (Eds.), *Post-industrial Labour Markets. Profiles of North America and Scandinavia* (pp. 147–168). London: Routledge.

Hogstedt, C., Bjurvald, M., Marklund, S., Palmer, E., & Theorell, T. (Eds.). (2004). *Den höga sjukfrånvaron – sanning och konsekvens*. Stockholm: Statens folkhälsoinstitut (National Public Health Institute).

Hult, C. (2004). *The Way We Conform to Paid Labour. Commitment to Employment and Organization from a Comparative Perspective*. Umeå University, Sweden: Department of Sociology.

Israel, J. (1964). *Den vilda strejken: en fallstudie*. Stockholm: Aldus/Bonniers.

Jakobsen, L., & Karlsson, J. Ch. (1993). *Arbete och kärlek. En utveckling av livsformsanalys*. Lund: Arkiv.

Johansson, M. (1990). Arbetsförhållanden och solidaritet. In Åberg (Ed.), op. cit., 163–208.

Johnson, J. (1986). *The Impact of Workplace Social Support, Job Demands and Work Control upon Cardiovascular Disease in Sweden*. Stockholm University, Sweden: Department of Psychology.

Jonsson, D. (1995). Lean Production in the Automobile Industry: Second thoughts. In Sandberg (Ed.), op. cit., 367–381.

Jonsson, D. (2007). Flexibility, Stability and Related Concepts. In Furåker, Håkansson, & Karlsson (Eds.), op. cit., 30–41.

Jonsson, D., Medbo, L., & Engström, T. (2004). Some Considerations Relating to the Reintroduction of the Assembly Lines in the Swedish Automotive Industry. *International Journal of Operation & Production Management, 24*(8), 754–772.

Jonsson, J., & Tåhlin, M. (1989). Svensk sociologi 1964–1985. In E. Allardt, S. Lysgaard, & A. B. Sørensen (Eds.), *Sociologin i Sverige. Vetenskap, miljö och organisation* (pp. 107–143). HSFR and UHÄ. Uppsala: Swedish Science Press.

Jørgensen, H., & Madsen, P. K. (Eds.). (2007). *Flexicurity and Beyond. Finding a New Agenda for the European Social Model*. Copenhagen: DJøF Publishing.

Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job Demands, Job Decision Latitude and Mental Strain. Implications for Job Redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*(2), 285–308.

Karasek, R. A., & Theorell, T. (1990). *Healthy Work. Stress, Productivity and the Reconstruction of Working Life*. New York: Basic Books.

Karlsson, J. Ch. (1986). *Begreppet arbete. Definitioner, ideologier och sociala former*. Lund: Arkiv.

Karlsson, J. Ch. (2000). *Developments in Swedish Sociology of Work*. Karlstad University, Sweden: Karlstad University Studies, *2000*, 6.

Karlsson, J. Ch. (2007). For Whom Is Flexibility Good and Bad? An Overview. In Furåker, Håkansson, & Karlsson (Eds.), op. cit., 18–29.

Karlsson, J. Ch. (2008). *Den smidiga mellanchefen – och andra motståndsberättelser*. Stockholm: Premiss förlag.

Karlsson, J. Ch. (2017). Arbetsbegreppet. In Bengtsson & Berglund (Eds.), op. cit., 33–60.

Karlsson, J. Ch., Skorstad, E. J., & Axelsson, J. (2015). On the Track of the Worker Collectivity. Its Adventures over the past 60 Years. *Sage Open*, http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy.ub.gu.se/10.1177/2158244015575635.

Kjellberg, A. (1983). *Facklig organisering i tolv länder*. Lund: Arkiv.

Kjellberg, A. (2001). *Fackliga organisationer och medlemmar i dagens Sverige*. Lund: Arkiv.

Kjellberg, A. (2011). The Decline in Swedish Union Density since 2007. *Nordic Journal of Working Life, 1*(1), 67–93.

Kjellberg, A. (2017). Fack, arbetsgivare och industrial relations. In Bengtsson & Berglund (Eds.), op. cit., 229–268.

Kjellsson, S., Magnusson, C., & Tåhlin, M. (2014). Arbete, hälsa och genus: betydelsen av kön och yrkets könssammansättning för individers villkor i arbetslivet. In *Jämställt arbete? Organisatoriska ramar och villkor i arbetslivet* (pp. 151–191). SOU 2014:30. Stockholm: Fritzes.

Korpi, W. (1970). *Varför strejkar arbetarna? En sociologisk betraktelse över konflikter, makt och rätt på arbetsmarknaden*. Stockholm: Tidens förlag.

Korpi, W. (1978). *The Working Class in Welfare Capitalism. Work, Unions and Politics in Sweden*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Korpi, W. (1980). Social Policy and Distributional Conflict in the Capitalist Democracies: A Preliminary Comparative Framework. *West European Politics, 3*(3), 296–316.

Korpi, W. (1983). *The Democratic Class Struggle*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Korpi, W. (1985). Power Resources Approach vs. Action and Conflict: On Causal and Intentional Explanations in the Study of Power. *Sociological Theory, 3*(2), 31–45.

Kumlin, J. (2010). *Har kvinnor och män blivit mer jämnt fördelade över yrken, organisationer och arbetsplatser i Sverige under perioden 1990-2003?* Stockholm: Institutet för framtidsstudier (Institute for Futures Studies).

Larsson, B. (2012). Obstacles to Transnational Trade Union Cooperation in Europe – Results from a European Survey. *Industrial Relations Journal, 43*(2), 152–170.

Larsson, B. (2014). Transnational Trade Union Action in Europe. The Significance of National and Sectoral Industrial Relations. *European Societies, 16*(3), 378–400.

Larsson, B. (2017). Cultural Borders as Obstacles to European Trade Union Cooperation. In M. Andrén (Ed.), *Cultural Borders and European Integration* (pp. 53–67). University of Gothenburg, Sweden: CERGU.

Larsson, B., Bengtsson, M., & Lovén Seldén, K. (2012). Transnational Trade Union Cooperation in the Nordic Countries. M*anagement Revue. The International Review of Management Studies, 23*(1): 32–48.

Liljeström, R., & Dahlström, E. (1981). *Arbetarkvinnor i hem-, arbets- och samhällsliv*. Stockholm: Tiden.

Lilliestam, Å. (1960). *Gustaf Steffen, samhällsteoretiker och idépolitiker*. Göteborg: Akademiförlaget/Gumperts.

Lindgren, G. (1985). *Kamrater, kollegor och kvinnor: en studie av könssegregeringsprocessen i två mansdominerade organisationer*. Umeå University, Sweden: Department of Sociology.

Lindgren, G. (1992). *Doktorer, systrar och flickor - om informell makt*. Stockholm: Carlssons.

Lovén Seldén, K. (2014). *Europafacklig samverkan. Problem och möjligheter*. University of Gothenburg, Sweden: Department of Sociology and Work Science.

Lundquist, A. (1957). *Arbetsledare och arbetsgrupp. Sociologisk studie av situationens och egenskapernas betydelse för arbetsledarens framgång i arbetet*. Stockholm: PA-rådet.

Lysgaard, S. (1961). *Arbeiderkollektivet. En studie i de underordnedes sosiologi*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Marklund, S., Bjurvald, M., Hogstedt, C., Palmer, E., & Theorell, T. (2005). *Den höga sjukfrånvaron – problem och lösningar*. Stockholm: Arbetslivsinstitutet (National Institute for Working Life).

Matthes, J. (Ed.). (1983). *Krise der Arbeitsgesellschaft?* Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

Naschold, F. (1992). *Evaluation Report. Commissioned by the Board of the LOM Programme*. Berlin: Science Center.

Nermo, M. (1996). Occupational Sex Segregation in Sweden, 1968–1991. *Work and Occupations, 23*(3), 319–332.

Nermo, M. (1999). *Structured by Gender. Patterns of Sex Segregation in the Swedish Labour Market. Historical and Cross-National Comparisons.* Stockholm University, Sweden: Swedish Institute for Social Research.

Nermo, M. (2000). Models of Cross-National Variation in Occupational Sex Segregation. *European Societies, 2*(3), 295–333.

Pfannenstill, B. (1955). *Begreppet arbetstrivsel – belyst genom en sociologisk fältundersökning av gruvarbetare i nordvästra Skåne.* Lund: Gleerups.

Rifkin, J. (1995). *The End of Work: The Decline of the Global Labor Force and the Dawn of the Post-market Era.* New York: G. G. Putnam's Sons.

Saltman, R. B., & von Otter, C. (1992). *Planned Markets and Public Competition: Strategic Reform in Northern European Health Systems.* Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Sandberg, Å. (Ed.). (1995). *Enriching Production. Perspectives on Volvo's Uddevalla Plant as an Alternative to Lean Production.* Aldershot: Avebury.

Sandberg, Å. (Ed.). (2013). *Nordic Lights. Work, Management and Welfare in Scandinavia.* Stockholm: SNS förlag.

Schierup, C.-U., & Paulson, S. (Eds.). (1994). *Arbetets etniska delning: studier från en svensk bilfabrik.* Stockholm: Carlssons.

Sederblad, P. (Ed.). (2013). *Lean i arbetslivet.* Stockholm: Liber.

Segerstedt, T., & Lundquist, A. (1952). *Människan i industrisamhället. Del I: Arbetslivet.* Stockholm: Studieförbundet Näringsliv och Samhälle/P.A. Norstedt & Söner.

Sociologisk forskning. (1982). Tidskrift för Sveriges Sociologförbund (Journal for the Swedish Sociological Association). *19*(2–3).

Svallfors, S., Halvorsen, K., & Andersen, J. G. (2001). Work Orientations in Scandinavia: Employment Commitment and Organizational Commitment in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. *Acta Sociologica, 44*(2), 139–156.

Tåhlin, M. (2001). 'Trettio års arbetsmiljösatsning – till vad nytta?' *Arbetsmarknad & Arbetsliv, 7*(2), 129–139.

Tåhlin, M. (2013). *Arbetslivskarriärer bland kvinnor och män i Sverige 1974– 2010. Jobbkvalitet, hälsoutveckling och arbetsmarknadsutträde.* Stockholm: Pensionsåldersutredningen (Government Investigation on Pension Age).

Therborn, G. (1987). Tar arbetet slut? och post-fordismens problem. In I. Hellberg & U. Björnberg (Eds.), *Sociologer ser på arbete. Festskrift till Edmund Dahlström* (pp. 109–130). Stockholm: Arbetslivscentrum (Swedish Center for Working Life).

Törnqvist, K. (1956). *Trivsel och konflikt i arbetslivet.* Stockholm: Kooperativa förbundet.

Välfärd och arbete i arbetslöshetens årtionde. Forskarantologi från Kommittén Välfärdsbokslut. SOU 2001:53. Stockholm: Fritzes.

Womack, J., Jones, D., & Roos, D. (1990). *The Machine That Changed the World. The Story of lean Production.* New York: Rawson Associates, Macmillan Publishing Company.

7

The Sociology of Work in Finland

Markku Sippola and Tuomo Alasoini

Introduction

This chapter explains the post-World War Two history of the sociology of work in Finland, showing how this history reflects the general societal development of the country. The review is divided into two major periods: first, the development of the welfare state from 1945 to the 1980s, and, second, the consolidation of neoliberalism and the idea of a competition state in public discourse and policy-making from the late 1980s to the present. The deep economic recession that hit Finland hard in the early 1990s can be considered a major dividing line between these two periods.

The sociology of work has never been a strictly defined discipline in Finland. Its direct Finnish-language translation, *työn sosiologia*, started to gain ground in common language only in the 1970s, when the subject of the research began to gradually expand from industrial work and industrial (male) workers to other types of work and workers along with the transformation of the Finnish economic and occupational structure. Before the

M. Sippola (✉)
Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Tampere, Tampere, Finland
e-mail: markku.sippola@uta.fi

T. Alasoini
Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Helsinki, Finland
e-mail: tuomo.alasoini@ttl.fi

1970s, a more widely used concept in the Finnish language was *teollisuussosiologia*, the equivalent Finnish word for industrial sociology.

Today, the sociology of work is often considered in Finland as part of a loosely defined research area of "working life research". Many sociologists, who study topics such as working conditions, new forms of work and employment, workplace learning, industrial relations, the labour market or unemployment, identify themselves equally as "working life researchers" as sociologists. So do a fair number of management scholars, social scientists (other than sociologists) and psychologists. However, there is a special link between the topic of working life research and sociology. Many sociologists of work in Finland are members of both the Finnish Sociological Association and the Finnish Association of Work Life Research and they publish their papers in scientific journals and participate in annual conferences of both associations. The inter-disciplinary approach to the subject has led to a situation in which the boundaries of sociological research of work in relation to, for example, organisation studies, management studies, work psychological studies or work-related studies that have been conducted in Finnish universities under social policy have become flexible and blurring.

In the 1950s and 1960s, modern American sociology was the most important single source of influence for Finnish academic sociology. This applied also to the developing sociology of work in Finland, which at that time still constituted only a small stream of sociology in the country. In the 1970s and 1980s, a diversification of sociological research occurred in Finland, which led to a deepening division and occasional tensions between positivist, reformist and critical studies of work. External influences were now sought, besides the USA, increasingly from Europe, including the UK, Germany, France and the other Nordic countries.

The sociology of work has managed to strengthen its legitimacy in Finland in recent years among academic scholars, policy-makers and representatives of labour market organisations. This development owes much to an increasing overall public interest in research on working life since the 1980s. This interest has manifested itself in the proliferation of institutional funding for working-life studies and action research inspired approaches, as well as the thematic and methodological broadening of the sociology of work. Until the 1990s, much of the Finnish sociology of work was homemade in the sense that the results of the studies were mainly published in Finnish (or Swedish). Today, the situation is very different. The networks of Finnish working life researchers in the other Nordic countries and elsewhere in Europe have clearly strengthened in recent years. This development has been speeded up by the renewed incentive schemes of universities,

researchers' improved language skills and the growing importance of international (including the EU) research funding.

In the following sections, the development of the sociology of work in Finland is elaborated by dividing it into two phases: (1) the development of the welfare state (1945–1980s) marked by the consolidation of the sociology of work as a sub-discipline, and (2) the rise of the competition state (late 1980s–present) when the scope of the studies in the sociology of work was widened.

Development of the Welfare State (1945–1980s)

Socio-economic and Political Background

After the Second World War, Finland was still a poor and relatively agrarian country, whose GDP per capita lagged behind other Nordic countries. The underdeveloped nature of Finland is well shown by the fact that out of all employed persons in 1950, 40% still earned their living from agriculture or forestry. During the period of rapid economic and social transformation that followed World War Two, in Finland, the share of employed persons working in primary production was reduced to 10% by 1980. The change in the Finnish occupational structure between 1950 and 1980 was probably one of the most dramatic in all of Europe.

Finland industrialised late compared with many Western European countries. In terms of the proportion of people working in manufacturing of all employed persons, the industrialisation process reached its saturation point only around 1980. Also, the development of the Finnish welfare state was delayed. The expansion phase, which started in the late 1960s and lasted until the mid-1980s, was financially enabled by two major export industries, the wood-processing industry and the metal and engineering industry. Finland's rapid economic growth from the 1940s to the 1980s was boosted by a high level of (partly state-led) investment in industrial production, characterised by an ideology of economic nationalism, occasional devaluations of the Finnish currency and extensive bilateral trade with the Soviet Union.

The political development of post-war Finland was characterised by a dual struggle between non-socialist and socialist parties, on the one hand, and the social democrats and the communists, on the other hand. Most governments, until the late 1980s, were led either by the Social Democratic Party or the social-liberal Agrarian League (renamed the Centre Party in 1965). The Finnish welfare state was, to a great extent, built as a political

compromise between the interests of these two parties. Governments were typically weak coalition governments whose average duration, between 1945 and the late 1980s, was less than two years. Their weakness was counterbalanced by the strong position of the President, especially during the reign of President Kekkonen between 1956 and 1981. The Communist Party, which participated in national elections under the name of the Finnish People's Democratic League, was stronger in Finland than in the other Nordic countries. The communists were also represented within governments in the 1940s and occasionally after 1966, when the socialist parties managed to achieve a majority of parliamentary seats for four years.

Until the 1970s, the Finnish trade union movement was weaker and more fragmented than in the other Nordic countries. Trade unions in Finland were torn by a power struggle between the social democrats and the communists, and in some cases by factions within these two groups as well. The very low union density of the late 1930s (10–15%) skyrocketed to 40% after the World War II, but fluctuated until the end of 1960s, before a new growth in unionisation took place. The unionisation rate soared and surpassed 70% by the 1970s. The new growth was the result of a radicalisation of the political climate, unification of the biggest trade union central organisation (SAK) and a rapid increase in the number of white-collar occupations.

The development of the Finnish welfare state can be considered both an attempt to build a modern infrastructure for meeting the needs of industrial society and, at the same time, a mechanism for creating national consensus in support of economic growth. The development meant a dramatic increase in governmental planning in all spheres of social life, and in this way also contributed to a growing role for science and research as a means of solving social problems. In the labour market, this process was paralleled by an increased coordination of wages and other terms and conditions of employment through the so-called "incomes policy agreements" (*tulopoliittiset sopimukset*) between the State and the central labour market organisations. The first such agreement was signed in 1968. This practice of centralised labour market agreements continued in Finland, with occasional short-term breaks, until 2016 when the Confederation of Finnish Industries EK decided to opt out of such agreements.

An Infrastructure for Sociological Research Takes Shape

Sociology has been an independent subject taught in Finnish universities since the 1920s. However, up until the end of the World War II, sociology was taught in Finland as what today would be called social anthropology

and ethnology. Only after the World War II did industrial society and especially Finnish society became objects of academic sociological research. In 1946, there were already four posts for professors in sociology within the country (Allardt 1973). The Finnish Sociological Association, the Westermarck Society, was established in 1940, and its peer-reviewed Finnish journal, *Sosiologia*, began to appear in 1964.

Owing to the fact that Finland industrialised late and that the most well-known Finnish social scientists, like Edward Westermarck, were mainly ethnologists by background, the tradition of the sociology of work in Finland was still very new after the World War II. The establishment of the Finnish Institute of Occupational Health in 1950 and the Laboratory of Industrial Psychology at the Helsinki University of Technology in 1951 were important indicators for the increased interest in working-life studies shown by the State and labour market parties. However, the research orientation of either institute could not be called primarily sociological.

The first Finnish doctoral dissertations that can be considered representative of the sociology of work appeared in the 1950s. However, each of them remained isolated works that did not do much to strengthen this discipline within universities. No major research groups specialised in the sociology of work existed in Finnish universities before the 1970s, when a new rise of sociological studies on working life took place.

The rapid modernisation of production processes and a radicalised social atmosphere during the late 1960s led to an aggravation of work-related problems in Finland. These problems also stemmed from bad working conditions, Fordist work organisation, the widespread use of shift work and authoritarian management, appearing as absenteeism, labour turnover, strikes or general job dissatisfaction and feelings of lack of industrial democracy. At the institutional level, a crucial difference between Finland in the 1970s compared to Finland in the 1950s was the existence of a more developed welfare-state machinery for addressing these kinds of problems (Lilja 1979). This machinery included, among others, the Ministry of Manpower (1970), the labour protection administration (1973), a tripartite Committee for Labour Relations (1974) and many new research units in universities and government research institutes. New opportunities for working-life studies were further opened by the Government's decision to include research on working life and working conditions as part of national science policy and allocate more funding to this area accordingly. As a result, the Academy of Finland became an important funder of working-life studies in Finland in the 1970s.

Interest in research into working conditions increased also among trade unions and employers, leading, in 1979, to the establishment of the Work

Environment Fund (WEF) whose assets originate from statutory accident insurance premiums (Ketola 2009). Here, Finland followed the Swedish example where a similar fund was established in 1972. In Finland, an additional underlying factor was employers' increased distrust with the political neutrality of decisions over research funding by different government bodies. Another factor was the desire of both labour market parties to fight against the occupational safety authorities' aspiration to strengthen their opportunities for direct intervention in workplace-level issues. A political decision was reached that the WEF would be administrated jointly by labour and employer organisations with no representation from any government body. It was also agreed, in 1982, between representatives of the Academy of Finland and the WEF that the Academy funds basic research and the WEF directs its funding to applied research, meaning research that more directly serves the interests of both employers and employees. At first, the WEF's research and development funding was limited to occupational safety, but its scope was expanded in the 1980s and 1990s to other areas as well, such as industrial relations, management studies, quality of working life and labour productivity.

The 1980s signified a further consolidation of the institutional basis of working-life studies in Finland. A new Ministry of Labour was established in 1989 with a broad mandate that covered also work environment, labour protection and industrial relations. The new Ministry appointed a Working Conditions Committee that was tasked with conducting a comprehensive survey on working conditions and examining and assessing needs for the development of working life and work environment in Finland. New research units, whose main focus now was on sociological research into working life, were established at the University of Jyväskylä (1986) and the University of Tampere (1988). A similar growth of awareness in the importance of joining forces and coordinating activities took place later also among labour researchers in the three universities located in the city of Turku, leading to the emergence of a looser network of researchers. The new Work Research Centre (WRC) at the University of Tampere under the leadership of the centre's first director, Antti Kasvio, in cooperation with other sociologically oriented units at the University, started to take an active role in the networking of Finnish working-life researchers nationally. At the same time, the use of a sociological orientation gained a greater foothold also in research projects conducted by existing major institutes in the field, such as the Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, the Technical Research Centre of Finland (VTT) and the Helsinki University of Technology.

A new feature was the rise of interest in action-oriented research on working life in many of the institutes, particularly towards the end of the decade. Finland did not have the same kind of rich history in workplace-level action research projects and socio-technical experiments that Norway and Sweden had already become famous for in the 1960s and 1970s, though academic researchers, policy-makers, employers and trade unions in Finland had been aware of them already for many years. Finland's laggard position compared with its Nordic neighbours can be partly explained by a much higher level of industrial conflict in Finland and, especially since the early 1970s, Finnish employers' general suspicion towards (too radical) academic researchers. Finnish trade unions, too, had an aspiration to push through renewals in working life one-sidedly through legislative reforms. Managerial prerogatives were rarely challenged in Finland and technical changes and Fordist patterns of work organisation were accepted to a greater extent than in Sweden as some kind of "technological necessity" (Koistinen and Lilja 1988).

Main Directions of Research and Prominent Persons and Projects

Modern sociology that began to gain a foothold in Finnish universities after the World War II had close links to two other subjects. The first was social policy, which was separated from sociology in many universities as a subject of its own. The other discipline was psychology. For many years, academic sociological studies in Finland included themes that are today considered as belonging to the sphere of social psychology (Allardt 1973).

While Westermarck was the figurehead of the 'old sociology' in Finland, Erik Allardt can be considered the figurehead of the 'new sociology' that emerged after the World War II. Allardt became internationally known in the 1960s, especially for his development of Durkheim's thoughts on social norms, the division of labour and different forms of solidarity (Allardt 1964, 1968). However, as an heir to Durkheimian tradition, Allardt's major interest never focused on the sociology of work (cf. Karlsson and Månson 2017).

Modern sociology in Finland was at first inspired by logical empiricism and social statistics research, and the influence of new American sociology was prominent. In contrast, the input of a Marxist tradition on academic Finnish sociology was very weak until the late 1960s. Marxist sociology at that time was practiced only within the labour movement and circles closely related to the Communist Party.

The first Finnish industrial sociological dissertations in the 1950s were interview-based studies in which historical and observation-based materials played a secondary role. As Eskola (1973) notes, their theoretical starting points were strongly idealistic and subjective, and reasons for conflicts were examined at the level of value systems and not as reflections of objective circumstances. Paavo Koli's (1955) dissertation on the interaction between managers and workers and its social preconditions in an industrial organisation is often considered the first Finnish industrial sociological interview study. It was preceded by Jouko Siipi's (1954) dissertation on industrial workers, but in this study the industrial sociological aspects still remained secondary. Other dissertations that can be classified under the sociology of work in the 1950s included Mauno Koivisto's (1956) study on social relationships at Turku harbour, Paavo Seppänen's (1958) study on industrial workers' dual allegiance to the factory and local union and Vesa Laakkonen's (1958) study on workers' attitudes towards technical change. Underlying this rising interest in industrial sociology and the subjective world of manual workers was the growing incidence of industrial conflict and other contradictions in Finnish society and workplaces after the World War II.

In political terms, the approach of these dissertations and mainstream Finnish sociology at that time can be regarded as liberal and consensual in approach. Mainstream sociology accepted social change as a historical necessity and tried to describe and explain it. Researchers were interested in settling societal contradictions and contrasting viewpoints, as well as increasing internal solidarity and feelings of security within a rapidly changing Finnish society. This approach is well illustrated, for example, in Paavo Seppänen's (1958) dissertation. He found out that the active unionists in two Finnish industrial plants were not only more dissatisfied with their jobs than the other workers but that they also were more interested in issues of work in general. Seppänen suggested that companies should regard the criticism addressed by the active unionists as positive rather than negative and transform it into a productive force. Another case in point of the liberal and consensual nature of the Finnish sociology of work during that time is Matti Savola's (1968) dissertation. Savola examined and explained the historical incidence of industrial conflict in Finland through the framework of Ralf Dahrendorf's theory on the institutionalisation of social conflict.

The 1970s marked a broadening of conceptual and methodological approaches within the Finnish sociology of work. Increased funding resources by the Academy of Finland and different ministries opened now better opportunities also for studies that took a critical stance towards existing

(capitalist) modes of production. The subjects of these studies ranged from shop-floor level issues such as working conditions, automation, labour turnover, worker participation or wildcat strikes to broader issues dealing with class structure, equality and political and economic democracy. Many of these studies were, to a greater or lesser degree, influenced by Marxist thinking, a fact that fuelled heated discussion in society and made many employers even more cautious to allow academic researchers into their workplaces.

One of the most well-known examples of such studies was the METELI study (*Noise*) from 1971–1975 that was conducted by a group of researchers at the University of Jyväskylä (Kirjonen 2010). The objective of METELI was to examine, in a open way, the socio-economic status, working conditions, health and life styles of manual metalworkers and the mutual interactions between these aspects of their life and work. Although the METELI study in itself was not especially Marxist in approach, it gave a strong voice to workers and made visible the problems that they faced in their work and life as deriving from prevailing, objective inequalities in Finnish society and working life. This caused many conservative employers and politicians raise eyebrows. They considered the study as a hidden attempt to affect occupational safety legislation and strengthen governmental intervention in workplace-level issues, leading to fierce public attacks against the research group and the scientific value of their research results.

A new generation of dissertations that were influenced by the Anglo-American labour process theory and Marxist approaches in German industrial sociology came out in Finland in the 1980s. They included Antti Kasvio's (1982) study on work and life styles of industrial workers, Pertti Koistinen's (1984) work on technological renewals and forms of labour deployment in the paper and cardboard industry and Raija Julkunen's (1987) theoretical work on interactions between the labour process and long economic cycles. In particular, the ambitious work of Julkunen became an important landmark in the Finnish sociology of work and a source of inspiration for a new generation of Finnish sociologists of work in the following decades. Kari Lilja's (1983) dissertation on workers' workplace organisation, in turn, was more resonant of Marxist British studies on industrial relations, a research tradition that never gained a significant foothold in Finland.

Despite rapid change in the industrial and occupational structure and the diversification of theoretical approaches, a male industrial worker remained a stereotypical object of study in Finnish sociology of work for a long period. Statistics Finland conducted in 1972 an experimental Quality of Work Life Survey, which was inspired by the OECD's social indicator movement.

A larger-scale survey followed in 1977. Since then, the survey has been repeated at more or less regular intervals (1984, 1990, 1997, 2003, 2008 and 2013). Over the years, the Quality of Work Life Survey has become an important vehicle for monitoring changes in Finnish working life and revealing its diversity, as well as providing a rich data source for quantitative social research. Researchers from Statistics Finland, such as Anna-Maija Lehto, since 1984 began to use gender as a key background variable in the analysis of the data, thus helping to raise discussion of gender-based differences and inequalities in working conditions in academic and public debates (Sutela and Lehto 2014).

During the 1980s, the number of jobs in manufacturing reached saturation point and the growth of jobs began to expand in private and public (welfare) services. The male industrial worker also started to lose his self-evident and prominent position as a target of working-life studies. Further, in the Finnish sociology of work, an increasing attention was now paid to emerging problems that were characteristic of jobs in rising welfare sector and other services, white-collar occupations and work typically performed by women. This opened many novel avenues for research, requiring researchers to find and develop new theoretical and methodological approaches, models and concepts.

One of these new avenues was a growing interest in the concept of gender. A group of female sociologists and social psychologists at the University of Tampere, led by Liisa Rantalaiho, launched a research project that developed novel conceptualisations that were better suited to analysing social relations in work typically performed by women, such as the concept of reproductive work orientation. The pioneering studies of the group on women's office work in the mid-1980s paved the way for the emergence of a new influential tradition of gender inspired approaches in Finnish sociology of work (Heiskanen and Rantalaiho 1997).

Another important line of development in the expansion of the scope of sociological research on working life in Finland since the late 1980s was the above-mentioned rise of action-oriented research. This development was made possible by a decrease of open political contradictions in the Finnish labour market and political life, as well as a normative turn in Finnish management thought. This normative turn, which was affected by the increasing knowledge-intensity focus of the economy and inspired by new American management and leadership rhetoric, appeared as an increased emphasis on the significance of organisational culture and the development of human relations and resources as productive forces (Seeck 2008). In the late 1980s and early 1990s, approximately ten major action research inspired projects

were launched through the funding of the WEF, the Academy of Finland and the Ministry of Labour (Kauppinen and Lahtonen 1994). All of these projects were multidisciplinary in approach, and included sociologists in most cases. Characteristic of this first generation of action-oriented research on working life in Finland was the fact that they involved work organisations from many different sectors. The dominant position of manufacturing industry and the male industrial blue-collar worker as the 'natural' target of working-life studies was finally over.

Rise of the Competition State (Late 1980s–Present)

Socio-economic and Political Background

The period from the late 1980s to the present in Finnish public discourse and policy-making can be characterised as the consolidation of neoliberalism and the rise of the competition state as the new *raison d'etre*. The new rhetoric that started to gain traction in Finnish politics in the 1980s lays an increased emphasis on market-based solutions, competition, competence, innovation, entrepreneurship and a predilection of institutions and individuals to change their orientation as drivers of economic growth. Revision of the rhetoric was a consequence of many interlinked factors, including the growing knowledge-intensity of the Finnish economy, the spread of the idea of economic liberalisation from other OECD countries, the abating of ideological contradictions in Finnish politics after the demise of the Soviet Union and a deep economic recession that destabilised the financial basis of the Finnish welfare state in the early 1990s.

Finland was one of the first countries that adopted the concept of a "national innovation system" in the early 1990s as a guiding framework for its economic and innovation policy (Miettinen 2002; Moen and Lilja 2005). This change of rhetoric can be considered a manifesto of a new form of economic nationalism that is perceived to be critical for a country seeking to cope with globalisation. Many authors in Finland (e.g. Heiskala and Luhtakallio 2006; Kettunen 2001) have aptly described how, and in which forms, the ideas of a competition state and national innovation system were introduced in social policy in the 1990s, forming a new hegemonic discourse. Such a change in discourse involved also the idea of the individualisation of work. In its extreme form, the new doctrine implied that systems

for the assessment of individual-level work performance and individualised reward systems should be developed, competition between workers, teams and work units should be encouraged, and flexible, agile and project-based forms of work organisation should be introduced.

However, in practice, neoliberalism has not been cultivated in Finland in its extreme form, and the welfare state and industrial relations system have proven considerably resilient thus far. Finland managed to recover from the deep economic recession of the early 1990s, when unemployment skyrocketed from the level of less than 4% to over 16% in four years, with the help of a rejuvenated world economy and the rise of Nokia, safeguarding the financial basis of public welfare services. Political development in the country between 1987 and 2015 was steered by coalition governments that were formed alternately between an axis of two of the three major political parties in Finland—the National Coalition Party (moderate conservatives), the Centre Party and the Social Democratic Party. All three parties have shown considerable support for the Nordic welfare state, albeit each with a somewhat varying emphasis (Aro and Heiskala 2015).

In 2008, Finland's favourable economic development abruptly halted and growth has been sluggish ever since. This time Finland's economic recovery was slowed by the demise of Nokia's mobile phone business and a weak demand and overcapacity plaguing the paper industry. Long-lasting economic difficulties and the rise of the populist Basic Finns Party have undermined the essentials of the above-mentioned political structures in the 2010s. In its fight against the growing public debt and pessimistic long-term prospects for the economy, the centre-right government of Prime Minister Juha Sipilä that took office in 2015 implemented a series of harsh austerity measures. Many of them focused on working life, the industrial relations system and innovation and research funding, giving rise to fierce criticism and resistance on the part of trade unions, the left and the academic world (Jokinen 2017). The full effects of the government's measures on these areas, or the political climate in Finland in general, are not possible to anticipate at this stage.

Since the early 1990s, the Finnish framework for workplace industrial relations has been under constant pressure from employers who have urged increased leeway for company-level bargaining within (or, in some cases, without) industry-wide collective agreements. Many trade unions have taken a critical stance towards employers' attempts, considering them a Trojan horse for introducing unilateral management-led human resource management (HRM) functions, in the name of flexibility, into areas previously jointly shaped by management and unions (Sippola 2012). For this reason,

company-level bargaining has in fact increased only slowly and at different rates in different industries.

Infrastructure for Research

As mentioned above, the new Ministry of Labour took an active role from the beginning in monitoring working-life studies in Finland and funding applied research that served the interest of the Ministry. The Ministry's funding covered a large area, ranging from employment and unemployment studies to studies focusing on industrial relations and the work environment. In 1992, the Ministry published its first working-life barometer, an annual representative survey for monitoring employees' views on their working conditions. The Ministry's decisions on funding took place through the framework of successive labour policy research programmes whose content labour market parties[1] could influence. However, the period of successive labour policy research programmes came to an end in 2007, when the Ministry of Labour was merged together with the Ministry of Trade and Industry (Valtakari et al. 2011). The new Ministry of Economic Affairs and Employment (TEM) continues to support research in this area, including the annual working-life barometer, but with lesser financial resources and without a similar coordinating role and research programmes.

In the area of working-life studies, the new rhetoric that revolves around the idea of a competition state and national innovation system is nowhere better seen than in successive Finnish governments' efforts to promote labour productivity and quality of working life through dedicated programmes (Alasoini 2016). The first such programmes, the National Productivity Programme and the Workplace Development Programme TYKE, began in 1993 and 1996. The Ministry of Labour coordinated both programmes, in which all central labour market organisations on both sides were closely involved. In 2004, the two programmes were combined under a new seven-year continuation programme with increased financial resources, entitled the Workplace Development Programme TYKES. From 1996 to 2010, over 1800 development projects at private and public workplaces and over 100 applied research projects conducted by universities and

---

[1]The term "labour market parties" is commonly used in Finnish language to imply the dynamics of the Finnish industrial relations system. The parties include the trade unions (and confederations) and employers' representatives (and associations). The emphasis on "parties" indicates the pluralistic tradition of the industrial relations system better than the use of a more unitarist term "partners".

research institutes were funded through the programmes, signifying a huge additional financial input into research and development in this area. The total public funding on the part of the TYKE and TYKES programmes alone, between 1996 and 2010, accounted for EUR 106 million, which was mainly used for the work input of consultants and researchers who worked for the projects. At the same time, funding to working-life studies was channelled through other ministries and programmes of the European Social Fund as well.

Unlike some of their European counterparts, Finnish trade unions were active advocates of these programmes. From their perspective, the programmes formed a unique means of acquiring up-to-date information on management strategies and shop-floor realities, as well as promoting employees' opportunities for participation in change processes at workplaces. For academic researchers, the programmes increased opportunities for research funding and paved the way for having access to workplaces. The other side of the coin was that the reformist or constructivist nature of the projects did not always leave much room for critical research approaches, a fact often not as problematic for researchers with a background in engineering or economic sciences as it is for social scientists.

In 2011, Prime Minister Jyrki Katainen's government decided to draw up a National Working Life Development Strategy for Finland. The strategy was prepared by TEM, in close cooperation with other ministries and labour market organisations. The Working Life 2020 project that was appointed in 2012 to implement the strategy has an ambitious goal according to which Finland would have "the best working life in Europe in 2020" (TEM 2012). Working Life 2020 does not directly fund research, but tends to be a coordinator of activities by several institutes for achieving this ambitious goal. For example, in 2012, the Finnish Funding Agency for Innovation (Tekes) launched a six-year programme, entitled Liideri—Business, Productivity and Joy at Work, for helping companies, especially SMEs, renew their businesses and grow in international markets through developing management, forms of working and employees' participation in innovation, in line with the Working Life 2020 vision. The Working Life 2020 initiative has continued during the reign of Prime Minister Sipilä's government, albeit with somewhat less vigour.

Besides direct governmental support, labour researchers have received funding from many other sources. The two most important ones have been the Academy of Finland that is subsidised from the state budget and the WEF that receives its funding from statutory accident insurance premiums. The division of work that was agreed to between the Academy and the Fund

in 1982 has been helpful in creating the basis for co-funding and other kind of cooperation between these two institutes in various programmes (Ketola 2009).

One of the most substantial inputs of the Academy in working-life studies (EUR 8 million) has been the funding of The Future of Work and Well-being programme, also known as WORK, from 2008 to 2011. Besides the funding of individual grants concerned with labour issues, the Academy has launched a number of other work-related research programmes. These include Social Capital and Networks of Trust SOCA (2004–2007), Finnish Companies and the Challenges of Global Competition LIIKE (2001–2004), Business Know-How LIIKE2 (2006–2009), Life as Learning LEARN (2002–2006) and The Future of Learning, Knowledge and Skills TULOS (2014–2017). From 2015 onwards, the division of work between the Academy and the WEF has become partly blurred. The Academy's role in applied research was broadened when a new research instrument, a strategic research programme, was added to its repertoire. These are three-year multidisciplinary research programmes that seek solutions to important societal challenges, defined by the government, in close collaboration with policy-makers and other relevant actors. One of the four strategic research programmes that started in 2016 was Skilled Employees—Successful Labour Market.

The Work Environment Fund has played a key role as a funder of working-life studies in Finland now for almost 40 years. The WEF has a quite steady annual inflow from statutory accident insurance premiums, providing funding for research, development and dissemination of information aimed at promoting safe and productive working communities. Over the years, the WEF has adopted a role of a kind of general funder of working-life studies that cover a wide range of areas. The WEF funds research projects on an individual basis, requiring that the awards allocated by the Fund be aimed at benefiting both employers who make statutory contributions to accident insurance and their employees. Unlike in the case of the Academy, decisions by the WEF over funding are not based exclusively on scientific novelty or societal relevance of the research in question, but also on its relevance from the point of view of the labour market parties.

Thanks to the increased input by the government in the funding of working-life research and development, the number of researchers in this area increased considerably in Finland in the 1990s and 2000s. In the early 2000s, there were about 40 units in Finnish universities actively involved in this area. In addition, working-life research and development was pursued in a number of polytechnics and in some government research institutes, such

as the Finnish Institutes of Occupational Health and the VTT. However, most of the units involved in this field were rather small and they were heavily concentrated in two geographical areas, the Helsinki metropolitan area and the Tampere region (Ramstad and Alasoini 2006).

Although research and development of working life has maintained its status on the agenda of Finnish policy-makers and labour market parties, the favourable development concerning the number of researchers in this area has since come to an end. Sluggish economic growth and increasing public debt in the 2010s have resulted in reductions in public expenditure, forcing many universities and government research institute to reduce staff numbers. By encouraging mergers between universities, research institutes and polytechnics, governments have also tried to give birth to bigger and more multidisciplinary research units that would have a sounder financial basis and greater ability to acquire also international research funding. A showcase of this strategy is the establishment of Aalto University in 2010, based on the merger of the Helsinki School of Economics, the Helsinki University of Technology and the University of Art and Design. Similarly, in Tampere, the three universities located in the region—the University of Tampere, the Tampere University of Technology and the Tampere University of Applied Sciences—are supposed to merge in 2019.

The Work Research Centre at the University of Tampere has played a special role as the leading unit of Finnish sociology of work since its establishment in 1988. The WRC has promoted research in various aspects of working life, such as information society and knowledge work, gender studies and participatory action research for the development of the organisation of work, and supported post-graduate training in these fields. Most of the Centre's research funding has come from the Academy of Finland and the WEF, but the Centre has also managed to acquire funding from the European Commission, Finnish companies, labour market organisations and local councils. In line with mainstream Finnish sociology of work in recent years, the focus of research at the WRC has revolved around qualitative aspects of working life. The WRC also ran the Finnish doctoral programme on labour and welfare studies, LabourNet, which under the supervision of Professor Pertti Koistinen supported dozens of Ph.D. students in the years of its existence, in 2003–2014. One of the most important external networking activities of the WRC is the hosting of an annual Work Research Conference, together with the Finnish Association of Work Life Research (FAWORE). The first such conference was arranged in 2004. In recent years, the event has become one of the largest social science conferences in Finland and an important annual meeting place, with

hundreds of participants, for Finnish researchers, students and practitioners in this area.

FAWORE is a scientific society of working-life researchers established in 2003 to continue and develop the activities of the former Finnish Labour Policy Association. The purpose of the Association is to promote scientific discussion, to develop the proficiency and expertise of working-life researchers and professionals and to disseminate the knowledge gained by working-life research and development activities. In addition to taking part in the hosting of the annual conference, the Association publishes the bilingual (Finnish/Swedish) multidisciplinary scientific journal *Työelämän tutkimus—Arbetslivsforskning*. FAWORE also arranges smaller seminars and other public discussions on topical work-related issues and collaborates with its Nordic and other international sister organisations.

Main Directions of Research and Prominent Persons and Projects

Drawing a fully-fledged picture of Finnish sociology of work in the era of the competition state is a much more demanding task than it was in the previous era, when the Finnish welfare state mainly took shape. The number of researchers and publications in this area has risen considerably and the content of the sociology of work has broadened in terms of both themes and methodological approaches. One way to approach this topic is to make a distinction between continuities and discontinuities, meaning the difference between research themes that derive from the era of the development of the welfare state and themes that more exclusively have emerged only in Finland's era as a competition state.

Regarding continuities in Finnish sociology in general, the themes of social inequality and the interaction between individuals and different social groups have constituted a central focus already for many decades (Erola and Räsänen 2014). Finnish studies on social class and social stratification, many of them influenced by the comprehensive Marx-inspired Class Project research initiative carried out in Finland in the early 1980s (Blom et al. 1984), follow this sociological tradition. However, sociological problem setting in this area has embraced new concerns in recent years. At the beginning of the 1980s, when the Class Project was conducted, people's labour market positions and working conditions in Finland were still clearly differentiated according to one's class position. Thereafter, the statuses of most employees—including both working-class and middle-class people—have

more or less converged due to technological innovations, changing management strategies and successful labour market policies cultivated by trade unions (Melin 2009; Mustosmäki 2017). This new setting has given rise to discussions on whether these converging trends signify a genuine upgrade or an overall deterioration of work in Finland, and to what extent this development has led to the emergence of new dividing lines in Finnish society.

Although traditionally the focus of Finnish sociology of work has been focused on the work of wage-earners (Aho 2004; Kinnunen and Suikkanen 2009; Koistinen 2009), the 2000s have seen a proliferation of studies on precarisation in Finnish working life, encompassing different atypical forms of employment (Jakonen 2015). The Finnish precariat movement criticises the traditional left for idealising wage work, while seeking grounds for a movement that goes beyond wage work. This line of discussion in Finland has been closely related to a discussion concerning the deterioration of working life during the era of hyper capitalism initiated by Juha Siltala (2004, 2017), Professor of History at the University of Helsinki.

The rise of the precarisation/deterioration theme in Finnish sociology of work can be linked to the current ongoing debate in other Western countries in which many Finnish labour intellectuals are also engaged. A cooperative with a leftist background, the General Intellect, published in 2008 a pamphlet entitled *Vasemmisto etsii työtä* (The Left looking for a job), which argues that the confrontation between the right and the left is no longer key to political conflicts, as the political left has lost its grip on ordinary people's ways of living (General Intellect 2008). It further argues that for the left, important political issues still arise from the realm of work, but that the left needs to recognise the changed world of work characterised by new spaces and rhythms of work, the dissolution of national labour markets, feminised work and the blurring of the gendered division of work.

In this debate, one can clearly perceive a tension between the logics of mainstream sociology tied to well-established sociological concepts and worldviews and contemporary analyses of work trends that operate with concepts outside the discipline. While the former bases its views mainly on strict empirical analyses, the latter is more engaged with pointing out scenarios based on anecdotal evidence[2] (Kinnunen and Suikkanen 2009).

---

[2]Matti Kortteinen's (1992) dissertation on features of Finnish wage work as a cultural form and its change in the era of flexible production constitutes a kind of a pioneering work of that sort of an analysis in the Finnish sociology of work. Kortteinen's work attracted extraordinary attention in Finland, both because of his views on the special characteristics of Finnish work culture and his unorthodox research methods. However, Kortteinen's work remained a stand-alone input, which was not attached to any school of thought in the Finnish sociology of work, and Kortteinen's own research interest moved to another area soon afterwards.

Taking into account the gap between these two logics, the task of the traditional mainstream sociology of work has been to pacify extreme hypothetical considerations of the contemporary features of working life. Such an approach is apparent in recent accounts by many sociologists of work (e.g. Julkunen 2005; Pyöriä 2017; Pyöriä and Ojala 2016; Suoranta 2009) who argue that it is not possible to find empirical evidence in support of the claim of the deterioration or precarisation of working life in Finland. On the contrary, it seems that Finland, together with the other Nordic countries, still stands out from the rest of Europe in terms of high job quality and a low level of polarisation (Mustosmäki 2017). Saloniemi and Virtanen (2008) argue that fixed-term jobs do not necessarily lead to job insecurity; nevertheless, they do not deny the rise of subjective feelings about uncertainty in many of today's jobs. Koistinen (2014), for his part, takes a middle line approach in this debate by introducing the idea of social rights to the realm of work. He calls for the recognising of non-market forms of work as socially acceptable, legitimate work, the remuneration for which could be ensured by means of social security or some other form of income distribution.

As mentioned above, a strong tradition of gender-inspired sociological approaches originated in Finnish universities in the 1980s, associated with the rapid growth of white-collar occupations and service jobs. This tradition has been sustained especially under the auspices of the WRC at the University of Tampere. Pioneering studies led by Professor Liisa Rantalaiho in the 1980s continued in the 1990s and 2000s, spreading into new areas of female work with the works of Anne Kovalainen (1995), Tuula Heiskanen and Rantalaiho (1997), Päivi Korvajärvi (1998, 2002) and Merja Kinnunen (2001). These studies in turn have paved the way for a new generation of studies in the area. For example, Merja Kinnunen's (2001) dissertation on "classified gender" offers a perspective on the classifications of occupations that are male-biased, drawing upon either agricultural classification of "auxiliary family members" for women or more individualist, albeit gendered wage earners' classification in which male industrial jobs are highly visible. She draws a picture of a society based on power relations and social structures that regenerate the pay gap between the sexes.

One special stream within gender studies in Finnish sociology of work is that of care work. Näre (2012) underpins the idea of the intersectional nature of care work, the subordination of which is not based only on the conception of the profession as female but also on historical class-based, institutional trajectories. An intersectional analysis in connection with care work is regarded as a fruitful starting point by Laurén and Wrede (2010) for analysing healthcare work undertaken by non-Finnish workers subject

to institutional racism. A related theme in Finnish gender-based socio-logical analyses has been the work-family balance. The work of Kinnunen and Mauno (1998) on antecedents and outcomes of the work-family con-flict among employed women and men, which was published in *Human Relations*, is perhaps the most cited peer-reviewed scientific article in the field of work sociology in Finland to date.

Another long-standing stream in the Finnish sociology of work concerns effects of technological and organisational changes, flexible forms of labour deployment and the adoption of post-Fordist forms of work organisation. Here, the influential work by Raija Julkunen (1987) of the University of Jyväskylä has been a major Finnish point of reference for many later socio-logical studies on the subject (e.g. Alasoini 1990; Järvensivu 2010; Kevätsalo 1999; Niemelä 1996). Julkunen later updated her views of the labour process theory, reflecting on the more recent international and Finnish debates revolv-ing around new forms of work and employment (Julkunen 2008). Julkunen's later works also include cooperative projects with working-life scholars at the University of Jyväskylä and Tampere, especially Professors Jouko Nätti and Timo Anttila, on atypical employment relationships, the modernisation and flexibilisation of working hours, work sharing, and working hours in knowl-edge work (e.g. Julkunen et al. 2004). Nätti and Anttila have since become distinct scholars also internationally in comparative analyses on job quality and working-time regimes (Anttila et al. 2015; Oinas et al. 2012).

Academic sociological analyses focusing exclusively on workplace industrial relations have been surprisingly few and far between in Finland since the 1990s (e.g. Ilmonen and Kevätsalo 1995; Jokivuori 2002; Uhmavaara et al. 2000). This area has been dominated by contributions of social historians instead. For example Tapio Bergholm, a long-time researcher of the Finnish Confederation of Trade Unions (SAK), has published many major works, including an analy-sis on how the idea of a "negotiation society" and the "double bond" between the State and the labour market organisations that contributed to the develop-ment of the Finnish welfare state consolidated in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s (Bergholm 2005, 2015). Similarly, Professor Pauli Kettunen, a distinguished scholar in studying trade union movement at the University of Helsinki, has in many of his works considered how nationalistic and global forces have shaped the Finnish welfare state and made it possible for the idea of a com-petition state to emerge within it (Kettunen 2001). Anu Suoranta (2009), for her part, has portrayed, from the perspective of gender studies, the rise of the wage-earner society as a modern way to consolidate gendered practices of work organisation and gendered wage structures, to which male representatives of employers' associations and trade unions have contributed.

Knowledge work, information society and innovation are new themes within Finnish sociology of work that have emerged with the rise of the competition-state discourse. In the 1990s, the catch phrase "information society" started to appear in the communiqués of the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Education. Later, it was even argued that Finland is the country closest to the idea of an information society (Heiskanen and Hearns 2004). At the job level, Raimo Blom, Harri Melin and Pasi Pyöriä (2001) of the University of Tampere conducted a benchmarking study in which they gave a precise definition to the concept of "knowledge work", enabling them to conduct a detailed investigation into the diffusion and effects of such work in Finland. Pyöriä has since played a visible role as a researcher and discussant in various areas of the Finnish sociology of work, including new ICT-enabled forms of working, quality of working life and work orientation of the net generation.

Another set of studies on the features of the Finnish system of national innovation from multiple perspectives has been conducted under the auspices of the Finnish Innovation Fund Sitra. These studies, which combined the input of several Finnish economists and sociologists, resulted in the book *Embracing the Knowledge Society* edited by Gerd Schienstock (2004), an Austrian-born scholar who acted for many years as director of the WRC after Kasvio. Schienstock opened up new international contacts for researchers at the WRC and contributed to further studies on organisational innovations and innovation systems in Finland.

The rise of action-oriented research since the late 1980s and governments' various programmes for the development of working life since the 1990s have also, to some degree, affected mainstream academic sociological discussion in Finland. However, the majority of academic researchers who have been involved in these projects have come from other disciplines, such as the engineering, educational or psychological sciences. Within the various approaches in this area, the sociologists' role has been the most prominent in participatory action research. Participatory action research in Finland is characterised by a mixture of theoretical influences, including the Scandinavian "work conference" approach and Habermas's discourse theory (Kalliola and Nakari 1999; Lehtonen and Kalliola 2008).

Summary and Conclusion

The sociology of work in Finland experienced its limited beginnings in the 1950s and 1960s before its proper development and expansion in the 1970s. The first research teams devoted to sociological studies on work were also formed in the 1970s. Considering the role played by different institutes in

this field, the role of the WRC and the University of Tampere in general has been prominent. However, the roles played by the Universities of Helsinki, Jyväskylä and Turku and that of the Finnish Institute of Occupational Health as other key research sites should not be forgotten. The focus of research in Finnish sociology of work has been on the tensions and contradictions caused by societal change in the 1950s and 1960s, critical studies on class-based divisions in the 1970s, new forms of work organisation in the 1980s and 1990s, quality of working life and employee well-being in the 1990s and 2000s, and working-time studies, gender and work-life balance issues from the 2000s onwards. Both action research and mainstream academic sociological research have been emphasised since the 1990s. In terms of methods, both quantitative and qualitative approaches, including ethnographies, have been used.

On the surface, it would seem that it is not possible to talk of a characteristically *Finnish* sociology of work, because Finnish scholars have, to a great extent, adapted their ideas from studies from abroad. To look at it more closely, there appears to be a considerable 'reformist' tendency in Finnish sociology of work, aiming at producing solutions to societal problems, and in many cases in the form of action-oriented research and developmental projects. Many researchers in this area have published their work only in Finnish and not in English, because there have been considerable institutional sources of funding available for such applied research. Although Finnish researchers have had access to empirically rich accounts, such as the Statistics Finland's Quality of Work Life Surveys, analyses that have utilised such data have not usually aimed to develop sociological theories, but rather sought to produce applicable information for policy-makers and labour market organisations in the context of targeted research projects, which only seldom leave room for radically novel ideas.

At first sight, it might seem that critical class-based labour research has been on the wane in Finland since the late 1980s. It could well be concluded that the lessening of ideological contradictions in politics after the demise of the Soviet Union, the successive economic recession in the early 1990s and the rise of a new hegemonic discourse based on the idea of a competition state have undermined critical labour research in Finland. However, such a conclusion may be too hasty. Despite the more cooperative relationships between employers and labour researchers as compared with the 1970s and 1980s, there still exists an important undertow of critical approaches in Finnish sociology of work, embodied especially in studies on work, gender and precarisation (e.g. Jokinen 2015; Kinnunen 2001; Korvajärvi 2002), industrial relations (e.g. Bergholm 2005; Kettunen 2001; Suoranta 2009)

and labour processes in multinational companies (Lillie and Sippola 2011; Sippola 2009). In particular, these latter studies have benefited from the researchers' strong links with labour unions. Nevertheless, labour intellectuals—perhaps with the exception of gender researchers—have not claimed a central role in the creation of an agenda for the sociology of work in Finland in the same way they have done in Germany, for example (see Köhler in this volume). In contrast, agendas have been set by governments, or in some cases by labour market parties. Using workplace development vocabulary, research within the Finnish sociology of work has been reactive rather than proactive in this respect.

What has been the impact on the sociology of work of an agenda for working-life studies largely defined by governmental bodies? One could argue that, especially in the era of the competition state, Finnish sociology of work has increasingly been concerned with solving or fixing societal problems defined by actors outside the academic world, rather than acting as a driver for societal change itself. On the one hand, by adopting this role, sociology of work in Finland has managed to safeguard its financial position, its institutional status and its broader political legitimacy. On the other hand, by expanding this role, it could have been more active in questioning the sustainability of the prevailing hegemonic discourse that revolves around the idea of a competition state in solving many society's current problems, including paving the way for more sustainable alternative visions. Ultimately, its future role, in this respect, remains to be seen.

References

Aho, S. (2004). *Kroonisen työttömyyden laajuus, rakenne ja syntytausta*. Työpoliittinen tutkimus 261. Helsinki: Työministeriö.

Alasoini, T. (1990). *Tuotannolliset rationalisoinnit ja teollisuuden työvoiman käyttötapojen muutos: tutkimus viidestä modernista suomalaisesta konepajateollisuuden, kevyen sähköteknisen teollisuuden ja paperiteollisuuden yksiköstä*. Työpoliittinen tutkimus 5. Helsinki: Työministeriö.

Alasoini, T. (2016). *Workplace Development Programmes as Institutional Entrepreneurs: Why They Produce Change and Why They Do Not*. Doctoral Dissertations 12/2016, Aalto University, School of Science, Department of Industrial Engineering and Management, Helsinki.

Allardt, E. (1964). *Yhteiskunnan rakenne ja sosiaalinen paine*. Porvoo: WSOY.

Allardt, E. (1968). Emile Durkheim: sein Betrag zur politischen Soziologie. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 20*(1), 1–16.

Allardt, E. (1973). Suomalaisen sosiologian tutkimisesta. In R. Alapuro, M. Alestalo, & E. Haavio-Mannila (Eds.), *Suomalaisen sosiologian juuret* (pp. 1–26). WSOY: Porvoo.

Anttila, T., Oinas, T., Tammelin, M., & Nätti, J. (2015). Working-Time Regimes and Work-Life Balance in Europe. *European Sociological Review, 31*(6), 713–724.

Aro, J., & Heiskala, R. (2015). *The Finnish Innovation System and Innovation Policy*, CRESSI Working Papers No. 22. Available at https://www.sbs.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/research-projects/CRESSI/docs/CRESSI_Working_Paper_22_Finland_Social_Innovation_Policy_Aro_Heiskala.pdf. Accessed 22 Nov, 2017.

Bergholm, T. (2005). *Sopimusyhteiskunnan synty I: työehtosopimusten läpimurrosta yleislakkoon. Suomen Ammattiyhdistysten Keskusliitto 1944–1956*. Keuruu: Otava.

Bergholm, T. (2015). *Kaksoissidoksen synty: Suomen työmarkkinasuhteiden muotoutuminen 1944–1969*. Helsinki: Työväen historian ja perinteen tutkimuksen seura.

Blom, R., Kerkelä, H., Kivinen, M., Melin, H., Järvelä, M., Rantalaiho, L., et al. (1984). *Suomalaiset luokkakuvassa: luokkaprojekti*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Blom, R., Melin, H., & Pyöriä, P. (2001). *Tietotyö ja työelämän muutos: palkkatyön arki tietoyhteiskunnassa*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Erola, J., & Räsänen, P. (2014). *Johdatus sosiologian perusteisiin*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Eskola, A. (1973). Suomalaisen sosiologian uudistuminen. In R. Alapuro, M. Alestalo, & E. Haavio-Mannila (Eds.), *Suomalaisen sosiologian juuret* (pp. 269–317). WSOY: Porvoo.

General Intellect. (2008). *Vasemmisto etsii työtä*. Helsinki: Like.

Heiskala, R., & Luhtakallio, E. (Eds.). (2006). *Uusi jako: miten Suomesta tuli kilpailukyky-yhteiskunta?* Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Heiskanen, T., & Hearn, J. (2004). *Information Society and the Workplace: Spaces, Boundaries and Agency*. London: Routledge.

Heiskanen, T., & Rantalaiho, L. (Eds.). (1997). *Gendered Practices in Working Life*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ilmonen, K., & Kevätsalo, K. (1995). *Ay-liikkeen vaikeat valinnat: sosiologinen näkökulma ammatilliseen järjestäytymiseen Suomessa*. Tutkimuksia 59. Helsinki: Palkansaajien tutkimuslaitos.

Jakonen, M. (2015). Let's Kill the Messenger! The Reception and Recognition of the Precarity Movement and Argument in Finland. In: D. della Porta, S. Hänninen, M. Siisiäinen, & T. Silvasti (Eds.), *The New Social Division: Making and Unmaking Precariousness* (pp. 177–196). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Järvensivu, A. (2010). *Tapaus työelämä ja voiko sitä muuttaa?* Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Jokinen, E. (2015). Precarious Everyday Agency. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 19*(1), 85–99.

Jokinen, E. (2017). Coping with the Crisis in Finland: Challenging Times for Social Dialogue. In I. Guardiancich & O. Molina (Eds.), *Talking Through the*

Crisis: Social Dialogue and Industrial Relations Trends in Selected EU Countries (pp. 83–105). Geneva: ILO.

Jokivuori, P. (2002). *Sitoutuminen työorganisaatioon ja ammattijärjestöön – kilpailevia vai täydentäviä?* Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research 206. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.

Julkunen, R. (1987). *Työprosessi ja pitkät aallot: työn uusien organisaatiomuotojen synty ja yleistyminen*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Julkunen, R. (2005). Työelämän pitkä ja lyhyt historia. *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka, 70*(1), 82–88.

Julkunen, R. (2008). *Uuden työn paradoksit: keskusteluja 2000-luvun työprosess(e)ista*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Julkunen, R., Nätti, J., & Anttila, T. (2004). *Aikanyrjähdys: keskiluokka tietotyön puristuksessa*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Kalliola, S., & Nakari, R. (Eds.). (1999). *The Resources for Renewal: A Participatory Approach to the Modernization of Municipal Organizations in Finland*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Karlsson, J. C., & Månson, P. (2017). Concepts of Work in Marx, Durkheim and Weber. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies, 7*(2): 107–119. Available at https://tidsskrift.dk/index.php/njwls/article/viewFile/81597/138430.

Kasvio, A. (1982). *Teollisuustyö ja elämäntapa: tutkimus kahden suuren teollisuuslaitoksen ammattitaitoisten työntekijöiden työn ja työn ulkopuolisen elämän kehityspiirteistä 1980-luvun suomalaisessa yhteiskunnassa*. Acta Universitatis Tamperensis A 134. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto.

Kauppinen, T., & Lahtonen, M. (Eds.). (1994). *Action Research in Finland*. Labour Policy Studies 82. Helsinki: Ministry of Labour.

Ketola, E. (2009). *Kasvu yhteistoimintaan*. Keuruu: Otava.

Kettunen, P. (2001). *Kansallinen työ: suomalaisen suorituskyvyn vaalimisesta*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.

Kevätsalo, K. (1999). *Jäykät joustot ja tuhlatut resurssit*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Kinnunen, M. (2001). *Luokiteltu sukupuoli*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Kinnunen, M., & Suikkanen, A. (2009). Johdanto. In M. Kinnunen & J. Autto (Eds.), *Tänään töissä: sosiologisia näkökulmia työhön* (pp. 9–19). Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press.

Kinnunen, U., & Mauno, S. (1998). Antecedents and Outcomes of Work Family Conflict among Employed Women and Men in Finland. *Human Relations, 51*(2), 157–177.

Kirjonen, J. (2010). *Ulos rautahäkistä: METELIn historia*. Jyväskylä: Liikunnan ja kansanterveyden edistämissäätiö.

Koistinen, P. (1984). *Teknologiset uudistukset ja työvoiman käyttö: tutkimus Suomen paperi – ja kartonkiteollisuudesta*. Työvoimaministeriön suunnitteluosaston työvoimapoliittisia tutkimuksia 47. Helsinki: Työvoimaministeriö.

Koistinen, P. (2009). Yhteiskunnallisen työn muodot. In P. Koistinen (Ed.), *Työn hiipuvat rajat: tutkielmia palkkatyön, hoivan ja vapaaehtoistyön muuttuvista suhteista* (pp. 7–15). Helsinki: Tilastokeskus.

Koistinen, P. (2014). *Työ, työvoima ja politiikka*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Koistinen, P., & Lilja, K. (1988). Consensual Adaptation to New Technology: The Finnish Case. In R. Hyman & W. Streeck (Eds.), *New Technology and Industrial Relations* (pp. 263–271). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Koivisto, M. (1956). *Sosiaaliset suhteet Turun satamassa: sosiologinen tutkimus*. Turun yliopiston julkaisuja B 60. Turku: Turun yliopisto.

Koli, P. (1955). *Ennakkoluuloista teollisessa organisaatiossa: sosiologinen tutkimus teollisen organisaation johtajiston ja työntekijöiden välisestä vuorovaikutuksesta ja sen eräistä sosiaalisista edellytyksistä*. Sosiaalipoliittisen yhdistyksen tutkimuksia 2. Porvoo: WSOY.

Kortteinen, M. (1992). *Kunnian kenttä: suomalainen palkkatyö kulttuurisena muotona*. Helsinki: Hanki ja jää.

Korvajärvi, P. (1998). *Gendering Dynamics in White-Collar Organizations*. Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 600. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Korvajärvi, P. (2002). Gender-Neutral Gender and Denial of Difference. In B. Czarniawska & H. Höpfl (Eds.), *Casting the Other: The Production and Maintenance of Inequalities in Work Organizations* (pp. 119–137). London: Routledge.

Kovalainen, A. (1995). *At the Margins of Economy: Women's Self-Employment in Finland, 1960–1990*. Avebury: Taylor & Francis.

Laakkonen, V. (1958). *Työntekijä ja teknillinen uudistus*. Sosiaalipoliittisen yhdistyksen tutkimuksia 5. Porvoo: WSOY.

Laurén, J., & Wrede, S. (2010). Työkäytännöt ja institutionaalinen rasismi – lähihoitajien työ. In S. Wrede & C. Nordberg (Eds.), *Vieraita työssä: työelämän etnistyvä eriarvoisuus* (pp. 172–192). Gaudeamus: Helsinki.

Lehtonen, J., & Kalliola, S. (Eds.). (2008). *Dialogue in Working Life Research and Development in Finland*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Lilja, K. (1979). Työelämän tutkimuksen kehityspiirteitä Suomessa. *Tiede & Edistys, 4*(1), 19–25.

Lilja, K. (1983). *Workers' Workplace Organisations: Their Conceptual Identification, Historically Specific Conditions and Manifestations*. Acta Academiae Oeconomicae Helsingiensis Series A 39. Helsinki: Helsingin kauppakorkeakoulu.

Lillie, N., & Sippola, M. (2011). National Unions and Transnational Workers: The Case of Olkiluoto 3, Finland. *Work, Employment & Society, 25*(2), 292–308.

Melin, H. (2009). Luokat ja työ. In R. Blom & A. Hautaniemi (Eds.), *Työelämä muuttuu, joustaako hyvinvointi* (pp. 56–77). Gaudeamus: Helsinki.

Miettinen, R. (2002). *National Innovation System: Scientific Concept or Political Rhetoric*. Helsinki: Edita.

Moen, E., & Lilja, K. (2005). Change in Coordinated Market Economies: The Case of Nokia and Finland. In G. Morgan, R. Whitley, & E. Moen (Eds.), *Changing Capitalisms? Internationalization, Institutional Change, and Systems of Economic Organization* (pp. 352–379). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mustosmäki, A. (2017). *How Bright are the Nordic Lights? Job Quality Trends in Nordic Countries in a Comparative Perspective*. Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research 586. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Näre, L. (2012). Hoivatyön uudet paradoksit. *Niin & Näin, 1*(2012), 92–96.

Niemelä, J. (1996). *Ammattirajoista tiimityöskentelyyn: työnjaon ja työelämän suhteiden murros Suomen telakoilla 1980 – ja 1990-luvulla*. Turun yliopiston julkaisuja sarja C 127. Turku: Turun yliopisto.

Oinas, T., Anttila, T., Mustosmäki, A., & Nätti, J. (2012). The Nordic Difference: Job Quality in Europe 1995–2010. *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies, 2*(4): 135–152. Available at https://tidsskrift.dk/njwls/article/view/26618/23390.

Pyöriä, P. (Ed.). (2017). *Työelämän myytit ja todellisuus*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Pyöriä, P., & Ojala, S. (2016). Precarious Work and Intrinsic Job Quality: Evidence from Finland, 1984–2013. *Economic and Labour Relations Review, 27*(3), 349–367.

Ramstad, E., & Alasoini, T. (2006). Interactive Research in Finland: Workplace Research from the 1940's to the Present Day. In K. Aagaard Nielsen & L. Svensson (Eds.), *Action and Interactive Research: Beyond Practice and Theory* (pp. 158–169). Maastricht: Shaker Publishing.

Saloniemi, A., & Virtanen, P. (2008). Joustavan huomisen varjossa? In T. Heiskanen, M. Leinonen, A. Järvensivu, & S. Aho (Eds.), *Kohti uutta työelämää?* (pp. 78–108). Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Savola, M. (1968). *Lakko työelämän ristiriitana: tutkimus suomalaisen yhteiskunnan lakoista*. Sosiaalipoliittisen yhdistyksen tutkimuksia 15. Porvoo: WSOY.

Schienstock, G. (Ed.). (2004). *Embracing the Knowledge Society: The Dynamic Transformation of the Finnish Innovation System*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Seeck, H. (2008). *Johtamisopit Suomessa: taylorismista innovaatioteorioihin*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Seppänen, P. (1958). *Tehdas ja ammattiyhdistysliike: työntekijäin kaksitahoinen liityntä ammattiyhdistyksen ja tehtaan organisaatioihin*. Sosiaalipoliittisen yhdistyksen tutkimuksia 4. Porvoo: WSOY.

Siipi, J. (1954). *Palkkatyöväen viihtyvyys: sosiaalipoliittinen tutkimus tehdasteollisuuden ja rakennusteollisuuden miespuolisten palkkatyöntekijäin viihtyvyydestä asuinpaikkakunnillaan*. Sosiaalipoliittisen yhdistyksen tutkimuksia 1. Porvoo: WSOY.

Siltala, J. (2004). *Työelämän huonontumisen lyhyt historia*. Keuruu: Otava.

Siltala, J. (2017). *Keskiluokan nousu, lasku ja pelot*. Keuruu: Otava.

Sippola, M. (2009) *A Low Road to Investment and Labour Management? The Labour Process at Nordic Subsidiaries in the Baltic States*. Jyväskylä Studies in Education, Psychology and Social Research 377. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Sippola, M. (2012). Local Bargaining and Codetermination: Finnish Experience in Comparative Perspective. *European Journal of Industrial Relations, 18*(1), 53–69.

Suoranta, A. (2009). *Halvennettu työ: pätkätyö ja sukupuoli sopimusyhteiskuntaa edeltävissä työmarkkinakäytännöissä*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Sutela, H., & Lehto, A.-M. (2014). *Työolojen muutokset 1977–2013*. Helsinki: Tilastokeskus.

TEM. (2012). *National Working Life Development Strategy to 2020*. Helsinki: TEM.

Uhmavaara, H., Kairinen, M., & Niemelä, J. (Eds.). (2000). *Paikallinen sopiminen työelämässä: hyötyyn ja luottamukseen perustuvaa muutosten hallintaa. Yksityisoikeuden julkaisusarja A 99*. Turku: Turun yliopisto.

Valtakari, M., Toivanen, M., Oosi, O., & Kotiranta, A. (2011). *Final Evaluation of the Employment Policy Research Program (2003–2007)*. Publications Employment and Entrepreneurship 16/2011. Helsinki: MEE.

8

Sociology of Work in Poland

Adam Mrozowicki

Introduction

This chapter sketches out the core developments of the sociology of work in Poland in the years 1956–2017. The Polish situation is specific insofar as it represents a special case of the changing landscape of the sub-discipline in a country that experienced a deep social, political and economic transformation from authoritarian socialism to (embedded) neoliberal capitalism (Bohle and Greskovits 2012), occupying a semi-peripheral place in the capitalist world system and European Union (Jasiecki 2013). Under state socialism in Poland (1945–1989), sociology retained its "very long and rich, non-Marxist institutional tradition" (Mucha and Keen 2010, p. 130). Sociology re-emerged after 1945 but it was suppressed soon afterwards, starting from 1947, in the wake of Stalinist repressions (Kurczewska 2006). Next, it was revived in the post-Stalinist period starting from 1955, the latter date denoting the emergence of the Sociological Research Department at the Institute of Philosophy of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw followed by the re-establishing of sociology as academic discipline across the country. Despite the censorship of research and publications and the

A. Mrozowicki (✉)
Institute of Sociology, University of Wrocław, Wrocław, Poland
e-mail: adam.mrozowicki@uwr.edu.pl

straightjacket of official, non-critical Marxist ideology, it is rather common to claim that the Polish sociology after 1956 remained polyphonic (Kurczewska 2006, p. 114) in terms of its research perspectives. Thanks to its early and ongoing contacts with US social sciences, the main reference point for Polish sociology in general and the sociology of work in particular was modern American sociology, in particular functionalism, and social psychology (Kilias 2017, p. 287). The political context of authoritarian socialism made it difficult for sociologists to engage in a critical discussion with the authorities. At the same time, the idea of political involvement, at least until the 1980s, was considered to be dangerous by sociologists themselves due to their belief in 'pure' science as an antidote to ideological pressure exercised by the authoritarian state (Kuczyński 1994).

Sociology of work in Poland began to be institutionalised in the second half of the 1950s soon after the return of sociology to academia. Since the early 1960s, the main organisational platform for this process was the Sociology of Work Section of the Polish Sociological Association as well as the growing group of "plant sociologists" employed in largest socialist enterprises and sectoral industrial organisations (Jędrzycki 1971; Kilias 2014). Due to its connections with the project of socialist industrialisation (Szczepański 1967), as well as an applied character strongly emphasised by the socialist authorities, the sociology of work in the late 1960s and early 1970s was one of the most important and socially visible sociological subdisciplines (Kurczewska 2006, p. 114). An important political context in which the Polish sociology of work developed was that of the cyclical rebellions of the Polish working class and intelligentsia (in 1956, 1968, 1970, 1976, 1980, 1988–1989), which were unique to CEE socialist countries. Despite these conditions, the analysis of industrial and social conflicts remained relatively rare and the main focus of sociological analysis of work was on resolving tensions at the micro-level of the company rather than tracing back their systemic and structural roots (cf. Matejko 1969; Holstein-Beck 1978; Sztumski 1979).

Since the 1980s, the symptoms of the crisis of the sociology of work became visible. Initially linked to the decline of the plant sociologists' milieu as a result of political crisis and their dismissals during Martial Law (Kilias 2014), the crisis deepened after 1989 when it became associated with the political changes in academic sociology after the end of state socialism. They include the "de-Marxisation" of Polish sociology (Mucha and Keen 2010), the abandonment of the sociology of work in favour of managerial sciences which claimed to fit better with capitalist-market reality, new, more technocratic ways of distributing state, European Union and private research

funding, as well as the changing nature of work itself. The latter shifted sociologists' attention away from the previously dominant workplace-level of analysis onto macro-level phenomena and factors. However, it is argued in the chapter that we can also observe a potential for reconstruction and development of the sub-discipline, roughly starting from the first decade of the twenty-first century. This putative revival is connected with the rediscovery of the sociology of work by a younger generation of researchers, intensified international cooperation and exchange of ideas, new funding sources related to the European Union, new forms of cooperation between sociologists and labour movements and the return of work (and in particular, precarious work) as a hot political and literary topic.

In this chapter, a chronological approach is taken and three main phases of the development of sociology of work are discussed: (1) the state socialist phase (1945–1980) marked by the dominance of systems approaches, humanistic strands and official Marxist doctrine, the institutionalisation of the sub-discipline and the emergence of the plant sociologist movement; (2) the transformation phase (1981–2004) characterised by gradual deinstitutionalisation of the sociology of work in favour of management sciences, industrial relations (IR) and the macrosociology of post-socialist transformation; and (3) the internationalisation/globalisation period (2004–until now) marked by the revival of both a practical and critical sociology of work.

The analysis is based on both literature review and primary data consisting of 20 oral history interviews carried out by the members of the Sociology of Work Section of the Polish Sociological Association with academic and plant-level sociologists of work who began their careers in 1960s and 1970s. The interviews were carried out within the project "Doyens of the Sociology of Work" founded by the Section and from private funds of researchers, between 2015 and 2017. Each interview lasted between 1 hour and 2 hours 30 minutes (see Giermanowska et al. 2016).[1] In the chapter, reference will be made to selected interviews only while the rest

---

[1]The informants included: Prof. dr hab. Danuta Dobrowolska, Prof. dr hab. Juliusz Gardawski, Prof. dr hab. Lesław Haber, Prof. dr hab. Maria Holstein-Beck, Prof. IFiS PAN dr hab. Krystyna Janicka, Prof. dr hab. Henryk Januszek, Prof. dr hab. Wiesława Kozek, Prof. dr hab. Jolanta Kulpińska, Prof. dr hab. Witold Morawski, Prof. dr hab. Irena Reszke, Prof. dr hab. Jan Sikora, Prof. dr hab. Kazimierz M. Słomczyński, dr Edward Sołtys, mgr Zbigniew Szczypiński, prof. dr hab. Janusz Sztumski, dr Romuald Śmiech, mgr Wojciech Święcicki and mgr Małgorzata Święcicka, dr Elżbieta Wojtaś, Prof. dr hab. Danuta Walczak-Duraj, Prof. dr hab. Robert Woźniak. The team of researchers involved in the project included: dr Robert Bartłomiejski, prof. USz dr hab. Zbigniew Galor, dr hab. Ewa Giermanowska, dr hab. Sławomira Kamińska-Berezowska, dr Elżbieta Kolasińska, mgr Michał Kujacz, dr Bartosz Mika, prof. UWr dr hab. Adam Mrozowicki, mgr Olga Czeranowska, dr Piotr Ostrowski, dr Joanna

of material is treated as a context for the presentation of the main themes in the literature.

Socio-economic and Political Conditions and Dominant Paradigms in State Socialism

Polish sociology had very rich tradition before the Second World War including both the representatives of a strong humanistic strand, for example Florian Znaniecki, Józef Chałasiński or Jan Bystroń, and Marxist approaches, for instance Ludwik Krzywicki. Thanks to these roots, social research in Poland began relatively quickly after the end of the Second World War despite either the death or emigration of some key pre-war sociologists during the war. However, from 1947 to 1952, sociology gradually started to lose its autonomy in academia (Kraśko 1996). In the context of emerging Stalinism, the discipline was condemned as bourgeois science during the First Congress of Polish Science which resulted in its elimination from research and educational institutions (Kurczewska 2006, p. 104). It began to re-emerge soon after the death of Stalin in 1953, first and foremost under the official banner of historical materialism applied to the analysis of socialist industrialisation and the role of key social classes, including the working class, working intelligentsia and the socialist peasantry.

Yet, the non-Marxist traditions had never been abandoned and guided the research orientations and interests of Polish sociologists. In the period of 'stabilisation' (*Polish: mała stabilizacja*) under the rule of Wiesław Gomułka, the First Secretary of the Polish United Workers Party (PZPR) (1956–1970), followed by the 'prosperity on credit' period from 1970 to 1980 (with Edward Gierek as the First Secretary of PZPR), more diverse theoretical approaches in sociology began to proliferate, including the inspirations of American functionalism and the return to pre-war humanistic traditions. Nevertheless, the dominant focus of research was on social order rather than social conflict. The critical sociology of socialism exploring the topics of social change and the pathologies of the system questioning the vision of

---

Róg-Ilnicka, mgr Peter Wegenschimmel, dr Joanna Wróblewska Jachna. More details about the methodology of research can be found in Giermanowska et al. (2016).

'socialist normality' was more typical of the last decades of state socialism in Poland, from 1976 to 1989 (cf. Kurczewska 2006, pp. 119–121).[2]

The institutionalisation of the sociology of work in the 1960s and 1970s in Poland was marked by the creative adaptation and development of systems approaches that resembled North American managerial strands, mostly inspired by social-psychology. An important role in bringing US-inspired approaches to Poland was played by the scholarship system offered by the Ford Foundation in 1957–1959 of which beneficiaries included 29 sociologists (Kilias 2017, p. 80). One of the founders of the post-war sociology of work in Poland, Aleksander Matejko, went to the USA in 1957 as a scholarship holder of the Population Council and spent two years at the University of Michigan. The result was the preparation of his Ph.D. thesis *Sociology of Industry in the United States of America* (Matejko 1962) which "functioned as the first textbook of modern sociology of industry in Poland" (Sułek 2011, p. 115). In a recent overview of the development of the sociology of work made by Kilias (2014, p. 424), specific intellectual origins of the subdiscipline have been well summarised:

> Polish sociologists of work felt closer to the perspective and conceptual categories of functionalism, including first and foremost the 'social system', than to Marxist conflict theories. As far as their own area of research was concerned, they were predominantly inspired by the American and French sociology of industry, including the human relations school that was occasionally, pro forma rather than wholeheartedly, criticized. (Kilias 2014, p. 424)

The sociology of work area of interest was defined as "social relationships between people in the context of work, as well as the role of work in the overall context of the collective life of various social groups or whole societies" (Matejko 1961, p. 8). In one early textbook, Adam Sarapata and Kazimierz Doktór (1962, pp. 7–8) made a useful distinction between the area of interest of three sociologies addressing the issue of work. In their own words, the sociology of work "deals with the social character of work, work as social process, i.e. the impact of social conditions on motives, course and effects of work and social consequences of work"; the sociology of industry is "a part of sociology of work connected with industrial production"; finally, the "sociology of the working class encompasses sociology of industry and

---

[2]The year of 1976 can be seen as one of the turning points in the history of the Polish People's Republic (PRL) due to mass demonstrations and strikes against the food price increases in June 1976 which gave the rise to the consolidation of the anti-communist opposition.

sociology of work (within historical and partially class limits) and it additionally deals with the sphere of social life of the working class going beyond the issue of work, for instance family life, cultural consumption, political activity." Clearly, all three sociologies were seen as applied social sciences which were useful for the purposes of socialist modernisation and industrialisation. This was emphasised in the interview with Jolanta Kulpińska who recalled the role of state funding of research on industrialisation, as well as support gained from the influential representatives of PZPR in the case of the development of the sociology of work at the University of Łódź:

> It was such a period in which they started to create central research programmes. And sociologists in Łódź were connected as far as research is concerned with the Committee for Research on Industrial Regions and we studied these regions one by one. It wasn't always something new, but its advantage was to have money to do fieldwork research with students – there were fieldwork practices, research camps. (…) And by the end of 1970-ies we decided that (…) we can apply for a central programme devoted to work. We found support in the Party, there was still Tatarkówna[3] there, so she got also interested in the possibility of studying work. And this was a programme which was called 'Man and work. Humanization of work' (…)

In terms of theoretical approaches, the main focus of the sociology of work was the social system of a socialist enterprise. However, this primary research interest often intersected with topics addressed by other sociological subdisciplines as well as other social and economic sciences, such as law, psychology and (political) economy. An important place in between the sociology of work, stratification and class analysis and working-class studies was occupied by research on various aspects of the situation of the Polish working class carried out, among others, by Włodzimierz Wesołowski (1969), Stanisław Widerszpil (1965). One of the central problems tackled by this stream was the question of the scope and composition of the working-class. According to one of the most representative definitions, a socialist working class was defined as "the large set of people, which encompasses employees who do not own production means, but who are their co-owners as the members of society, who work in the sphere of production and circulation, who perform subordinated work in the framework of enterprise system, and

---

[3]Michalina Tatarkówna-Majkowska, former First Secretary of PZPR in Łódź (in 1955–1964), retired in 1965, but still influential in 1970s.

for whom the main source of income is a working wage" (Widerszpil 1965, p. 182).

Connected with the sociology of work, there was also the sociology of occupations and stratification research (Sarapata 1965; Słomczyński 1972). Examples of research in this stream were studies on the complexity of work and personality carried out in the USA and Poland in cooperation between Melvin L. Kohn and the Polish team, including, among others, Włodzimierz Wesołowski, Kazimierz M. Słomczyński, Bohdan W. Mach and Krystyna Janicka (Słomczyński et al. 1981; cf. Janicka 1997). The sociology of occupations documented also important divergences between the level of income and qualifications, in particular among white-collar workers (Reszke 1977). There were also successful attempts to develop the Polish Sociological Classification of Occupations (PSKZ, cf. Pohoski and Słomczyński 1978). Finally, a group of researchers systematically studied labour relations in socialist enterprises, often in cooperation with official trade unions (the Central Trade Union Council, CRZZ). The topics covered concerned the problems of workers' self-government at plant level (present in various forms since 1956), workers' councils in state owned enterprises and socialist trade unionism (cf. Balcerek and Gilejko 1967; Jarosz 1967; Morawski 1973; Gilejko 1969). It is the latter group of researchers and their students which formed in the later years the foundations of IR studies in Poland.

Despite the Marxist rhetoric of much research, the analyses of labour processes were limited and the problems of the relationships between conflicts at work and conflicts in broader society were taboo except for some, often censored, studies. Referring again to the analysis of Joanna Kurczewska (2006, p. 116), Polish sociology 'was relatively weakly anchored in historical materialism except for few but influential cases (J. Hochfeld, M. Hirszowicz, S. Kozyr-Kowalski, early Z. Bauman)'. This was also confirmed in interview with W. Kozek, J. Kulpińska and other doyens of the sociology of work. Kurczewska (2006, pp. 116–117) has coined a useful typology of Marxist scholarship under socialism distinguishing between "Lyric Marxism" (J. Strzelecki term) (erudite references to Marxists classics usually in the introduction of the books, often for the purpose of signalling to authorities and censors), "Epic Marxism" (applying official Marxist propaganda categories taken out of original theoretical context to the analysis of Polish reality in functionalist terms); "Dramatic Marxism" (concerning work making use of Marxist theories to the diagnosis of the situation in Third World and Western countries). There was not much space left for the critical diagnosis

of labour-management and labour-state conflicts in socialism. Despite important exceptions (e.g. Staniszkis 1972, 1984), if work-related conflicts were analysed, this was done mainly within micro-level, psycho-social and humanistic approaches rather than from a systemic perspective exploring contradictions of interests and the division of power within state-socialist society. In terms of methodologies, quantitative, survey-based studies were dominant. This was, again, an effect of US scholarship and, in particular, Paul Lazarsfeld's vision of empirical social research. As remarked by Antoni Sułek,

> This "style of research", based on neo-positivistic philosophy of science, was characterised by: standardisation of research tools, translation of concepts into 'variables' and their operationalization through 'indicators', indexes and scales, mathematical analysis of relationships between variables, at best within survey research as a model of social research. (Sułek 2011, p. 105)

Nevertheless, from early on, there were also some non-survey techniques present in the sociology of work. An emblematic example is Kazimierz Doktór's study of Metal Industry Company H. Cegielski, utilising participant observation to explore issues such as interactions within the plant and the role of informal relations at work, was clearly inspired by the studies of factory cultures carried out, amongst others, by D. Roy (cf. Doktór 1964). The departure from positivistic traditions began to proliferate in the late 1970s and continued to be present in the subsequent transformation period. The humanist strand of research, emblematic for pre-war Polish sociology, returned, in research on the meanings and value of work (Dobrowolska 1974; Prawda 1987; Walczak-Duraj 1988). The biographical approach was represented principal by Narojek (1982), who, on the basis of working-class memoirs, demonstrated (in the 1970s) a critical potential of "micro-events" and the "climate of interpersonal interactions" for understanding the macro-dynamics of conflicts in a "statised society". The major interpretative works attempting to describe workers experiences emerged, however, only after the August 1980. Such works included, for instance, biographical research on blue collar workers by Leoński (1987). At least until the mid-1970s, "the questionnaire method, and related to it an understanding of society as an aggregate of individuals, and focus on the sphere of consciousness constituted a cluster, which narrowed the possibility of research on the newly arising tendencies" (Sułek 2006, p. 263). The critical potential of sociology was also blocked by omnipresent censorship starting from the requirement to have research tools accepted by the censors up to cases of

blocking publications of sociological books which were deemed too critical of the system.

At least initially, the activity of academic sociologists of work was closely connected with "plant sociologists" (Jędrzycki 1971; Kilias 2014; Gałdzicki et al. 2009, pp. 21–23) employed in large state-owned socialist enterprises. Kilias (2014) notes the gradual development of plant sociologists' profession since the 1960s. It is estimated that by the end of 1970s there were no less than 400 sociologists employed in large enterprises (Kilias 2014, p. 426); a rapid growth from 1 person in 1959 (Jędrzycki 1971, p. 8). Plant sociologists predominantly played the role of technocratic experts solving the problems inherent to state socialist companies (Kilias 2014, p. 427). As argued in the interview with Witold Morawski (quoted in Giermanowska et al. 2016, p. 98), "On one hand, sociologists wanted to show their relevance to the system. On the other hand, the system naively allowed for such sociological cells [in the enterprises – AM] to be something more than an offshoot of personnel department… specialized in sociotechnical knowledge". Wiesław Jędrzycki (1971, pp. 28–41), who studied plant sociologists in 1970s, mentioned several factors which contributed to the institutionalisation of plant sociology in Poland, of which two seemed to be crucial: (1) the role of sociologists having connections with central and regional branches of the communist party as well as support from the Central Committee of PZPR to carry out research on social relations in socialist enterprises; and (2) support from the Central Trade Union Council (CRZZ) and its cooperation with the Sociology of Work Department at the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences (IFiS PAN), in particular in terms of research on staff turnover and later, on work humanisation.

To the aforementioned factors, a specific fashion amongst socialist management in the 1970s can be added: "Having a sociologist in the enterprise means to be an enlightened manager, to be progressive, to go with the flow" (Jędrzycki 1971, p. 38). However, the relationships between plant sociologists and management, as well as plant sociologists and academic sociologists proved to be complicated. In the companies, the sociologists complained about their limited influence on managerial decisions and limited possibilities for independent research. In the academy, they were sometimes considered as less serious scholars, dealing with too practical topics and indirectly involved in support of communist industrial policies (as recalled in interview with Wiesława Kozek). Their core area of activity was related to the humanisation of work understood in terms of the improvement of working conditions in the context of 'socialist humanism' and the development of the

worker as an individual human being, against the alienation of work and in line with the general idea of the humanisation of socialist society (Jędrzycki 1979). An important problem which plant sociologists attempted to solve was staff fluctuation motivated by the search for better benefits offered by state-owned enterprises (Kilias 2014, p. 429; see also Muszalski and Sarapata 1973); other problems included worker absenteeism, motivation and the relationships between worker and management (e.g. Gałdzicki 1967; Surmaczyński 1966).

The main platform for the activity of plant sociologists was the Sociology of Work Section of the Polish Sociological Association (PTS). The Section also involved academic sociologists, but their presence was less pronounced than practitioners, especially in the 1970s. The Section was founded in the early 1960s by Aleksander Matejko. Following his emigration from Poland to Zambia (in 1968) and then to Canada (in 1970), it was taken over by Wiesław Jędrzycki who led it until 1993 (next replaced by Wiesława Kozek in 1993). Since 1971, the Section organised regular seminars in Warsaw under the auspices of the Nationwide Seminar on the Sociology of Work. In the 1970s, it took over the monthly journal, *Humanism of Work*, published earlier as *Information Bulletin* (in 1963–1968) by the Psychohygiene of Work Section of the Polish Association of Psychic Hygiene, and transformed it in 1975 into *Humanisation of Work* journal (still published, albeit not any longer by the Section). The activity of the Sociology of Work Section had also regional dimensions. For instance, in Wrocław, the Section had 25 members in the 1970s and organised regular meetings and conferences (the last one in 1976, cf. Gałdzicki et al. 2009, p. 25). Strong research centres of the sociology of work existed in Warsaw, Łódź, Katowice and Kraków. In 1967, sociologists and psychologists representing the Academy of Mining and Metallurgy (AGH) in Kraków, including Czesław Herod, Julian Bugiel and Aleksandra Anasiewicz, founded the first sociological research unit within the technical universities in Poland, the Psychology and Sociology of Work Research Unit (Bugiel 2012). In Łódź, the main place of activity was the Sociology of Industry Department of the University of Łódź led since 1969 by Jolanta Kulpińska. In 1978, the Department of Sociology of Work and Organisation was established at the University of Silesia by Władysław Jacher, who began his research in Silesia on the four-brigade system of work in black coal mining—the results of this study were initially censored and published only after the emergence of NSZZ Solidarność (Ciarkowski and Jacher 1981).

Due to demand for plant sociologists, some steps were undertaken to improve their skills by reforms to sociological education (in late 1960s) in

line with industry's requirements. In 1974, the Sociology of Work Section of PTS (and its leader, Wiesław Jędrzycki) began to lobby for increasing the number of students specialising in the sociology of work necessitating the development of a professional code of conduct and introducing legal regulations for the profession of industrial sociologist. The goal was to counteract the practices of employing plant sociologists who did not meet certain professional requirements. However, the project was abandoned. In 1976 membership in the Polish Sociological Association became limited to sociologists who had formal sociological education or an academic track record in sociology. Simultaneously, the membership in the PTS was separated from the membership to the Sociology of Work Section of PTS (Kraśko 2010, p. 110). Consequently, plant sociologists, many of whom had no formal sociological qualifications, became increasingly distanced from academic sociology, "deepening [their] alienation from academic science" (Kilias 2014, p. 434).

The marginalisation of plant level sociology of work accelerated in the 1980s. Kilias (2014) saw this trend as resulting from the growing economic and political crisis of the system and the liquidation of the plant sociologists' position in state owned enterprises. Both Wiesława Kozek and Jolanta Kulpińska recalled in their interviews the repression of some plant sociologists who were considered supporters of the anti-communist trade union, NSZZ Solidarność and who lost their jobs after the introduction of Martial Law in 1981. Others, who were closer to the Party or management, could not perform their research due to the lack of workers' trust. Consequently, the profession practically disappeared in the course of the 1980s. At the same time, academic sociology of work entered the new, transformation phase of its development, with a different focus and much less pronounced presence in the institutionalised field of general sociology in Poland.

The Transformation Phase of the Sociology of Work (1981–2004)

The emergence of the first independent trade union in state socialist Eastern European countries, NSZZ 'Solidarność' (*Solidarity*), as well as the growing economic and political crisis since the late 1970s contributed to important shifts in the sociology of work. One of the consequences of this was a growth in research on workers' consciousness and circumstances which was led by the reformist wing of sociologists staying close to PZPR. For instance,

studies by Malanowski (1981) documented the discrepancy between the ideology of the workers' state and the poor living and working conditions of workers. In 1984, the Institute of Research on the Working Class was established by Leszek Gilejko within the Academy of Social Sciences by PZPR which carried out critical research on workers (cf. Gardawski 2017, p. 35). One of the main achievements of the Institute was the publication of a seven-volume work on the situation of the Polish working class. It addressed issues of working conditions, the situation of health, housing problems, pathology and criminality, ecological challenges, the problems of elderly people as well as the needs and aspirations of workers (cf. Wójcik 1988). As recalled by Leszek Gilejko in interview with Juliusz Gardawski, the relationships between the Political Bureau of PZPR and the Institute were rather tense:

> (…) [the results of research – AM] were shocking. Everyone seemingly knew something, but it was something else to 'know something' and something else if you sat in the most important room in Poland [of the Political Bureau of PZPR – AM] and unexpectedly heard such a story. And it was not based on watch log, on reports by Security Service, but from the volumes of work published by the Academy of Social Sciences of PZPR, based on empirical research, signed by well-known names. (Gardawski 2017, pp. 40–41)

Despite the involvement of many sociologists in Solidarność, they were usually reluctant to let their political views influence their research. On the one hand, we can mention the experiences of the Polish members of the Alain Touraine, Francois Dubet, Michel Wieviorka and Jan Strzelecki team, studying Solidarity using the method of sociological intervention (cf. Touraine et al. 1983). As noted by Kuczyński (1994, p. 112), the Polish team members, all of whom were also the members of Solidarność, were concerned that their involvement in action research might not be considered science. They were also sceptical of what they saw as the left-wing orientation of the study and even of some core concepts, such as the centrality of conflict and social class, which they considered the language of the communist authorities (ibidem, p. 114). On the other hand, there were also sociologists and social scientists who theorised and studied the workers' movement from an insiders' perspective, publishing their books in the underground press or abroad (Starski [Magala] 1982[4]; Staniszkis 1984).

---

[4]The book on "Class Struggle in Classless Poland" was originally published by Sławomir Magala under a pseudonym Stanisław Starski.

In the context of renewed interest in a critical class and systems perspectives, some researchers, such as Jolanta Kulpińska (1985), recalled the French hypothesis of the "new working class" to explain the sources and nature of the NSZZ Solidarność revolt in key, technologically modern branches of state socialist industries. The new perspectives, stemming from British studies on working class attitudes and value systems, carried out by D. Lockwood, J. Goldthorpe (Goldthorpe et al. 1968), M. Bulmer (1975) and F. Parkin (1971), were creatively adopted by Juliusz Gardawski's team who, together with Leszek Gilejko, and other researchers, began to explore workers' economic consciousness:

> In the case of my research, it was first and foremost, at the beginning, the 'Affluent Workers' study, Bulmer's research and some earlier works (…) These various British texts (…) And later on Parkin and the problem of dominant values, the problem of who brings these dominant values. It is an interesting problem for me until now. How in the context without the dominant class, but with a dominating pattern of international, globalised values (…) how this pattern has been internalised by our [workers - AM], our minor working-class gentry [*zagrodową szlachtę robotniczą*]. (interview with Juliusz Gardawski)

A central feature of research on work in the 1980s was an attempt to reconstruct the social consciousness of workers in the context of expected social and political changes. Since the mid 1980s, most sociological research on workers was focused on the question of workers' support for, and resistance to, market reforms. This research involved the analysis of workers' consciousness in terms of its functionality or, more often than not, dysfunctionality towards projected market and democratic reforms. On one hand, sociologists spoke of the "new middle-class" (cf. Kurczewski 2006 [1981]) and the "pro-reform coalition" (Kolarska-Bobińska 1998) consisting of skilled workers and technical intelligentsia. Both social categories were presented in social research as united by their for support economic reform, largely driven by the 'myth of the market'. In opposition to the economics of shortage typical of late state socialism, the market economy was seen as a mechanism which, "providing work and welfare for everyone, full pockets and shelves in shops, should have also improved the management of companies and better functioning of economy as a whole" (Kolarska-Bobińska 1998, p. 123). On the other hand, research also emphasised the ambivalent character of workers' backing for reforms. Industrial workers' surveys carried out in large enterprises conducted by teams led by Ziółkowski (1990) and Gilejko (cf. Czarzasty et al. 1987) suggested that workers would support

marketisation if the latter had maintained the institutions of the welfare state and its employment protection. They also detected greater sympathy for the market economy among those in larger cities, employed in industry, youth and the better educated (cf. overview in Gardawski 1996, pp. 65–70).

Despite the already mentioned significant exceptions, research on workers and workplaces in the transformation phase has declined visibly. As remarked by Kurcz (1992, p. 10), during the socialist period even a nominal interest in workers "could have [been] elevated in the official scale of prestige as an expression of the relationship with progressive forces". By contrast, in the new political reality, the latter was not the working class, but entrepreneurs and middle classes which were seen as the driving force and mainstay of democracy and the market economy (Jasiecki 1996). Systematic research on workers' positions, social consciousness and attitudes has been carried out by a limited number of researchers, most notably by Juliusz Gardawski's team (1992, 1996). The main conclusion of these studies was that "workers generally accepted the main transgressive values (market economy or capitalist institutions and privatisation) but chose existential or specific negotiated values when it comes to matters affecting their living conditions" (cf. Gardawski 1996, p. 208). This meant, in practice, that the majority of Polish workers expressed a "moderate consent" to market reforms in the country and did not contest them in the early 1990s in so far as reforms did not directly affect their existential interests. The myth of the market already began to erode at the turn of 1990s and early 2000s; this trend accelerated in the late 2000s.

Other important topics addressed by sociologists of work, economic sociologists and IR researchers in the 1990s concerned issues of privatisation (Pańków 1993; Jarosz 2001), the emergence of employee firm-ownership from the perspective of workers and managers (Jarosz 1996), the problems of unemployment and unemployed (Borkowski and Marcinkowski 1999; Reszke 1999) and labour market changes (Kozek 1993; Kryńska 1996). A newly emerging, largely interdisciplinary field tackling the issues of work and employment and involving sociologists, economists, political scientists and demographers was witnessed by the rise in the importance of analyses of emigration from Poland both during state socialism and after 1989 (Okólski 2001; Slany 1997). Similarly, the analysis of the evolution of the post-1989 IR system presented a separate stream of research in which economic sociologists and sociologists of work played a prominent role (cf. Czarzasty and Mrozowicki 2018 for an overview). In a nutshell, the analyses carried out in the 1990s led to the conclusion that the IR system in Poland presents a hybrid model combining some elements of pluralism,

etatism and neo-corporatism (Hausner 1995; Morawski 1997; Sroka 2000). Importantly, they also suggested that the mechanisms behind the development of this system involved both top-down, state-led, neoliberal reforms and their bottom-up contestation by IR actors (Kozek 1997; Kulpińska 1998). Some other topics covered included, for instance, sectoral differentiation of workers' interest representation (Gardawski et al. 1999) and the role played by trade unions in the restructuring of key industries, such as steel (Gilejko 2003).

Despite the continuous interest in the issues of work and employment amongst sociologists, as compared to the 1960s and 1970s we can observe some symptoms of deinstitutionalisation of the sociology of work in the 1990s. Firstly, the pluralisation of research interests and approaches of sociologists dealing with work has not been reflected in the creation of a modern textbook on the sociology of work which could reaffirm its identity and usefulness in new social, political and economic spaces. Even though some textbooks were published in the 1990s (e.g. Bugiel and Haber 1994; Januszek and Sikora 1998; Sztumski 1999), for the most part they were still inspired by the approaches of the 1960s and the 1970s largely omitting new research fields, theories and methodologies. Secondly, the sociology of work began to disappear from the standard curricula of sociology undergraduate and Masters courses.[5] This does not mean that the topics of work, labour market and employment have been absent. However, they appear mostly as a part of optional and specialising courses with limited references to the traditions of the sub-discipline. Thirdly, the activity of the Sociology of Work Section of the Polish Sociological Association has visibly decreased. The main reason for this has been the outflow of plant sociologists from the Section, but also there has been a decreasing identification with its activities among its members.

There are many reasons for the erosion of disciplinary identity of the sociology of work some of which have been mentioned already. Firstly, after 1989, some within sociological circles identified the sociology of work as part of the 'official sociology' of the *ancien regime*. The de-Marxisation of sociology (Mucha and Keen 2010, p. 132) contributed to the reorientation of some sociologists to other areas of interests and/or beyond academic sociology. This was facilitated by intersections between the sociology of work

---

[5]For instance, in 2015, only 6 out of 20 universities ranked highest in terms of the quality of sociological programmes in the ranking of the internet portal Perspektywy.pl offered any courses in the sociology of work (Mrozowicki 2015).

and other sociological sub-disciplines, such as stratification studies, the sociology of organisations and economic sociology, which were visible already in the period of state socialism. Interestingly enough, for the majority of the interviewed doyens, the identification with the sociology of work was not the primary one during their academic career. Secondly, similarly to many Western European countries (Halford and Strangleman 2009, p. 820), the field abandoned by the sub-discipline was eagerly taken over by management studies (see Chapter 1 above for complementary perspective on this process in the UK). This tendency is visible in the statistics of research keywords registered in the database of Polish scientific research (nauka-polska. pl). The keyword "management" appeared in 2201 cases, sociology in 382 cases and sociology of work in 13 (cf. Mrozowicki 2015). Thirdly, the newly emerging fields of research on work-related problems, such as IR studies or migration research, were inter and transdisciplinary by their very nature. Sharing the fields with other disciplines has not helped the preservation and cultivation of sub-disciplinary identities. Fourthly, a solid support for the sociology of work from the labour movement and private foundations, which had been important in some Western countries, was largely missing in Poland in the 1990s. Neither trade union leaders, nor the majority of sociologists have been interested in close cooperation and the creation of think tanks or labour-focused research institutes; the situation began to change only recently with the inflow of a new generation of experts on trade unionism, including some sociologists.

Finally, the sociology of work was also affected by the changing nature of work and employment. The precarisation of employment (Standing 2011), the growing recognition of reproductive labour as being a crucial, albeit omitted aspect of capitalism (Federici 2006), the increasing significance of immaterial labour (Lazzarato 1996) and crowd employment within the digital and sharing economy (Sundararajan 2017) has challenged the boundaries between working and non-working lives, workplace and home, formal and informal work. The workplace-focused, human relations-oriented analysis, typical of the sociology of work in Poland in the 1960s and 1970s, required significant theoretical, methodological and disciplinary development to grasp the changing relationships between working and non-working lives. In the final section of the chapter, it is argued that such broadening of sociology of work's field of interest has been of vital significance to date.

The Internationalisation/Globalisation Period (2004–Present)

The current phase in the development of the sociology of work in Poland started in the mid-2000s. 2004, when Poland joined the European Union (EU), is merely a symbolic start to the period characterised by the increasing relevance of international contacts, European collaboration and funds. As already mentioned, international cooperation had begun in 1950s and 1960s. Yet, Jarosław Kilias (2017, p. 249) critically assessed the relevance of Polish sociology in international academic life: "even though it was not bad and well present in international scientific life, it was roughly equally a peripheral science in the 1960s as it is today". The challenges of internationalisation in the case of Eastern European scientists have also been mentioned by Julia Szalai (2015, p. 13). She noted that the position of Easterners should be seen rather as "service providers" than "equal partners" for Westerners who tended to see the post-communist East as a laboratory to test their theories. Simultaneously, she acknowledges the advantages of East-West cooperation in "career terms, well-being and also in the new forms of mobility for 'Easterners'".

In the case of the sociology of work, the advantages of internationalisation after 1989, were not simply pragmatic. The work of left-wing and liberal social scientists from the West, such as Elizabeth Dunn, Jane Hardy, Guglielmo Meardi, David Ost, Alison Stenning or Vera Trappmann, and in particular the books by Dunn (2004), Ost (2005), Hardy (2009) which were translated into Polish, provided an important impetus for the renewal of a critical sociology of work in Poland, becoming an inspiration for the young generation of sociologists. The extent of their influence can be debated and interpreted in terms of asymmetric, core-periphery relationships, in particular given the close connections between foreign and Polish scholars (Hardy et al. 2008; Meardi and Gardawski 2010). Their joint publications provoken, often critical debate in Poland (see, for instance, Zarycki [2008] critique of Ost [2005]). Additionally, one should note the role of Polish labour scholars working in academic institutions abroad, for instance Magdalena Bernaciak, Agnieszka Piasna and Romuald Jagodziński at the ETUI, who act as translators between the Polish and international worlds of science. Nevertheless, as in the case of social sciences more broadly, the hegemony of Anglo-Saxon academic culture, involving, for instance, the pressure to align theoretical references to those present in the leading JCR-listed academic journals (and participating in an uneven com-

petition for EU grants), cannot be denied. From this perspective, contemporary academic sociology of work in Poland indeed remains peripheral since it is quite rare that genuinely local ideas manage to make their way into international circulation, shaping the state of the global debate in the sub discipline.

The renewed interest in the sociology of work in the globalisation phase has also a practical aspect. The development of applied sociology of work is connected, on the one hand, with the demand for human resource management specialists in private enterprises and, on the other hand, with new sources of funding. Sociological perspectives are helpful in going beyond a purely instrumental business logic, based on low labour costs, typical of the early phase of system transformation. The sub-discipline is seen to be relevant because of the need to acknowledge employers social responsibilities in particular in the period of low unemployment and tight labour markets. As argued by Giermanowska et al. (2016, p. 101), "the occupational careers of the sociology graduates who completed the specializations related to the sociology of work show that they are sought by employers, and their achievements on the labour market are the results of changes in the approaches to work in organizations." The latter changes include, for instance, a growing emphasis on corporate social responsibility, diversity management and workers' involvement, in particular in the case of some larger international corporations. Simultaneously, applied sociology of work is also supported by the inflow of EU structural funds within the programmes such as the Human Capital Operational Programme [POKL] or, currently, Knowledge, Education, Development [POWER], which support the analyses of local, regional and national labour markets. Even though such studies have a rather descriptive character, they are often implicitly based on the heritage of the sociology of work. It needs to be added that practical and politically oriented research and seminars on employment relations and work-related social changes in Poland are also supported by some private foundations, most notably Friedrich Ebert Foundation and Rosa Luxemburg Foundation and, in the case of IR researchers, the European Trade Union Institute and the European Foundation for the Improvement of Working and Living Conditions.

The increasing attentiveness to the problems of work has also to do with the process of the disenchantment with the market economy. As we argued earlier, the transformation in the sphere of work which took place in 2000s, including the growing precarisation of employment, "have mobilised potential debates on the ideas and discourses that question the ideas of self-regulating markets" (Mrozowicki 2014, p. 91). On the one hand,

it was manifested in trade union-led public campaigns against the expansion of the non-Labour Code regulated civil-law employment contracts in the period following the late 2000s economic slowdown. Its side effect was a political turn in the country, after 2015, with the right-wing conservative party, Law and Justice, which won both presidential and parliamentary elections promising to improve working and living conditions of Poles. On the other hand, we can observe a growing popular interest in problems of working life amongst journalists, reporters, writers and artists. In 2017, three popular books on precarious work appeared: *Profession/Disappointment.*[6] *Tales about Work in Poland. It's about Us* (Fejfer 2017), *No disgrace* (Gitkiewicz 2017) and *This is not a country for workers* (Woś 2017). Earlier on, books by Kuba Szreder (2016) *ABC of Projectariat. On the Poverty of Life in Projects*—concerning working conditions in the cultural sector and Jarosław Urbański (2014, *Precariat and New Class War. The Transformations of Contemporary Working Class and its Forms of Struggles*) were published. Each of these books received positive critical recognition, with the meet-the-author sessions having been organised across Poland by left-wing and liberal academic and non-academic organisations. Undeniably, it demonstrates a considerable public concern with issues of work and employment in contemporary Poland.

The renewed interest in sociological studies of work has been paralleled, to some degree, by a reversal of its de-institutionalisation. In 2014, the Sociology of Work Section of the Polish Sociological Association began a new international conference cycle (*Social boundaries of work*), with three editions so far in Wrocław (2014), Zielona Góra (2015) and Katowice (2017). The aim of this conference series has been to systematically explore the meanings of work in the process of economic and cultural changes associated with globalisation, Europeanisation and the expansion of neoliberal capitalism, in the context of the shifting boundaries between formal and informal, precarious and non-precarious, standard and non-standard employment (cf. Kolasińska et al. 2017). It is also a meeting place of Polish sociologists of work with scholars from abroad. In 2015, the Board of the Section, initiated a research project *The Doyens of the Sociology of Work in Poland* with the objective of preserving the memory of academic and plant-level sociology of work through collecting oral history interviews, and preparing a series of publications based on the project's results. Finally, thanks to funds granted to the Polish Sociological Association by the family of

---

[6]Polish: "zawód" means both profession/occupation and disappointment.

Aleksander Matejko, the Aleksander Matejko Prize for the best doctoral thesis in the area of the sociology of work was established in 2016. It was managed by the Sociology of Work Section and the jury chaired by Jolanta Kulpińska. Its main purpose is to promote the sociology of work among the young generation of sociologists.

In terms of geographical coverage, sociological research on work and employment continues to be carried out not only in the 'old' academic centres of the subdiscipline, such as, for instance, the University of Warsaw, the University of Łódź, the Warsaw School of Economics, AGH University of Science and Technology in Kraków and the University of Silesia in Katowice. The sociology of work also re-emerged in places in which the intergenerational continuity of academic sociology of work had been broken; examples being the Institute of Sociology at the University of Wrocław, in which the author of this chapter works, or the Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin, the University of Gdańsk, the University of Szczecin or the University of Zielona Góra. Besides academic journals which have continued to publish research on work and employment for the last 40 years such as *Humanizacja Pracy* (Humanisation of Work) and *Polityka Społeczna* (Social Policy), new titles have emerged, including, for instance the English-language journal *Warsaw Forum of Economic Sociology* edited by Juliusz Gardawski and Jan Czarzasty from the Warsaw School of Economics.

The theoretical agenda of the new sociologies of work is diverse and, for obvious reasons, difficult to sum up within the limits of this chapter. Firstly, we can observe a continuous relevance of system approaches (e.g. Banaszak and Doktór 2011; Januszek and Sikora 1998) and humanistic approaches (Swadźba 2001; Walczak-Duraj 2011). The studies of the relationship between work organisation and culture from the *longue durée* perspective (Hryniewicz 2012), as well as the analysis of economy and culture in Poland during systemic changes also belong to this strand (Kochanowicz and Marody 2010). A separate, but intersecting perspective is represented by new sociological studies on organisations which also lean on the tradition of the sociology of industry (cf. Kołodziej-Durnaś 2017 for an overview). A solid place in the Polish sociology of work is occupied by the symbolic interactionist perspective and interpretive strands (e.g. Konecki 1992; Konecki and Chomczyński 2007; Konecki and Kacperczyk 2010). The representatives of the interpretive strand address new topics and areas of interest,

such as for instance interactional analysis of mobbing at work[7] (Chomczyński 2008), temporal aspects of managerial careers (Dymarczyk 2008), the career and mobility of scientists (Wagner 2011), domestic work (Kordasiewicz 2016), motherhood and migration (Urbańska 2015), the work of women in escort agencies (Ślęzak 2016), the occupational careers of business people (Domecka 2014) and the analysis of street-level bureaucracy in the context of employment offices (Sztandar-Sztanderska 2016).

There are also interesting attempts to apply various other theoretical perspectives to the analysis of work-related phenomena, including the reference to exchange theories as a means of exploring the emergence of trade unions in the private sector (Ostrowski 2009), Bourdieu's theory to study women's trade union activists (Kamińska-Berezowska 2013) and critical realism by Margaret Archer to research blue-collar workers' coping strategies (Mrozowicki 2011), or Polish migrants' careers (Grabowska-Lusińska 2012). A prominent place in the contemporary analysis of work in Poland is occupied by feminist theories, which are used to explore the phenomena of the care economy (cf. Charkiewicz and Zachorowska-Mazurkiewicz 2009; Kordasiewicz 2016; Urbańska 2015), resistance of workers in feminised sectors, such as health care (Kubisa 2014), the analysis of low-paid women's work in the special economic zones (Maciejewska 2013) and women's activism in labour organisations (Kamińska-Berezowska 2013; Trawinska 2012). There are also creative references to autonomous Italian Marxism within critical labour studies. A good example of the latter can be seen in the analysis of precarious work in cultural festival sectors carried out by Gorgoń et al. (2013).

The central feature of new social studies on work, including those inspired by sociological approaches, is their interdisciplinary character. As far as labour market, IR and political economy of work are concerned, neo-institutional approaches seem to be dominant (e.g. Czarzasty 2010; Giermanowska 2013; Jasiecki 2013; Kulpińska 1998; Kozek 2013), even though we can also observe a renewed interest in class analysis inspired by neo-Marxist (Galor 2006; Tittenbrun 2012) and Bourdieuian perspectives (cf. Gardawski 2009). In most cases, the research combines sociological, economic, legal and political science perspectives. The new topics include, for instance, research on social dialogue in multinational enterprises (Czarzasty 2014) and in public services affected by liberalisation and privatisation (Kozek 2012; Kubisa 2014), the comparative analysis of IR and trade

---

[7]Mobbing is referred to as bullying in the UK.

unionism in Poland and other European countries (Bsoul and Bylok 2013; Towalski 2011) or research on trade union renewal and organising in the private sector (Czarzasty and Mrozowicki 2014; Ostrowski 2009). Another example of the interdisciplinary field is research on precarious employment which involves not just sociologists, but also IR researchers, legal scholars, anthropologists and philosophers (cf. Kozek et al. 2005; Bednarski and Friske 2012; Desperak 2015; Giermanowska 2013; Mrozowicki et al. 2016; Poławski 2012; Rakowski 2009; Sowa 2010). Sociologies of work can also be found in migration studies of which many are focused on migrants occupational experiences (e.g. Górny et al. 2010; Grabowska-Lusińska 2012; Kindler 2011).

Regardless of the plurality of methodological approaches, a turn towards qualitative research on work and employment can be observed. A short review of the publications prepared by the Qualitative Sociology and Symbolic Interactionism Section of the Polish Sociological Association (e.g. Konecki and Chomczyński 2007; Konecki and Kacperczyk 2010), points to a broad spectrum of work-related research interests, including the analyses of experiences, social worlds and the identities of occupational categories such as scientists, domestic workers, sex workers, dancers, managers, workers and poets. The qualitative methodologies used include participant observation (e.g. Konecki 1992; Maciejewska 2013; Ślęzak 2016; Sztandar-Sztanderska 2016), biographical narrative interviews (e.g. Domecka 2014; Mrozowicki 2011; Trawinska 2012; Urbańska 2015; Waniek 2012), grounded theory methodology (e.g. Chomczyński 2008; Dymarczyk 2008) and qualitative case studies (Czarzasty 2010; Ostrowski 2009). Discourse analysis has been used by Kozek (2003) and Figiel with Ostrowski (2015) as a way to analyse the representations of trade unions and employers in the Polish media. Simultaneously, large-scale survey research is continuously used by J. Gardawski's team to study the economic mentality of working Poles (2009) and entrepreneurs (2013). Protest event analysis (PEA) has been recently used by Wenzel (2016) and, currently, Płucienniczak (2017) to research labour protests. Quantitative analysis was also used to explore the relationships between precarious work and the economic circumstances of households (e.g. Kiersztyn 2012).

Finally, we can observe the emergence of critical sociologies of work and labour studies; a rather new phenomenon under post-socialist conditions (cf. Mrozowicki et al. 2015). Even though cooperation between sociologists and trade unions existed in former times, there are some interesting new developments in this respect with regard to the situation of a younger generation of scholars. Firstly, many critically oriented left-wing students

and scholars conducting research on labour are also trade union activists, or members of the new left-wing party *Together* which calls itself a party of the precariat. Secondly, there are organic intellectuals reflecting on labour outside academia, in close relationship with radical social movements and trade unions (Urbański 2014). Studies developed in close cooperation with the labour movement include, for instance, research on women activists in trade unions (Kamińska-Berezowska 2013; Kubisa 2014; Trawinska 2012), trade union renewal (e.g. Czarzasty and Mrozowicki 2014) or workers in special economic zones (Maciejewska 2012). It can be noted that many of the new generation of labour scholars themselves have rather unstable positions in academia, or function outside it, which makes their interest in regulating employment relations and labour activism not just theoretically oriented, but also personally driven.

Conclusions

This chapter presented research orientations, concepts and paradigms developed in Polish sociology of work from 1945 to the present. It argued that the original focus of the sociology of work on the social system of an enterprise was broadened over time due to both socio-political and economic changes in the country and the changing nature of work itself. The identity of the sociology of work as a separate sociological sub-discipline has been challenged since 1989. Firstly, the distinct group of plant sociologists which functioned in state-owned enterprises since 1960s has disappeared in the context of political changes in the country, including, notably, the process of privatisation. Secondly, the sociology of work was accused of representing the *ancient regime* and was consequently replaced by seemingly less troublesome sociological sub-disciplines, such as economic sociology, the sociology of organisation or stratification studies, interdisciplinary research fields, including migration studies or IR research, or by new disciplines, such as human resources management. Thirdly, however, there is the potential for the revival of the sociology of work at the present moment due to a growing public and academic interest in the analysis of work-related phenomena and processes.

One of the main challenges faced by the sociology of work in Poland and elsewhere was the taking over of its traditional research field by managerial sciences (cf. Kamińska-Berezowska 2002). Yet, there are important differences between sociology and human resource management. According to Bohdziewicz (2014, p. 103), "the sociological meanings of concepts

emphasise their social functions and sometimes also their effectiveness and praxeological functions. In the science of human resource management the same concepts and phenomena are the elements of a system of actions which should support the business strategy of an organization and contribute to the creation of economic value." As observed by Kulpińska (2011, p. 174), the full absorption of the sociology of work by management studies is impossible as the latter present mostly a top-down approach and do not take into account the interests and perspectives of labour. Indeed, the recent revival of interest in the sociology of work in Poland, driven mostly by research from a younger generation of scholars, bears a clear critical mark which can be linked to the exhaustion of the "myth of the market" (Kolarska-Bobińska 1998) in Polish society more broadly (Mrozowicki 2014).

Regardless of emergent cross-disciplinary fields, it seems to be obvious that a fruitful inter and cross-disciplinary dialogue is possible so long as some disciplinary boundaries can be established. The analysis presented in the chapter suggests that a distinctively sociological approach, as reflected in the existing traditions of research, tends to combine an actor-centred perspective on work with a critical understanding of its systemic and organisational contexts. Due to its focus on understanding multi-level conditions, the processes and consequences of human work, the field of the sociology of work seems to be broader than that of the sociology of organisations which focuses on the mesosocial level of reality. As it concentrates on work in its market and non-market dimensions (Kozek 2013, pp. 56–67), or productive and reproductive aspects (Federici 2006), the sociology of work is also different from an economic sociology that explores economic phenomena and processes from a sociological perspective (Morawski 2011, p. 15). Nevertheless, defence of disciplinary boundaries is increasingly difficult in a context in which the social definitions and meanings of work are not fixed. Thus, while we can be sure about the future of the sociology of work given its current revitalisation, the dynamic developments in interdisciplinary fields, such as migration studies, IR or precarity research, suggest that theoretical openness is needed to address concrete, work-related problems in the globalised world of the twenty-first century.

Literature

Balcerek, J., & Gilejko, L. (1967). *Społeczno-ekonomiczne funkcje samorządu robot-niczego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Związkowe CRZZ.

Banaszak, S., & Doktór, K. (Eds.). (2011). *Socjologiczne, pedagogiczne i psychologiczne problemy organizacji i zarządzania*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo WSKiZ.

Bednarski, M., & Frieske, K. W. (Eds.). (2012). *Zatrudnienie na czas określony w polskiej gospodarce. Społeczne i ekonomiczne konsekwencje zjawiska*. Warszawa: IPiSS.

Bohdziewicz, P. (2014). Próba zinwentaryzowania i analizy zasadniczych nurtów socjologii pracy, przemysłu i organizacji w badaniach polskich po 1989 roku. *Zarządzanie Zasobami Ludzkimi, 3–4*(98), 104–118.

Bohle, D., & Greskovits, B. (2012). *Capitalist Diversity in Europe's Periphery*. London and Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Borkowski, T., & Marcinkowski, A. (1999). *Socjologia bezrobocia*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Śląsk.

Bsoul, M., & Bylok, F. (Eds.). (2013). *Związki zawodowe w procesie przemian społeczno-gospodarczych w Polsce i wybranych krajach Unii Europejskiej*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Śląsk'.

Bugiel, J. (2012). *Prof. dr hab. Julian Bugiel. Zarys pracy dydaktycznej, naukowej i organizacyjnej*. http://wh.agh.edu.pl/profesorowie-emerytowani/prof-dr-hab-julian-bugiel/241/. Acccessed 4 Jan 2018.

Bugiel, J., & Haber, H. L. (1994). *Zarządzanie a socjologia i psychologia pracy. Wybór tekstów dla studentów uczelni technicznych*. Kraków: AGH.

Bulmer, M. (1975). *Working-Class Images of Society*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Ciarkowski, K., & Jacher, W. (1981). Socjologiczne aspekty wprowadzania czterobrygadowego systemu pracy w górnictwie węgla kamiennego. In *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Śląskiego w Katowicach* (p. 440). Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.

Charkiewicz, E., & Zachorowska-Mazurkiewicz, A. (Eds.). (2009). *Gender i ekonomia opieki*. Warszawa: Biblioteka Think Tanku Feministycznego.

Chomczyński, P. (2008). *Mobbing w pracy z perspektywy interakcyjnej: proces stawania się ofiarą*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Czarzasty, J. (2010). *Stosunki pracy w handlu wielkopowierzchniowym w Polsce*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza SGH.

Czarzasty, J. (Ed.). (2014). *Rokowania zbiorowe w cieniu globalizacji. Rola i miejsce związków zawodowych w korporacjach ponadnarodowych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Scholar'.

Czarzasty, J., & Mrozowicki, A. (2014). *Organizowanie związków zawodowych w Europie. Badania i praktyka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

Czarzasty, J., Mrozowicki, A. (2018). Industrial Relations in Poland: Historical Background, Institutional Evolution and Research Trends. *Employee Relations*. Published online before print in May 2018. https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-04-2017-0082.

Czarzasty, M., Gilejko, L., & Nowacki, G. (1987). *Robotnicy, reforma, rzeczywistość*. Warszawa: Akademia Nauk Społecznych - Instytut Badań Klasy Robotniczej.

Desperak, I. (2015). Precarisation of work in precarious world. *Forum Socjologiczne, Special Issue, 1,* 165–172.

Dobrowolska, D. (1974). *Studia nad znaczeniem pracy dla człowieka*. Wrocław-Warszawa-Kraków: Ossolineum.

Doktór, K. (1964). *Przedsiębiorstwo przemysłowe. Studium socjologiczne Zakładów Przemysłu Metalowego 'H.Cegielski'*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.

Domecka, M. (2014). *Maneuvering Between Opportunities and Constraints. Polish Business People in the Time of Transformation*. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, KU Leuven, Leuven.

Dunn, E. (2004). *Privatizing Poland: Baby Food, Big Business, and the Remaking of Labor*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Dymarczyk, W. (2008). *Temporalny wymiar karier menedżerskich*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Śląsk'.

Federici, S. (2006). *Precarious Labor. A Feminist Viewpoint.* Available at https://inthemiddleofthewhirlwind.wordpress.com/precarious-labor-a-feminist-viewpoint/. Accessed 6 Jan 2018.

Fejfer, K. (2017). *Zawód. Opowieści o pracy w Polsce. To o nas*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Czerwone i Czarne.

Figiel, W., & Ostrowski, P. (2015). The Portrait of an Entrepreneur: Discursive Representation of Employers in the Polish Opinion-Making Weeklies. *Humanizacja Pracy, 3*(281), 67–79.

Gałdzicki, Z. (1967). *Pracownicy przedsiębiorstwa elektronicznego. Studium socjograficzne wrocławskich zakładów elektronicznych ELWRO*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Gałdzicki, Z., Łucewicz, J., Stalewski, T., & Wojtaś, J. (2009). Wrocławski oddział Polskiego Towarzystwa Socjologicznego (1963–1993). In J. Wojtaś (Ed.), *Wrocławskie reminescencje socjologiczne* (pp. 15–38). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo DTSK „Silesia".

Galor, Z. (2006). *Lumpenwłasność: szara strefa i margines społeczny*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Akademii Rolniczej im. Augusta Cieszkowskiego w Poznaniu.

Gardawski, J. (1992). *Robotnicy 1991. Świadomość ekonomiczna w czasach przełomu*. Warszawa: FES.

Gardawski, J. (1996). *Przyzwolenie ograniczone. Robotnicy wobec rynku i demokracji*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Gardawski, J. (Ed.). (2009). *Polacy pracujący a kryzys fordyzmu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Scholar'.

Gardawski, J. (Ed.). (2013). *Rzemieślnicy i biznesmeni. Właściciele małych i średnich przedsiębiorstw prywatnych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Scholar'.

Gardawski, J. (2017). Życie aktywne. Rozmowa z Profesorem Leszkiem Gilejką. In J. Gardawski & R. Towalski (Eds.), *Świat pracy: instytucje i wartości* (pp. 7–48). Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza SGH.

Gardawski, J., Gąciarz, B., Mokrzyszewski, A., & Pańków, W. (Eds.). (1999). *Rozpad bastionu? Związki zawodowe w gospodarce prywatyzowanej*. Warszawa: Instytut Spraw Publicznych.

Giermanowska, E. (2013). *Ryzyko elastyczności czy elastyczność ryzyka. Instytucjonalna analiza kontraktów zatrudnienia*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Giermanowska, E., Kolasińska, E., Mrozowicki, A., & Róg-Ilnicka, J. (2016). Tradition, Present and Future of the Sociology of Work in Poland: Reflections on the Project "Doyens of Sociology of Work". *Warsaw Forum of Economic Sociology, 7*(13), 89–104.

Gilejko, L. (1969). *Związki zawodowe w społeczeństwie kapitalistycznym*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo CRZZ.

Gilejko, L. (2003). *Związki zawodowe a restrukturyzacja: bariery czy kompromis?* Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza SGH.

Gitkiewicz, O. (2017). *Nie hańbi*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Dowody na Istnienie.

Goldthorpe, J. H., Lockwood, D., Bechhofer, F., & Platt, J. (1968). *The Affluent Worker: Industrial Attitudes and Behaviour*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gorgoń, J., Kieńć, W., Machnikowski, M., Maciejewska, M., Marszałek, M., & Skoczylas, T. (2013). *Fabryka kultury – praca i wolontariat przy festiwalach kulturalnych*. Wrocław: SIWK.

Górny, A., Grabowska-Lusińska, I., Lesińska, M., & Okólski, M. (2010). *Transformacja nieoczywista. Polska jako kraj imigracji*. Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego: Warszawa.

Grabowska-Lusińska, I. (2012). *Migrantów ścieżki zawodowe bez granic*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Scholar'.

Halford, S., & Strangleman, T. (2009). In Search of the Sociology of Work: Past, Present and Future. *Sociology, 43*(5), 811–828.

Hardy, J. (2009). *Poland's New Capitalism*. London: Pluto Press.

Hardy, J., Kozek, W., & Stenning, A. (2008). In the Front Line: Women, Work and New Spaces of Labour Politics in Poland. *Gender, Place and Culture, 15*(2), 99–116.

Hausner, J. (1995). Formowanie się stosunków pracy i reprezentacji interesów w Polsce w warunkach transformacji ustrojowej. In T. Kowalik (Ed.), *Negocjacje. Droga do paktu społecznego. Doświadczenia, treść, partnerzy, formy*. Warszawa: IPiPS.

Holstein-Beck, M. (1978). *Konflikty*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo CRZZ.

Hryniewicz, J. (2012). *Stosunki pracy w polskich organizacjach*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Scholar'.

Janicka, K. (1997). *Sytuacja pracy a struktura społeczna. W poszukiwaniu nowego wymiaru pozycji społeczno-zawodowej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.

Januszek, H., & Sikora, J. (1998). *Socjologia pracy*. Poznan: Akademia Ekonomiczna.

Jarosz, M. (1967). *Samorząd robotniczy w przedsiębiorstwie przemysłowym*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.

Jarosz, M. (1996). *Spółki pracownicze '95*. Warszawa: ISP.

Jarosz, M. (2001). *Manowce polskiej prywatyzacji*. Warszawa: PWN.

Jasiecki, K. (1996). Przedsiębiorcy jako aktor transformacji. *Studia Socjologiczne, 1,* 115–134.

Jasiecki, K. (2013). *Kapitalizm po polsku. Między modernizacją a peryferiami Unii Europejskiej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.

Jędrzycki, W. (1971). *Socjolog w zakładzie pracy*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Jędrzycki, W. (1979). *Humanizacja pracy i kierowania*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo CRZZ.

Kamińska-Berezowska, S. (2002). *Socjolog w zakładzie pracy - nowe wyzwania i perspektywy*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Kamińska-Berezowska, S. (2013). *Kobiety w wybranych segmentach polskiego ruchu związkowego a równość płci. Studium z zastosowanie teorii Pierre'a Bourdieu*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Kiersztyn, A. (2012). Analiza ekonomicznych konsekwencji zatrudnienia na czas określony dla jednostek i gospodarstw domowych. In M. Bednarski & K. Frieske (Eds.), *Zatrudnienie na czas określony w polskiej gospodarce. Społeczne i ekonomiczne konsekwencje zjawiska* (pp. 93–121). Warszawa: IPiSS.

Kilias, J. (2014). Zapomniana profesja? Socjologia pracy i socjologowie zakładowi w Polsce. In P. Binder (Ed.), *Lokalne, narodowe, inne...Księga dla Profesor Joanny Kurczewskiej* (pp. 423–435). Warszawa: IFIS PAN.

Kilias, J. (2017). *Goście ze Wschodu. Socjologia polska lat sześćdziesiątych XX wieku a nauka światowa*. Kraków: Zakład Wydawniczy Nomos.

Kindler, M. (2011). *Risky Business? Ukrainian Migrant Women in Warsaw's Domestic Work Sector*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Kochanowicz, J., & Marody, M. (2010). *Kultura i gospodarka*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Scholar'.

Kolarska-Bobińska, L. (1998). Egalitaryzm i interesy grupowe w procesie zmian ustrojowych. In W. Adamski (Ed.), *Polacy '95. Aktorzy i klienci transformacji* (pp. 121–143). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFIS PAN.

Kolasińska, E., Róg-Ilnicka, J., & Mrozowicki, A. (Eds.). (2017). *Praca w XXI wieku. Wymiary formalne i nieformalne*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Katedra'.

Kołodziej-Durnaś, A. (2017). *Kultura organizacji – idea i instrumentalizacja. Socjologiczne studium krytyczne*. Szczecin: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego.

Konecki, K. (1992). *Nowi pracownicy a kultura organizacyjna przedsiębiorstwa. Studium folkloru fabrycznego*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Konecki, K., & Chomczyński, P. (Eds.). (2007). *Zarządzanie organizacjami. Organizacja jako proces*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Konecki, K., & Kacperczyk, A. (Eds.). (2010). *Procesy tożsamościowe. Symboliczno-interakcyjny wymiar konstruowania ładu i nieładu społecznego*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Kordasiewicz, A. (2016). *(U)sługi domowe. Przemiany relacji społecznych w płatnej pracy domowej*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo UMK.

Kozek, W. (1993). Rynek pracy. Socjologiczne interpretacje podstawowych pojęć'. *Studia socjologiczne, 1,* 51–64.

Kozek, W. (Ed.). (1997). *Zbiorowe stosunki pracy w Polsce w perspektywie integracji europejskiej*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Scholar'.

Kozek, W. (2003). Destruktorzy. Tendencyjny obraz związków zawodowych w tygodnikach politycznych w Polsce. In W. Kozek (Ed.), *Instytucjonalizacja stosunków pracy w Polsce* (pp. 161–185). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Scholar'.

Kozek, W. (Ed.). (2012). *Gra o jutro usług publicznych w Polsce*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Kozek, W. (2013). *Rynek pracy. Perspektywa instytucjonalna*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Kozek, W., Kubisa, J., & Ostrowski, P. (2005). Bliżej junk job niż working poor. Nisko kwalifikowana nisko płatna praca w usługach w Polsce. *Polityka społeczna, 10,* 1–8.

Kraśko, N. (1996). *Instytucjonalizacja socjologii w Polsce 1920–1970*. Warszawa: PWN.

Kraśko, N. (2010). *Instytucjonalizacja socjologii w Polsce 1970–2000*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Kryńska, E. (1996). *Segmentacja rynku pracy. Podstawy teoretyczne i analiza statystyczna*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Kubisa, J. (2014). *Bunt białych czepków. Analiza działalności związkowej pielęgniarek i położnych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

Kuczyński, P. (1994). Badanie „Solidarności": kontekst społeczny i kontekst polityczny. In P. Kuczyński, M. Frybes, J. Strzelecki, & D. Lapeyronnie (Eds.), *W poszukiwaniu ruchu społecznego. Wokół socjologii Alaina Touraine'a* (pp. 111–121). Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.

Kulpińska, J. (1985). Hipoteza o nowej klasie robotniczej. In S. Nowakowski (Ed.), *Społeczeństwo i socjologia. Księga poświęcona Profesorowi Janowi Szczepańskiemu*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Kulpińska, J. (1998). *Stosunki przemysłowe w Polsce w perspektywie integracji europejskiej* (pp. 103–114). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Scholar'.

Kulpińska, J. (2011). Nowe koncepcje w socjologii organizacji i zarządzania. In S. Banaszak & K. Doktór (Eds.), *Socjologiczne, pedagogiczne i psychologiczne problemy organizacji i zarządzania* (pp. 171–178). Poznań: Wydawnictwo WSKiZ.

Kurcz, Z. (1992). *Wzór robotnika i jego przemiany w PRL*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Kurczewska, J. (2006). Socjologia polska w latach 1944–1989 w służbie społeczeństwa, siebie samej i/lub władzy. In U. Jakubowska & J. Myśliński (Eds.), *Humanistyka polska w latach 1945–1990* (pp. 96–126). Warszawa: Fundacja Akademia Humanistyczna and Instytut Badań Literackich PAN.

Kurczewski, J. (2006 [1981]). The Social Functions of Solidarity. *Polish Sociological Review*, *153*(1), 111–127.

Lazzarato, M. (1996). Immaterial Labor. In P. Virno & M. Hard (Eds.), *Radical Thought in Italy. A Potential Politics* (pp. 133–149). Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.

Leoński, J. (1987). *Drogi życiowe i świadomość społeczna robotników polskich*. Poznań: PWN.

Maciejewska, M. (2012). *Zmęczone ciała i bezcenne produkty. Warunki pracy kobiet w specjalnej strefie ekonomicznej przemysłu elektronicznego*. Biblioteka Think Tanku Feministycznego. Available at http://www.ekologiasztuka.pl/pdf/strefy_raport_maciejewska_2012.pdf. Accessed 6 Jan 2018.

Maciejewska, M. (2013). *Transformacja i jej konsekwencje dla społecznej reprodukcji w regionie wałbrzyskim. Warunki życia i pracy kobiet*. Unpublished Ph.D. manuscript, Faculty of Social Sciences, Wrocław.

Malanowski, J. (1981). *Polscy robotnicy*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.

Matejko, A. (1961). *Socjologia zakładu pracy*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.

Matejko, A. (1962). *Socjologia przemysłu w Stanach Zjednoczonych Ameryki*. Warszawa: PWN.

Matejko, A. (1969). *Więź i konflikt w zakładzie pracy*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.

Meardi, G., & Gardawski, J. (2010). Keep Trying? Polish Failures and Half-successes in Social Pacting. In Ph. Pochet, M. Keune, & D. Natali (Eds.), *After the Euro and Enlargement: Social Pacts in the EU* (pp. 371–394). Brussels: ETUI and OSE.

Morawski, W. (1973). *Samorząd robotniczy w gospodarce socjalistycznej*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.

Morawski, W. (1997). Stosunki pracy w Polsce a wzory zewnętrzne. In W. Kozek (Ed.), *Zbiorowe stosunki pracy w Polsce w perspektywie integracji europejskiej* (pp. 45–57). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Scholar'.

Morawski, W. (2011). *Socjologia ekonomiczna. Problemy. Teoria. Empiria*. Warszawa: PWN.

Mrozowicki, A. (2011). *Coping with Social Change. Life Strategies of Workers in Poland's New Capitalism*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Mrozowicki, A. (2014). 'Odczarowanie rynku'? Socjologiczne refleksje o konsekwencjach globalnego kryzysu ekonomicznego w Polsce. *Przegląd socjologiczny, 64*(4), 67–91.

Mrozowicki, A. (2015). Socjologia pracy - perspektywy odbudowy subdyscypliny. *Humanizacja pracy, 1*(279), 13–23.

Mrozowicki, A., Karolak, M., & Krasowska, A. (2016). Between Commitment and Indifference. Trade Unions, Young Workers and the Expansion of Precarious

Employment in Poland. In V. Delteil & V. Kirov (Eds.), *Labour and Social Transformation in Central and Eastern Europe: Europeanization and Beyond* (pp. 228–246). London and New York: Routledge.

Mrozowicki, A., Stewart, P., & Zentai, V. (2015). Critical Labour Studies in Hungary. *Poland and the UK: Between Crisis and Revitalization, Forum Socjologiczne, Special Issue, 1,* 19–34.

Mucha, J., & Keen, M. F. (2010). Postcommunist Democratization and the Practice of Sociology in Central and Eastern Europe. In S. Patel (Ed.), *The ISA Handbook of Diverse Sociological Traditions* (pp. 129–139). London: Sage.

Muszalski, W., & Sarapata, A. (1973). *Stabilizacja kadr. Zaganienia społeczne, ekonomiczne i prawne*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.

Narojek, W. (1982). *Struktura społeczna w doświadczeniu jednostki. Studium z socjologii współczesnego społeczeństwa polskiego*. Warszawa: Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Okólski, M. (Ed.). (2001). *Ludzie na huśtawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe 'Scholar'.

Ost, D. (2000). Illusory Corporatism in Eastern Europe: Neoliberal Tripartism and Post-communist Class Identities. *Politics and Society, 28*(4), 503–530.

Ost, D. (2005). *The Defeat of Solidarity. Anger and Politics in Postcommunist Eastern Europe*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Ostrowski, P. (2009). *Powstawanie związków zawodowych w sektorze prywatnym w Polsce*. Warszawa: C.H. Beck.

Pańków, W. (1993). *Instytucje pracy w procesach transformacji (polskie doświadczenia z lat 1990–1992)*. Warszawa: IFiS PAN.

Parkin, F. (1971). *Class Inequality and Political Order. Social Stratification in Capitalist and Communist Societies*. New York: Praeger.

Płucienniczak, P. (2017, September 6–7). *Threats & Strikes: Labour Collective Action in Poland, 2004–2016*. Paper Presented During the IREC Conference 2017 in Warsaw.

Pohoski, M., & Słomczyński, K. (1978). *Społeczna klasyfikacja zawodów*. Warszawa: IFiS PAN.

Poławski, P. (2012). Precarious Generation on the Polish Labour Market. *Polityka Społeczna* (English Edition), *1,* 15–22.

Prawda, M. (1987). *Cykl życia jednostki a wartość pracy*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Rakowski, T. (2009). *Łowcy, zbieracze, praktycy niemocy. Etnografia człowieka zdegradowanego*. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo słowo/obraz terytoria.

Reszke, I. (1977). *Następstwa rozbieżności między poziomami zarobków i kwalifikacji*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Reszke, I. (1999). *Wobec bezrobocia: opinie, stereotypy*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Śląsk.

Sarapata, A. (Ed.). (1965). *Socjologia zawodów*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.

Sarapata, A., & Doktór, K. (1962). *Elementy socjologii przemysłu, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne*. Warszawa.

Slany, K. (Ed.). (1997). *Orientacje emigracyjne Polaków*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Kwadrat.

Ślęzak, I. (2016). *Praca kobiet świadczących usługi seksualne w agencjach towarzyskich*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Słomczyński, K. M. (1972). *Zróżnicowanie społeczno-zawodowe i jego korelaty*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Słomczyński, K. M., Miller, J., & Kohn, M. (1981). Stratification, Work and Values: A Polish-United States Comparison. *American Sociological Review, 46*(6), 720–744.

Sowa, J. (2010). Prekariat - proletariat epoki globalizacji. In J. Sokołowska (Ed.), *Robotnicy opuszczają miejsca pracy* (pp. 100–132). Łódź: Muzeum Sztuki w Łodzi.

Sroka, J. (2000). *Europejskie stosunki przemysłowe w perspektywie porównawczej*. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Standing, G. (2011). *Precariat. New Dangerous Class*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Staniszkis, J. (1972). *Patologie struktur organizacyjnych. Próba podejścia systemowego*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Staniszkis, J. (1984). *Poland's Self-Limiting Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Starski, S. [Magala, S.] (1982). *Class Struggle in Classless Poland*. Cambridge: South End Press.

Sułek, A. (2006). Dlaczego socjologia nie przewidziała Solidarności i co z tego wynikło? In A. Sułek (Ed.), *Solidarność. Wydarzenie, konsekwencje, pamięć* (pp. 255–269). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo IFiS PAN.

Sułek, A. (2011). 'Do Ameryki!' Polscy socjologowie w Stanach Zjednoczonych po 1956 roku i rozwój socjologii empirycznej w Polsce. In A. Sułek (Ed.), *Obrazy z życia socjologii w Polsce* (pp. 96–141). Warszawa: Oficyna Naukowa.

Sundararajan, A. (2017). *The Sharing Economy. The End of Employment and the Rise of Crowd-Based Capitalism*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Surmaczyński, M. (1966). *Rola dozoru średniego w WZE Elwro we Wrocławiu*. Wrocław.

Swadźba, U. (2001). *Śląski etos pracy. Studium Socjologiczne*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Szalai, J. (2015). Disquieted Relations. West Meeting East in Contemporary Sociological Research. *Intersections, 1*(2), 12–37.

Szczepański, J. (Ed.). (1967). *Socjologiczne problemy industrializacji w Polsce Ludowej*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Szreder, K. (2016). *ABC Projektariatu. O nędzy projektowego życia*. Warszawa: Fundacja Bęc Zmiana.

Sztandar-Sztanderska, K. (2016). *Obywatel spotyka państwo. O urzędach pracy jako biurokracji pierwszego kontaktu*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

Sztumski, J. (1979). *Konflikt w miejscu pracy*. Warszawa: Instytut Wydawniczy CRZZ.

Sztumski, J. (1999). *Socjologia pracy*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo GWSzH.

Tittenbrun, J. (2012). *Gospodarka w społeczeństwie. Zarys socjologii gospodarki i socjologii ekonomicznej w ujęciu strukturalizmu socjoekonomicznego*. Poznań: Zysk i S-ka.

Touraine, A., Dubet, F., Wieviorka, M., & Strzelecki, J. (1983). *Solidarity. Poland 1980–81*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Towalski, R. (2011). *Dialog społeczny w Europie Środkowej i Wschodniej w procesie integracji europejskiej (na przykładzie krajów Grupy Wyszehradzkiej)*. Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza SGH.

Trawinska, M. (2012). *Kobiety w związkach zawodowych w społeczeństwie polskim. Socjologiczna analiza aktywności kobiet w sferze publicznej*. Unpublished Ph.D. manuscript, Faculty of Social Sciences, Wrocław.

Urbańska, S. (2015). *Matka Polka na odległość. Z doświadczeń migracyjnych robotnic 1989–2010*. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika.

Urbański, J. (2014). *Prekariat i nowa walka klas. Przeobrażenia współczesnej klasy pracowniczej i jej formy walki*. Warszawa: IWKiP.

Wagner, I. (2011). *Becoming Transnational Professional. Kariery i mobilność polskich elit naukowych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

Walczak-Duraj, D. (1988). *Ideologiczne i instytucjonalne uwarunkowania ethosu pracy klasy robotniczej*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Walczak-Duraj, D. (Ed.). (2011). *Przemiany pracy, postaw i ról zawodowych*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

Waniek, K. (Ed.). (2012). Wykluczenie, marginalność oraz praca w doświadczeniach biograficznych. *Folia sociologica, 41*, 5–12.

Wenzel, M. (2016). *Labour Protests in Poland. Trade Unions and Employee Interest Articulation After Socialism*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Wesołowski, W. (1969). *Klasa robotnicza i przeobrażenia struktury społecznej w PRL*. Warszawa: Książka i Wiedza.

Widerszpil, S. (1965). *Skład polskiej klasy robotniczej*. Warszawa: PWN.

Wójcik, P. (1988). *Położenie i aspiracje klasy robotniczej w Polsce*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo MON.

Woś, R. (2017). *To nie jest kraj dla pracowników*. Warszawa: W.A.B.

Zarycki, T. (2008). Socjologia krytyczna na peryferiach. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo, 52*(4), 105–121.

Ziółkowski, M. (1990). *Robotnicy '84 - '85. Świadomość społeczna pracowników czterech wielkich zakładów przemysłowych*. Warszawa: PAN.

9

Sociology of Work in Hungary

Violetta Zentai

Introduction

Broadly speaking, critical approaches to labour relations contribute to the study of relations of power in the production process and wider societal relations. These inquiries also usher in a search for the human condition in which work is exempted from exploitation, contributing to dignified life. In the Hungarian context, these objectives translate to the critique of labour processes shaped by bureaucratic relations of production during socialism and by global capitalist expansion after the fall of state socialism. Although the study of socialism tends to mobilize the values of liberal capitalism and the review of capitalism is often pursued from socialist ideals, the grounds for critical explanation are more complex and diverse. Thus, critical labour studies before and after 1989 are not the mirror image of each other. The chapter uncovers key themes, approaches, and positions in the field of labour sociology in Hungary as these reflect upon systemic conditions in the

The chapter relies on some arguments developed in an earlier article by Mrozowicki et al. (2015).

V. Zentai (✉)
Center for Policy Studies, Central European University, Budapest, Hungary
e-mail: zentaiv@ceu.edu

dominant economic regime and mobilize, or depart from, scholarly traditions in the field.

The chapter will discuss two stages in the development of the sociology of labour in Hungary. The first stage emerged with the re-establishment of sociology in Hungarian academia in the 1960s and lasted until the end of state socialism in 1989. Labour-related inquiries examined labour relations at the workplace, the role of work in shaping status in society, and the actual lives of workers in existing socialism. These inquiries began to challenge the ideological tenets of the party-state regime, in particular its vision of an empowered and homogenous working class. Leading scholars investigated the composition and living conditions of industrial workers, the socio-economic inequalities and stratification among them, and explored the bargaining power and practices of workers in conflict with management within state socialist plants. These critical inquiries unveiled hierarchical and often exploitative relations within state socialist industrial structures. The related field of economic sociology examined the peculiar Hungarian economic system in existing socialism which experimented with elements of market exchange in organizing production that fundamentally shaped relations between state and society.

In the second stage of labour sociology following 1989, the meaning of *critical* has become multiple. A group of scholars have begun to monitor the post-socialist capitalist transition in Hungary and Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) from within the standards of democratic capitalist models. They have ventured to explain late modern capitalism and its direct and indirect impact on the status of labour and labour markets in post-socialist settings. A distinctive chapter in the Hungarian labour literature explores the transformations of labour relations through the renewed concept of class in order to elaborate a comprehensive critique of capitalism. Finally, an important track of scholarship has also begun to examine formations of vulnerabilities across and within wage labour along the divides of ethnicity, migration, gender, and space. The chapter will discuss these major streams of thought in the sociology of labour by revealing some wider intellectual and scholarly encounters, transnational theoretical discussions, and local social and political conditions in post-socialist Hungary. The separation between the two periods, before and after 1989, may wrongly create an image of rupture which rarely happens in the production of ideas. However differences for sure existed between the two eras and these will be discussed below.

Scholarship Under State Socialism

Sociological and sociologically informed research on labour and wage-labourers emerged in two broader domains in Hungary, similarly to other Central and East European contexts. On the one hand, research on workers in the production process usually focused on shop floor activities. On the other, research concerned the social position of workers as a group or class and objects, and subjects, in socialist industrial modernity. In the first theme, sociologists found an alliance with labour and institutional economists, whereas in the second theme, sociologists often collaborated with essayists and novelists.

The Re-establishment of the Field of Sociology

As in other Central and East European countries, critical social science in Hungary was seriously constrained during the state socialist regime. Sociology became a prohibited field of study following the communist take-over in 1949. It was re-established as a tolerated discipline in the early 1960s and as a legitimate subject in academic training only in the 1970s. The independent Research Group for Sociology was created within the Institute of Philosophy of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences in 1963. András Hegedüs, a Marxist scholar with former political engagement was appointed to director. In parallel, the Central Statistical Office embarked on newly designed social statistical research by involving competent sociologists. The two groups engaged in an intensive dialogue with each other and embraced both senior and young thinkers.

The early socialist take-off of the discipline was tied to a tangible interest in labour studies in both rural and industrial contexts. In the former, the Hungarian intellectual tradition was particularly rich in the first half of the century. According to the official ideological dogma after 1945, the egalitarian socialist system embraced two major social classes, the workers and the peasants, whose alliance was supported by the intellectuals. Society was portrayed as one excluding exploitation, antagonism, and harmful hierarchies. A homogeneous working class was seen to resonate with the revolutionary drive and mission of the communist party. The emerging sociological inquiry sought to question this reductionist concept of society by challenging the empty concept of class and the purified and ahistorical vision of workers.

The founding director of the Research Group for Sociology, Hegedüs, embarked on research on industrial workers and proposed that the control

over one's and others' work together with the necessary competence defines people's position in the division of labour. He revealed that social groups were formed according to the character of work in different occupations and that these constituted the basis of social stratification (Hegedüs 1966, pp. 65–75). Hegedüs and his colleagues also revealed that alienation in work was also widespread in socialism and humanization of work remained an unfulfilled goal of the early decades of socialism (Hegedüs and Márkus 1966). In short, Hegedüs conceived of sociology as a reflexive account of socialism imbued with critical potentialities for a Marxist renewal. This drive generated immediate disapproval by the spokespersons of an ideologically correct scholarship of the time. As a young researcher of the National Statistical Office, Zsuzsa Ferge, in her first major social stratification research, questioned the Stalinist class model of society in ways echoing Hegedüs. Her research captured the relevance of work form and type as opposed to property relations in shaping societal structures. As early as 1969, her empirical inquiry also revealed that material inequalities did exist during socialism due to the type of work in the production process and school system that continued to reproduce social inequalities in socialist Hungary. The children of working-class parents received worse grades in school than those of employees and intellectuals (Ferge 1969). The stratification of society seemed to speak well about the nature of the dominant social hierarchies of the time and marked a departure from Stalinist ideological tropes in empirical research. This direction resonated with wider currents in the international scholarship of the time using the language of "social layers" (Éber 2012).

A path-breaking line of thought was developed by István Kemény, vastly knowledgeable in classical and modern social theory, who investigated the differentiation among workers by observing their family and educational backgrounds in addition to their living and working conditions. Relying on the social critique and social history of the interwar period, he discovered tangible inequalities in terms of access to positions, remuneration, and social mobility. Kemény (1971, 1972, 1990) showed that the industrial working class was differentiated according to its place in the division of labour: commuting or migrating workers of lesser qualification occupied lower ranks in the production hierarchy than more skilled ones from the old working-class families who monopolized the posts of functionaries, foremen, and other key positions in production. He also found that instead of a unifying revolutionary consciousness, groups of workers had different political and collective identities. This diversified working-class consciousness diverted significantly from the teachings of the official ideology. Kemény applied social statistics and also immersed himself in plant ethnography. He

continued to explore working-class topics in the subsequent years but was rarely published. His critical approach, passion for his subject, and methodological competence inspired future generations of sociologists. When turning to problems of poverty and the Roma, Kemény faced even more explicit resistance from the party.

Another stream of research emerged in the 1970s through interest in the bargaining power of workers and the divide between management and workers within socialist industrial firms. Scholars attracted to these topics demonstrated a variegated critical stance with regard to the socialist regime. Csaba Makó and Lajos Héthy conducted pioneering studies on the informal bargaining power of groups of skilled workers in key positions in production. By conducting in-depth empirical observations in a giant model plant of socialist industry, Héthy and Makó portrayed how highly skilled workers were able to successfully represent their interests in wage disputes against management. Different groups of workers, foremen and managers tried to fight for their interests by means of often manipulative tactics. Trade unions did not stand behind workers since they argued that they were not entitled to raise wage-related issues with management. The researchers claimed that the outcome embodied 'harmful compromises'. They concluded that power sharing and fair and transparent interest representation would eliminate these negative practices in the belief that all this was possible in socialism (Héthy and Makó 1972, 1978). Héthy also studied other groups of workers in the construction industry demonstrating their bargaining power. These scholars later became engaged in management studies and post-socialist economic and business transformations. Interestingly, their work was tolerated by the regime and its academic institutions.

Few empirical investigations concerning the realm of labour, and more broadly the political economy of state socialism, became known to the wider international public in the Cold-War period. A notable exception was Miklós Haraszti's factory ethnography, *Unit Wage: A Worker in the Workers' State* written in 1972 but published only in Germany in 1975 (Haraszti 1977). Haraszti became a factory worker after he was expelled from university for voicing critical leftist views and he subsequently became a leading figure in the Hungarian dissident movement. The book uncovered the way in which 'socialist' Fordist production was saturated by labour exploitation. Workers did not consider the factory as their own, in stark contrast to the ideological propositions of the system. They used various tricks to seduce company managers: they stole from collective property without conscience, cheated on performance measures and neglected safety regulations. Workers detested the ruling elite within the factory. Haraszti's monograph conveyed a similar

picture to that provided by Héthy and Makó, in his account of the way in which managers and workers were locked in a production logic whereby firms tried to hoard a reserve of labour as a buttress against bureaucratic uncertainties whereas workers, by contrast, withheld their labour in production (Stark 1989, p. 15). The writer's account was much more critical than that of the sociologist. Yet, it was rich in substantial empirical data in describing workers' political opinions both of their supervisors and the system as a whole.

Although class was a suspect concept among critical scholars, some of them did contemplate social theory and analysis based on positions occupied in the production process during socialism. György Konrád and Ivan Szelényi in *The Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power*, a samizdat book written in the early 1970s, argued that a new class of intellectuals was evolving in state socialist society: technocratic and humanistic intellectuals in alliance with ruling party officials took control of state redistribution and state property. They obtained major advantages and privileges by appropriating the dividends of the surplus product that workers produced (Konrád and Szelényi 1979). In parallel to this work, Konrád and Szelényi produced empirically sustained studies on housing conditions in relation to social hierarchies in Hungarian society. Their influential article on delayed urban development serving forced industrialization (Konrád and Szelényi 1972) was an explicit critique of socialist recognition, or lack of recognition, of workers' needs. A weak urban infrastructure policy forced, especially the 'new working class', from rural areas, and those with lesser skills, to pursue a dual life by securing housing and additional revenue outside urban centres. This not only generated double working hours for these workers but detached them from the collective lives and spirit of the industrial working class. The critical fervour in this politically important scholarship directly targeted social hierarchies and conflicts in existing socialism. The provocative language challenged social policy measures, a political economy that treated workers as simply resources, and addressed class conflict. The effect was to push sociology in general to sharpen its theoretical and analytical tools so as to understand the nature of wage labour in socialism.

The researchers of two formative post-Stalinist decades of sociology in Hungary captured the labour process through empirical studies of micro-practices of job control and resistance, and individual and informal, as well as collective and organized, bargains. Parallel to this, sociologists strove to conceptualize the logic of social and political-bureaucratic power in a period when not even genuine Marxism was a welcome theoretical frame of reference. Some sociologists had a sharp eye focussed on power relations,

hypocritically concealed or downplayed, in the process of production and social reproduction, between and within social groups, urban and rural spaces, and between those who practised political leadership and the rest of society. They strove for constantly widening the intellectual space for critical inquiry, resonating with international intellectual developments, and thus taking seriously the profession of sociology. Most of them, in particular Ferge, Kemény, and Szelényi later became trend-setting scholars in the discipline of sociology in Hungary or in exile.[1]

Sociology's takeoff within labour inquiries was strongly connected to the process whereby the party-state began to cautiously loosen its grip on societal and scholarly affairs following the consolidation of the Kádár regime and the introduction of new economic mechanisms in 1968. This period of relative relaxation in the field of knowledge production did not endure. The disciples of the philosopher György Lukács were expelled from their positions, and István Kemény was first banned from publishing and left the country in the early 1970s. By the middle of 1970s, Szelényi was forced to emigrate and Konrád had to give up his sociological career. The old Stalinist scholarship had no chance to be re-established in social sciences, but scholars of critical ideas had to seek compromise or take up a dissident voice with all its consequences. Some contemporary young scholars argue that Hungarian sociology retreated behind the lines of anti-ideological methodological and empirical professionalism, compatible with Western standards (Éber and Gagyi 2015). In fact, this landscape looked more nuanced including in the field of labour studies.

Parallel to the academic and scholarly re-institutionalization of sociology, another development in critical thought took place. Literary scholars and writers also became inspired by the call to offer genuine accounts of the lives of those who were either the cherished heroes of the socialist regime, at one end, and the ones who were marked as alien to the system, at the other end, or simply remained ideologically unmarked and irrelevant. The genre of *sociography* emerged in the Hungarian intellectual and cultural landscape—in fact re-emerged—and was cultivated by a series of monographs published by a major literary publishing house (*Magvető*). The series was initiated and legitimized by the official leaders of cultural politics with a 'recommendation' to compare the state of affairs before and after the start of

---

[1]As for the milestones of institutionalization, The Research Group was elevated to an Institute in 1968, and in the early 1970s, departments for sociology were established at ELTE and Karl Marx University. The leading journal of the discipline in the early years, launched in 1972, was *Szociológia* (Sociology).

the socialist regime—with Marxist backing. The series *Magyarország felfedezése* (Discovery of Hungary) harked back to a pre-socialist series with the same title. Scholars, writers, and intellectuals, who sought opportunities to embark on empirical explorations in society with no ideological control took advantage of this new opening outside of an academic setting. The genre allowed and invited a variety of styles of writing and reasoning but a common interest was shared in the promotion of bottom-up views, unacknowledged social actors and spaces and autonomous authorship. From the early 1970s, social and literary journals also opened their gates to the genre of sociography[2] (Bartha 2013).

Although internal debates were concerned with authenticity, credibility and relevance, the genre was built on an explicit interest in inequalities, injustice and marginalities. The main subjects of this work were blue collar workers (miners, railway operators, steel factory workers, etc.) in difficult labour conditions, women and Roma at the bottom of the labour market, groups entrapped in undeveloped areas and those otherwise economically disadvantaged. Documentary monographs, case studies based on thick ethnographic description and written with literary erudition were published, couched in ways that avoided open political critique. One of the first monographs by György Moldova portrayed the labour conditions and the hardship of miners employed in a major coal mining company in the 'socialist' city of Komló (1971). The often-heroic biographies of miners revealed the hard toil of socialist industrialization, a particular manifestation of industrial modernity which did not refer to systemic failures or tensions, but nevertheless disclosed brutal working conditions. One of the most influential and widely read sociographies of the working class written by György Berkovits (1976) unveiled the life of industrial workers who lived in the vicinity of urban industrial centres including the capital. They had lower education and engaged in unskilled jobs. They faced much higher housing costs than their peers in the city and participated in additional income generation, typically in agricultural production. Their social ties to the factory appeared to be loose, remaining largely outside of plant labour affairs. This portrayal endorsed the scholarly account of an important group of workers already acknowledged by Konrád and Szelényi.

---

[2]The most important journals included *Valóság, Forrás, Kortárs* (original Hungarian titles).

The Rise of the Second Economy
and Intellectual Partnership with Economists

The introduction of the New Economic Mechanism in Hungary in 1968 resulted in a softening of some of the orthodox structures of the centrally planned economy. As a direct response to challenges of the day, the reforms sought to handle pressing inefficiencies, growing energy costs, major shortages in consumer goods, and facilitate an increase of living standards viewed as the price for political quiescence. By relaxing plan directives and central resource allocations, firms received more autonomy in investment, trading among themselves, and wage decisions, and workers were allowed to change jobs. Without changing the commitment to state dominance and notably regarding property, cooperative and private property were declared part of the socialist economy. The reform generated more autonomy in the daily organization of production and the management of the labour force within the firm. This opened new opportunities and limits to bargaining between socialist firms and workers (Kornai 1989; Seleny 2006).

In addition to realigning management and incentive structures of industrial production, the Hungarian regime also experimented with policy reform in agriculture from the late 1960s. This entailed reforming the strictly hierarchical ties between state agricultural farms and households and encouraging a new symbiosis between the two domains. Market elements of production and coordination were introduced, household production was acknowledged, and agricultural farms were encouraged to pursue auxiliary activities other than agricultural ones. Small-scale and largely part-time economic activities were encouraged in the service sector and housing by mobilizing labour and the network resources of individuals and households (Kovách and Kuczi 1982; Juhász 1982; Sik 1987). The reform efforts proved that the party-state started to tolerate activities that earlier were seen as illegal or subversive. Employees and households revised their strategies for exploiting their time, labour force and decisions between different domains of the economy. These new opportunities unleashed both rural and urban households' aspirations for income generation. The social and economic outcomes of these reforms coalesced in a whole system which was later called the *second economy* (Gábor 1979b; Gábor and Galasi 1981) replacing the notion of invisible economy. Eminent sociologists and economists examined the broader consequences of the duality of the first and second economies. Furthermore, as part of a fifteen-year-long research initiative conducted by the Institute for Social Sciences of the Central Committee of the Hungarian

Socialist Party, the issue of the second economy received greater attention. Although the term was used first in Hungarian print in 1979, these activities had been discussed throughout the 1970s. At the Karl Marx University of Economics (Budapest), the Department of Labour Studies became a leading centre of scholarship exploring the many faces and instances of the second economy (Sik 1996).

The coexistence of the two domains of the economy led to social and economic conflicts between managers and workers, and different groups of employees, respectively. Managers of state firms had to accommodate the consequences of shifting availabilities for conducting meaningful and productive work by wage labourers. By the second half of the 1970s, a significant part of the Hungarian working population, particularly those industrial workers cultivating household farms, considered their engagement in the low-wage state economy as the price to be paid for their expanding opportunities in the second economy. The double engagement widened the gap between the earning possibilities of the two spheres. This made it more difficult for managers to influence workers' behaviour and meet productivity and output expectations in the socialist firm. The partly symbiotic and partly competitive relations between the two domains perpetuated extremely unstable and highly complex labour market relations in the first economy which still suffered from manpower shortages and low labour innovation and productivity. The understanding that the second economy provided a much higher income for workers made them believe that higher earnings in the state sector were blocked by managers. By contrast, managers believed that the cause of lower productivity was due to the fact of workers' enhanced participation in the second economy (Kővári and Sziráczki 1985).

Inspired by a compelling local tradition of sociology of rural society and the agrarian economy, by the relative 'successes' of socialist Hungarian agriculture, and by massive changes in the circumstances of the rural population, a powerful and internationally acknowledged scholarship emerged in the 1970s. A peculiar research outlet, the Research Institute on Cooperatives, assigned to explore the development of cooperative arrangements in the economy, was led by an open-minded former party cadre in 1968–1985. The institution bravely hosted critical social scientists, many of whom joined the core group of the Hungarian dissident movement. The most outstanding and prolific researcher, Pál Juhász, described himself as an agrarian economist and sociologist. He explored agrarian production systems, institutions, labour relations, reform cycles and social reactions to those cycles. From the late 1970s, he examined the planned economy and redistributive management in agrarian production, and the expansion

of the second economy. Most importantly, he became the reference point with regard to Taylorist transformation of socialist cooperatives from the late 1960s, the hierarchy of the labour force within the cooperatives, the struggle between management and the old leadership, the transformative impact of the second economy, and the changing nature of the lives of agrarian wage labourers divided by generation, engagement in industrial works, skills, family background and gender. His studies were often banned or quickly withdrawn from print even while being widely read by party cadres (Juhász 1981, 1982, 1986/1987).

Topics and Scholarly Alliances During Reformed Socialism of the 1980s

Between 1973–1978, Hungary experienced growing centralization in the state economy and continued expansion in the second economy. By the end of the decade, reformists and pragmatists within the party leadership managed to convince the conservative ones on further reforms. In 1982, the party-state announced new regulations that allowed the establishment of the enterprise business partnerships (VGMK). A number of workers in a state enterprise were invited to organize semi-autonomous sub-contracted units to produce goods and services during their non-working time utilizing the factory's infrastructure. Other measures allowed people to initiate new forms of private enterprise, to make decisions on business revenue, and employ others. As earlier, this opening stemmed from commitment to mobilize financial reserves and labour power and to mitigate shortages in consumer goods. Equally importantly, reforms nurtured the hope of maintaining the living standards of core groups of workers (Stark 1989, p. 142). External economic pressure, most notably the problem of growing debt, also facilitated the reform process. The legalization of production collectives using the premises of private enterprises allowed for the generation of revenue which energized core workers including most skilled industrial workers. The reshuffled institutional structures of production altered the power dynamics in shop floor labour processes while re-tailoring labour market relations.

The new reform currents as well as the research traditions of the previous decade provided impetus to a burgeoning labour sociology in the 1980s. This comprised three streams of thought. One of these adapted the theory of labour market segmentation in state socialist conditions and produced rich and original scholarly outputs in the field. The second one followed the

dynamic institutionalization of the second economy, this time within state property and its consequences for labour relations. The third one extended investigations on the shop floor dynamics of workers' struggles and placed industrial employment within a wider structural inquiry of society.

The problem of *labour market segmentation* occupied the attention of labour economists in Hungary when the space for manoeuvre, both for firms and workers, was reshuffled in the 1980s. Kertesi and Sziráczki, leading scholars in the field, proposed that the concept of dual labour market was insufficient as an explanation for the way in which labour market mechanisms operated in a mature state socialist regime. Instead, they canvassed a multi-segmented arena in which firms' and workers' conflicting aspirations and mutual compromises prevailed (Kertesi and Sziráczki 1985, p. 217). They argued that in addition to various adjustment techniques of resource bargaining used since the 1970s, firms began generating intra-firm labour markets hierarchized by labour force needs with different skills (ibid., pp. 219–220). Offering sociologically rich observations, Kertesi and Sziráczki analysed workers' behaviour in segmented labour market which perpetuated inequalities in wage, mobility and bargaining positions. They proposed a typology of workers' behaviour patterns seen as a response to employer power. The four categories embraced elite workers in key positions in the production process which included their powerful role within internal bargaining mechanisms; the double status workers who have alternative income sources and thus are motivated to carefully balance their efforts in the firm; 'workhorses' who are interested in wage increases by all means, mostly due to their demographic characteristics; and, finally, marginal workers at the bottom of the hierarchy who still possessed some degree of bargaining power. Endowed with differential mobility and bargaining power, the living conditions, sensitivities, attitudes, and prospects of the four groups were highly divergent (ibid., pp. 231–241). Other sociologists and economists also examined the selective bargaining power of different workers' groups within the socialist firm. Employee turnover was mobilized for short-term wage improvements, whereas longer term loyalty enabling informal connections was deployed to bargain bonus distribution (Köllő 1984; Fazekas et al. 1984; Stark 1986). The repertoire of those holding strategic locations in the production process became ever more refined. The dynamics of informal exchanges on the shop floor remained transient yet more complicated with the arrival of VGMK.

The study of the *second economy* continued to be one of the most important joint undertakings conducted by Hungarian sociologists and economists in the 1980s. In most interpretations, society attempted to create and maintain relatively autonomous activities exempt from direct state control.

The significance of the second economy can be demonstrated by the fact that in the mid-1980s, 33% of all active labour time (excluding housework) was spent in the second economy (Timár 1985). Surveys showed that nearly three-quarters of all households, including industrial workers, derived some income from the second economy (Kolosi 1980, p. 41). Household consumption largely relied on products prepared by the sector; 42% of housing construction (Gábor 1979a; Sik 1988) and around 85% of building repairs were undertaken by second economy producers. Within one single year, following the regulatory opening in 1982, the number of the intra-firm partnerships increased to 20,000 (Gábor 1989). By the end of 1986, one in ten manual workers worked in a partnership scheme. Empirical inquires revealed that workers joining the VGMKs found their labour corresponding to their skills and experiences more than in other spheres of the second economy. The division of labour became more flexible and the boundaries between mental and manual labour diminished within the new production units (Stark 1989, p. 145). In the proliferating VGMKs, organizational and technical innovations and accomplished efficiency outperformed the state sector. Hourly earnings sometimes were two times more than in regular hours. These results also helped to develop earning inequalities among workers while at the same time reducing pay differentials between managers and skilled workers (ibid., pp. 147–157). Some argued that the new production units to some degree served to pacify workplace politics (Kővári and Sziráczki 1985, pp. 289–292). Others highlighted the fact that managers became co-conspirators in the erosion of working rules, and norms, and the routinization of shop floor practices for exploiting state resources (Laky 1985).

Several scholars considered the transformative impact of the widening of space in the second economy including its encroachment in the first economy. A leading sociologist in the field, István Gábor R., argued that differences in adaptation capabilities reinforced, or increased, inequalities among second economy actors largely as a result of sector and size (Gábor 1989, p. 348). He warned that second economy actors had to be prepared for unpredictable changes which made them vulnerable to fragile business ethics including certain forms of corruption. Another important stream within the literature was concerned with the way in which the second economy fostered the transformation of the subjects of the party-state: to what extent did they become 'autonomous citizens' and in what ways might someone's experience of the second economy become attuned to a Western type entrepreneurial spirit? Szelényi, who re-engaged with Hungarians scholarship from the early 1980s, captured the problem of becoming an entrepreneurial citizen by

using the term of embourgeoisement (Szelényi 1988). Later, he even argued that the second economy had resulted from a decade-long class struggle, rather than a master plan instituted by the political leadership. Accordingly, Hungarian workers instituted a silent revolution from below according to which they achieved more freedom through everyday economic practices (Szelényi 1989, p. 222).

The third major avenue of research continued the study of shop floor labour relations within large industrial firms. Inspired by Kemény, Haraszti, Héthy and Makó, and in search of working class revolt, the well-known American sociologist and scholar of labour relations, Michael Burawoy, proposed that by the 1980s, a hegemonic managerial regime replaced despotic labour relations in the socialist firms. Stemming from his conviction that labour relations are shaped at the point of production, Burawoy worked together with János Lukács, a young Hungarian scholar, in exploring labour processes in large industrial plants. They conducted observations on intra-firm struggles by the workers and their fights over wages and recognition. Burawoy took part in classical participant observation in order to account for the physical, mental, social and political aspects of blue collar workers' lives. In an essay published in 1985, he portrayed the microcosm of a socialist firm. The scene was well known from the 1970s: piece-rates and norms were bargained within bureaucratic strictures which in turn were dependent on worker–manager collusion. Overall, management was seen to be able to superimpose personal domination on top of bureaucratic impersonal domination (Burawoy 1985, p. 220). The bargain process was embedded in a fundamentally atomized workforce (ibid., p. 224). In the absence of effective unions, moments of solidarity were rare. While workers were resentful of management, shop floor solidarity emerged only exceptionally.

Although published shortly after 1989, but based on investigations conducted during state socialism, a co-authored book by Burawoy and Lukács, *The Radiant Past* (1992), deserves consideration. They studied two Hungarian factories, a machine-manufacturing plant and a steel factory. Burawoy worked as a manual worker in both plants, while Lukács studied the management. The book compares the mechanisms of manufacturing consent in the capitalist and the socialist firm and then explores the conflicts and bargains between management and labour in both plants. The conceptual underpinnings are found in Kornai's theorems of the economy of shortage and Szelényi's concept of class struggle. The book discusses the

political position of workers in the socialist regime and their deep disillusionment with the existing political system. The conclusion argues that state socialism failed because it pretended but could not live up to its ideals. Furthermore, out of the divergence of ideology and reality, a distinctive working-class consciousness emerged. But in Hungary, this was a negative consciousness which "combines with extra work in the second economy, with gardening and VGMK work" (Burawoy and Lukács 1992, p. 139). Thus, socialism is seen to have created a weak and atomized working class.

Labour Sociology During State Socialism: Contribution and Location

The study of the economic structures of existing socialism has become one of the most complex and important agendas within the re-established field of sociology. It is fair to argue that in the formation of labour sociology in Hungary, the discipline embraced but was not fully engulfed, by *economic sociology* in the 1970s and 1980s. Róna-Tas, who became part of this field of studies through Western academic engagement, argues that Hungarian economic sociology, especially its critical traditions, allied with economics in critiquing Marxism and "really existing socialism". Several sociologists obtained their first degree in economics and called themselves *economist-sociologists*. Róna-Tas also stresses that this intellectual liaison was facilitated by the fact that leading Hungarian economists were profoundly interested in the institutional arrangements of state socialism. The most well-known economist of the shortage-based socialist economy, Kornai, combined economic modelling with inquiries into the political and sociological nature of institutions. Róna-Tas also proposed that due to the formative encounters between Western and Hungarian social scientists in the 1970s and 1980s, Hungarian economic sociology was often discussed by Western academia. "Hungary became one of the main prisms through which state socialism became refracted" in particular through the work of Ivan Szelényi, David Stark, and Michael Burawoy who utilized and reassembled various currents of thought articulated by those Hungarian scholars discussed above (Róna-Tas 2002, p. 33). Equally intriguing would be to attempt to uncover how this intensive intellectual link with Anglo-Saxon scholarship has influenced the late socialist path of economic sociology. This question, however, is beyond the scope of this chapter.

Post-Socialist Inquiries

Critical understanding of post socialist transformations could be harnessed from within the logic of a generalized Western democratic capitalist model, a coordinated market economy perspective, or a broad socialist vision of the economy without exploitation and private property. This list of stand-points is not exclusive, yet embodies the most commonly articulated positions among social scientists who venture to study labour transformation of in Hungary since 1989. Although the literature, and several chapters in this book, separate scholarship before and after 2010, I consider this dividing line less relevant in the Hungarian context. Institutional, political and social reactions to financialization and neoliberalization preceded the 2008 crisis, or at least cannot be sharply detached from struggles related to the accumulating setbacks and tensions emerging in various domains of economy and society since the 2000s. Nonetheless, since 2010, a new regime in Hungary has forcefully altered relations between state, market and society, conjuring up an authoritarian capitalism, or authoritarian neoliberalism, and this will be discussed elsewhere.

Historical Vistas and the Meaning of Systemic Changes

Post-1989 critical labour studies are embedded in deep and passionate debates on the nature and direction of wholesale socio-political changes that have occurred since the fall of the Berlin Wall. Focus has been on the historical hopes in a new world without external dependency relations, engagement with global capitalist markets and the role of social science as it seeks to make sense of profound socio-economic change. The debates on social and economic change consider, most importantly; the transformation of property relations and their consequences for social hierarchies; labour organizations and representations; the role of the regulatory and welfare state in taming the market; and institutions of democratic politics in Central and Eastern Europe. Simultaneously, cultivating labour sociology became embedded in the formations of critical social science in new regimes of knowledge production which quickly linked into international debates. Any outstanding early endeavours in the 1990s to research labour relations were influenced either directly or indirectly by comprehensive theories of social transformation. These theories, even if motivated by analytical interest, were saturated by normative and visionary components concerning the benign or poisonous effects of the market, the role of elites in setting political and

policy agendas and of the relations between the past and the present in Central and East European history.

The dominant trends in global economic systems and the cyclical effects of late capitalism in the 1990s pushed the former societies of 'actually existing socialism' to offer instant responses. Cheap and disorganized CEE labour, weakly prepared economic policy machinery and undeveloped business infrastructure had little chance to become anything but peripheral and subordinate in the era of globalized neoliberal capitalism. Many hoped that this could be changed by smart economic policies while others had high hopes in the compelling and benevolent impact of a European social model of capitalism. Many others expected domestic elites to seek to ameliorate the impact of unequal relations of exchange between external forces and domestic conditions. At the same time, influential accounts offered by social scientists mostly from Western academia and with long-standing engagement with the CEE region, did anticipate the negative consequences of 'capitalism without capitalists' (Eyal et al. 1998) and capitalism without Protestant ethics (Burawoy and Verdery 1999, p. 305).

Several social scientists who examined the early steps in the deconstruction of state socialism highlighted the controversies around the issue of privatization and the way in which it was critical to the shifting of resources from labour to capital in Hungary as elsewhere. But policy mistakes, or necessary temporary drawbacks due to restructuring, did not generate significant distrust in 'Westernizing' transformation. A few early voices warned, however, that global dependency relations might quickly present pressing consequences for Central and Eastern Europe. József Böröcz, an eminent Hungarian scholar embedded in US academia, and his followers, interpreted post-socialist change as a re-enactment of semi-peripheral dependency relations. Replacing of double dependency relations between the Soviet Union and global capitalism, the post-1989 conditions emerged as a result of the unconditional acceptance of global hierarchies. Böröcz proposed as early as 1992 (Böröcz 1992) that the development of market relations, new political economies, elites, redistribution, informality and inequality needed to be understood in the light of broader economic and political processes occurring on a global scale. This was in sharp contrast to the dominant narrative of 'catching up' with the West which made several Hungarian researchers disconnect restructuring within Hungarian society from wider global processes (Gagyi and Éber 2015, pp. 602–605).

In fact, important lines of thought did not buy into the 'catch-up' narrative. One of the incisive accounts argued that more than one economic model might persist in the aftermath of state socialism. For example, Eyal,

Szelényi and Townsley together argued that instead of reproduction of a singular capitalism, "a mosaic of the most diverse socio-economic structures and institutions" emerged in the CEE (Eyal et al. 1998, p. 16). In *Postsocialist Pathways*, László Bruszt and David Stark argued that diverse types of capitalism were experimented with after the demise of state socialism. Specifically, they argued that market coordination could be pursued in various configurations of social and political institutions. They sought to stand aside from the socialism versus capitalism, or capitalism versus non-capitalism, dichotomies (Bruszt and Stark 1998). One of the most valued comprehensive inquiries on post-socialist systemic transformations by Dorothee Bohle and Bela Greskovits offered a Polanyi-inspired typology of Central and East European capitalism (Bohle and Greskovits 2012).

Explaining Transformations in Labour Relations

The quickly transforming field of labour relations in Central and Eastern Europe in the early 1990s captured the attention of labour economists, political economy scholars, political scientists and sociologists. In Hungary, several scholars linked their interest with wholesale systemic changes to an examination of the changing relations between employers and employees amidst the perplexities of privatization, marketization, reshuffling the role of the state and legitimation struggles among the main social actors. A somewhat more focused field exploring shop floor and labour representation inspired a limited number of labour market economists, sociologists and political scientists.

Those concerned with attempting to explain systemic changes shed light on the entanglement of foreign capital, domestic institutions and collective labour representation. A degree of convergence emerged amongst researchers who suggested that industrial relations in post socialist CEE were profoundly shaped by transnational factors rather more than by Western liberal market economies (Bohle and Greskovits 2007, p. 464). Most political economy scholars stressed that the composition of foreign capital investment fundamentally tailored the potential for protecting labour conditions, jobs and other local interests. In an emerging division of labour in global markets, the arrival of low-skill and labour-intensive operations was watched with a critical eye (Bohle and Greskovits 2004). A range of critical inquiries on post-1989 transformations made clear the perception that the labour movement had suffered major setbacks in CEE. Trade unions lost their standing in policy formation and in their defence of labour rights (Crowley and Ost 2001). Tripartite structures of coordination did emerge

(Pollert 1999, 2000; Myant et al. 2000) which Ost judged "illusory corporatism" since it constituted trade unions as unequal partners (Ost 2000; Swain 2011). From the first decade of the 2000s, research results have begun to challenge the view that CEE labour was uniformly weak and revealed the extent to which unions occasionally play an active role in the process of policy reform (Bernaciak et al. 2011).

Hungary acted as a pioneer in globalizing and marketizing its economy after 1989. Following a rapid privatization process, there was a massive influx of foreign capital. By 1998, the contribution of the private sector to GDP amounted to 85% GDP and foreign ownership in industry reached 66% (Koltay 2010). Towards the end of the decade, Hungary continued to attract one-third of all FDI to the region (Swain 2011; Koltay 2010). The new MNCs brought new management and labour organization strategies. Freedom of association evoked pluralism and competition between older and newer unions. This resulted in a pronounced fragmentation of the trade union landscape, with major divisions between pre- and post-1989 established federations. Altogether, unions mobilized 12% of the total workforce by 2009, resulting in one of the lowest union density rates in CEE (Neumann 1991; Makó and Simonyi 1997; Koltay 2010). Unionization remained higher in the public sector, transportation, energy and mining. The majority of the strikes between 1999 and 2008 were organized mostly in the public sector. By 1998, the majority of large companies (three quarters of those employing over one thousand and two-thirds of those employing 500–1000) had at least a basic collective agreement, but the overwhelming majority of enterprises had none (about 3% of all firms with 5 or more employees had a collective agreement). SMEs employing two-thirds of the total employees to all intents and purposes remained outside the scope of collective bargaining (Köllő and Nacsa 2006).

In Hungary, only a few scholars remained interested in researching power arenas in which trade unions were formed and reformed by applying historical and institutional theories. Some established labour economists explored the structural causes of union weakness. These scholars believed in the necessity of legal and state protection of institutions that regulate and mediate interests and conflicts between employers and employees. Jenő Koltay, András Tóth, László Neumann, Mihály Laki, János Köllő and Bea Nacsa, by adding political and legal perspectives to labour economics, collaborated in producing some of the most prominent research in this period (Neumann and Koltay 2006; Laki et al. 2012; Tóth et al. 2012). They regularly reviewed the formation and modification of the Labour Code, the transposition of European Union regulations, economic policy reactions to crisis and boom situations, and other milestones of post socialist transformations.

Another related and highly significant stream of scholarship centred on the institutional arena of trade union affairs linked to the wider ideological, legal and social transformations in Hungary after 1989. András Tóth, sociologist and political scientist, in a range of publications, has revealed that the system of labour representation neither echoed pre-socialist traditions nor automatically mimicked Western forms of structure and practice. The new model was characterized by a commitment to a decentralizing model of associations common during the mature socialist regime. The coordination across sectors and scales became the subject of interest deliberation by all kinds of actors driven by various concerns. Parallel to this, a deep mistrust in the principle of exclusive labour representation by trade unions prevailed among various circles of society. The Constitutional Court decisions and the new Labour Code in 1992 also mirrored the rejection of trade unions' exclusive role. The Code allowed for the creation of works councils with the consequence that labour representation operated at double company level. At the other end, a national tripartite coordination mechanism was established resonating with the European social model. Over the years, the national-level interest deliberation became pronounced and brought back the 'spirit of state socialism': intriguingly, the state has become the single most important force in shaping labour relations, and the main source of legitimation for employer and employee representation bodies (Tóth 2013).

Sociologists of work who studied industrial relations in multinational companies in Hungary experimented with actor-oriented approaches as a means of explaining traces of employee voice in post-socialist employment practices (Galgóczi 2003; Meardi and Tóth 2006). They applied bottom-up inquiries with a particular focus on the interplay between management, business and trade union strategies at CEE subsidiaries. They identified modalities of industrial relations including "hybridization" (Meardi and Tóth 2006) and divergence in local trade unions' opportunities to resist exploitative activities. Differences by sector, and green and brown field investment histories, were seen to be significant (Meardi 2007; Meardi et al. 2009). None of these results did change, however, the wider picture portraying the low potential for labour mobilization by trade unions.

Debates on the Concept of Class and a New Labour History

While the notion of class was used in Hungarian sociology before and after 1989 in research on social stratification, it did not refer to deep underlying

structural forces. In the first decade of post-socialist transformation, class did not appear to be a particularly attractive theoretical device for most scholars, (whatever their philosophical point of departure), who sought to uncover new socio-economic structures. There have been some exceptions and the landscape has changed significantly since the mid-2000s. A distinctive circle of scholars have argued that industrial workers have been the major losers, or victims, of the post-socialist transition. Research within this tradition addresses themes of; structural injustice, the creation of worker identity, subjectivity, and class formation. In Hungary, a left-wing monthly, *Eszmélet* (Consciousness), which began publication in 1989, has served as the main intellectual home for these inquiries. The leading figures are closely connected to anthropologists and historians from Western academia (Eszter Bartha, Gábor Halmai, Erzsébet Szalai). Their collective statement promoting the journal states that it is the "only theoretical and scholarly publication in Hungary which provides true and sharp anti-capitalist critique of post socialist conditions".[3] The group challenges global capital relations, social and economic inequalities and their damaging effects on nature and people. They are, as they make clear, against all forms of oppression.

Erzsébet Szalai, who left the core circle of economic sociology in the 1980s and has been a leading voice of authority around the leftist journal, developed the concept of the "double structure" of economy and society in post-socialist Hungary. The double structure is comprised of firms embedded in global markets and others tied to domestic markets. The former operates with developed technology and labour management and ensures a decent quality of life for employees. The latter, dominating the Hungarian economy, embodies parochial and paternalistic labour relations. This split serves as a major obstacle to the formation of political alliances among workers preventing the development of class consciousness. Szalai argues that resistance would be essential because the post-socialist capitalist system is a regime of exploitation which has seen a massive increase in the shift of wealth from labour to capital since the 1990s. There is, however, one group which acts as a class: the technocratic managerial elite (Szalai 2001, 2004, 2006).

A smaller group of mostly young qualitative sociologists and anthropologists have embarked on studying the unmaking of the socialist working class (Kideckel term 2003), and the formation of a new one. These scholars, often explicitly, embrace the concept of class as an organizing structure of labour and wider societal relations. Through the work of transnational

---

[3]http://www.eszmelet.hu/, accessed on March 24, 2018.

scholarship, but also linked to the *Eszmélet* circle, Gábor Halmai and Don Kalb (Hungarian and Dutch scholars) have provided a very significant perspective on working-class politics in the 2000s. Their collective undertaking has been concerned to unmask the essential features behind an emerging working-class populism. They have been examining the impact of disenfranchisement and elite behaviour (Kalb and Halmi 2011). Accordingly, de-democratization, dispossession and the denigration of the working class is often overlooked, or actively promoted, by cosmopolitan economic and political elites.

Another, also smaller group of social historians, defended the notion of class as part of their theoretical framework. In 1998, a young British historian, Mark Pittaway completed a doctoral thesis titled *Industrial Workers, Socialist Industrialisation and the State in Hungary, 1948–1958* (Pittaway 2012). This monograph, which explored the production of factory regimes within the broader structures of the planned economy and bureaucratic control during Stalinism, inspired a new generation of social historians. The analysis of working time and the wage relationship in Hungary's early socialist industry generously acknowledged the explorations in the sociology of labour published from the 1970s onwards. Pittaway used the methods of the social historian to argue that the regime was able to operate with a minimum of worker legitimacy. He uncovered the hegemonic modality of power and the compromise between workers and the political class during the Kádár era (Pittaway 1999, 2007). In the mid-2000s, he helped to bring Hungarian social history scholarship to an international academic audience. He portrayed his fellow-historians' work thus: "They illustrate how the protracted construction and consolidation of socialist states in the region was negotiated on an everyday level by working class citizens, and that this was a dynamic process in which state projects interacted with a variety of working-class cultures, that were in turn segmented by notions of gender, skill, generation, and occupation" (Pittaway 2005, p. 1).

Almost a decade later, another doctoral project made a tangible contribution to recent labour history. Eszter Bartha completed a comparative empirical inquiry of two industrial sites, one of the Rába works in Győr, and another in Carl Zeiss works in Jena (located in the former GDR). She investigated factory regimes and working-class lives at the end of the Stalinist era. She compared the emergence, and the experience of, "welfare dictatorship" which transformed workers into consumers with different inclinations in the two countries. Certain practices of sociability and solidarity were enacted in the workplaces modifying the thoroughly atomized image of socialist workers. Bartha highlighted the way in which a superficial creation of

community was overridden by bottom-up horizontal networking and collegiality (Bartha 2009a, b). Despite the premature death of Pittaway, the circle has remained active, productive, and internationally engaged with the support of the *Eszmélet* circle and university backing (Bartha and Varga 2012). Bartha argues that the rediscovery of the working class in the post-socialist era directs attention to the properties of contemporary capitalism and enriches the scholarship of labour history which connects socialism and post-socialism in a comparative Central and East European perspective (Bartha and Bartha 2015; c.f. Valuch 2012).

A formalized group of young sociologists, Ph.D. students and young post-doctoral researchers established a small yet highly visible atelier, the *Helyzet Műhely* (*Working Group for Public Sociology*) in 2010 in order to analyse contemporary Hungarian society from a critical leftist perspective (Éber and Gagyi 2015). Its members felt that questions of politics and economy were treated almost separately in Hungarian discourses, while there was an increasing need to understand them as interconnected. The group formulated a critical stance towards social, political and economic analysis in contemporary Hungary, arguing the master narrative of transition to an idealized Western European modernity offered a very limited agenda. This narrative transformed local 'complexities into exoticisms and viewed local-global relationships through a primitive linear model of development'.[4] The working group argues that contemporary Hungary is part and parcel of contemporary European and global power relations. Their aim is to connect existing knowledge of global and supranational relationships with local knowledge gathered from the broader sphere of sociology. They argue that in the renewal of sociology since 1990, Hungarian sociologists have understood class as a cornerstone of redundant Stalinist Marxism. The latter they see as unsuitable for guiding either empirical or intellectual inquiries. In contrast, they strive to understand class relations in post socialist Hungary from a global perspective, within a framework of "globally interacting modes of production and their structuring effects" (Éber et al. 2014).

Accordingly, along with Bourdieu and Ulrich Beck, class is conceptualized as the structural position of social groups embedded in the economy. Inspired by world systems theories and critical globalism scholars (József Böröcz, Attila Melegh, Erzsébet Szalai and Iván Szelényi), Éber has proposed that position in the social division of labour, relation of production, and distribution of capital generates class division and consciousness (Éber 2015,

---

[4]https://helyzet.wordpress.com/english/, accessed on 24 March 2018.

pp. 121–125). These relations are constitutive of global capitalism and its semi-peripheral manifestations. Classes can be found where class conflicts and struggles emerge, where historically shaped positions in relations of production are revealed and endorsed. In others words, labour and capital, manager and employee, respectively, are likely collectives occupying class positions. Éber and colleagues suggest that even if the contours of classes are fluid, class relations are paramount.

A theoretically robust response arrived from another scholar of rising significance. In addressing three questions, Ákos Huszár has advocated an Axel Honeth-inspired normative-functionalist theory: the equality of employers and employees in setting the terms of labour contracts; the links of vertical inequalities between groups with respect to their performance; and access to social rights in society. This theorem considers which forms of inequality are underpinned by institutionalized norms and which ones are delegitimized by these norms. The approach accepts the realm of production as one of the most important domains of power but adds to this the notion that patterns of non-material recognition are also vital in understanding the nature of social action. The purpose of class analysis is to find out whether the different social categories do occupy the place ascribed to them by institutionalized norms (Huszár 2013, pp. 43–44).

The Production of Flexible Workers, the Precariat and the Marginalized

Besides consideration of the formation of new economic elites and the propertied and managerial classes, the wider field of economic sociology in Hungary turned to outstanding issues of labour market transformations with special emphasis on unemployment. Sociologists and labour economists began to explore the end of Fordist models of production in the most advanced Western economies and the consequences of this for labour in CEE from the second half of the 1990s. They examined the shrinking labour markets in certain sectors, the flexibilization of labour contracts and the march of computerized technologies in industry. The division of labour between the core and fringes of Europe and its systemic consequences for CEE was also high on the research agenda. A core group of labour economists, affiliated to various research institutes (the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and universities), launched an annual series titled Labour Market Survey (*Munkaerőpiaci Tükör* 2000). These bi-lingual flagship publica-

tions provide data and analyses accessible for social scientists and experts concerned with labour relations. The converging, although not homogeneous, viewpoint for analysis in this circle stems from a drive to support viable and democratically coordinated market economies with welfare provisions. In addition to the Survey initiative, the Institute for Economics at the HAS, the largest department of sociology at the Eötvös Lóránd University Budapest, the independent research institutes established in the 1980s (TÁRKI, KOPINT-DAOTRG), and new ones such as the Budapest Institute, also explore labour market dynamics with either an explicit sociological agenda or a degree of sociological sensitivity.

A number of universities outside Budapest also engaged in research and debates in the sub-discipline of labour sociology. A prime example includes the Department of Sociology and Social Policy at University of Debrecen. Judit Csoba, a senior labour sociologist, has been conducting research on employment conditions, labour market transformations and inequalities generated by differential access to work in Hungary. Together with her team, she has been focusing on contemporary social theories of late modern capitalism, employment conditions and the meanings and values of work. She explores the consequences of systemic changes in employment relations due to the rise of flexible contracts, the spread of atypical and temporary work, the dissolution of larger and enduring production organizations and income insecurity. Csoba stresses the continued significance of work in the production of social status and the shrinking access to wage labour. She argues that the major divide in society is between those who have and those who do not have access to regular jobs. This view resonates with wider paradigms of labour reintegration by separating labour revenue, meaningful work and social inclusion in a new configuration (Csoba 2010a, b). Csoba's academic location bridges some traditions of the 1980s and the post-1989 eras by embracing, among others, Endre Sik with his prolific and wide-ranging sociology of labour.

A group of researchers, exploring the economic and social conditions of rural localities, and anchored in particular academic places of excellence, such as the Center for Regional Studies and the Institute for Sociology at the Hungarian Academy Sciences, must be considered to be part of the core of the sociology of work in Hungary. In the 1990s, these scholars examined structural and social responses to the dramatic effects of the deconstruction of the Hungarian cooperative and state farm system in the privatization era. Central to their inquiries has been the reconstruction of agricultural production with its institutional, resource, and power environment, and spatial inequalities. The researchers have retained a sharp focus on the formation of

persistent, or shifting, experiences of disadvantages that are critical to social and spatial exclusion. This group of researchers has been contributing to the sociology of labour in a profound way concentrating on work occurring outside large-scale industrial production. This remained highly significant for urbanized workers and their families in the 1990s and over time actually became the main source of living for many of those who had lost their jobs in the industrial sector in the 1990s. Katalin Kovács, Monika Váradi, Imre Kovách, Tibor Kuczi, Tünde Virág, to name several, together with Pál Juhász, the doyen of rural sociology, produced a remarkable body of research that has embraced a new generation of geographers, anthropologists and sociologists (see for example Juhász 2006; Kuczi 2011; Kovács and Váradi 2013).

There is a distinguished group of sociologists, welfare sociologists and economists who are committed to the study of labour relations especially with regard to the structural causes of social exclusion (mainly due to ethnic and educational background, family status and place of residence). This circle has been concerned with the rapid and transformative privatization that created high job loss and long-term joblessness in the 1990s. In the 2000s, new economic challenges considerably worsened employment conditions for particular groups in society. Rather than placing industrial workers at the centre of their inquiries, scholars of social exclusion have uncovered social categories, hierarchies and relations, shaped by post-socialist (or contemporary capitalist) economic and social circumstances and political struggles. The theoretical foundations of their inquiries are built on a relational understanding of economic and social power which inspires them to concentrate on the marginalized of post-socialist transformations (Ferge 2006; Köllő 2009).

From the 1990s, the most outstanding scholars and public intellectuals analysed economic conditions, policy interventions, and the direct and indirect forms of discrimination that very quickly marginalized larger parts of the Roma in Hungary. Quite a few of them combined action research with academic inquiries. In so doing, they tried to nudge policy circles and the educated public with critical insights into the social mechanisms of exclusion. István Kemény, upon return from exile, became the voice of authority in the field until his death (see for example Kemény 2003). He inspired several young scholars to team up and reconnect with his earlier explorations and empirical knowledge of the Roma in the 1970s and the 1980s. It is not incidental that the other trend-setting senior sociological thinker, Iván Szelényi, also turned to the plight of the Roma (Ladányi and Szelényi 2006). Research on the Roma, in ways resonant with the field of labour history, opened the archives and channelled attention to social experiences

in state socialism, in this case to the highly controversial pattern of Roma labour market integration during actually existing socialism. In this regard, it is imperative to refer to Gábor Kertesi, Gábor Kézdi, Gábor Havas, Péter Szuhay, Anna Csongor, Béla Janky, Júlia Szalai and Mária Neményi as key names in the field (see for example Kertesi 2005; Kertesi and Kézdi 2011).

The acknowledgement of growing inequalities, including chronic poverty and socio-economic marginalization in the 2000s, has kept various circles of labour sociologists constantly engaged. Some have argued that the categories of industrial workers and blue-collar employees remain relevant but more significantly in relation to other social groups rather than to capital or managers. Huszár and Sik, for examaple, combine their expertise in labour sociology and social stratification. They utilize labour market segmentation studies conducted since the 1980s in Hungary and reflect on the international debates regarding Guy Standing's powerful proposal to consider the *precariat* as an emerging social class. They suggest that the concept of the triadic division of the labour market (primary, secondary, precarious) is an apt framework and can be used to discuss recent transformations of wage labour. Huszár and Sik found that although in strictly materials conditions of life the precariat is closer to secondary labour market actors, it is actually closer to the primary group when we consider social status and recognition. People in this position of precarity also show more active political interest than those in the secondary labour market. These findings raise intriguing questions about the scholarly and political significance of the concept of precariat applied more and more to demonstrate the disarticulation of the traditional working class (c.f. Meszmann 2016). Empirical research, such as that carried out by Huszár and Sik, continues to depict a still coping and socially anchored group of workers whose conditions are structurally different from the most vulnerable in the secondary labour market (Huszár and Sik 2017).

Two important streams of scholarship have also emerged in the 2000s which do not address vulnerability, yet shed light on hierarchies and inequalities, and even on social and political struggles in the realm of work and beyond. Specifically, in this regard, sociologists have turned to the topic of transnational labour migration in the 2000s. In the last five years, Hungary has seen the migration of some 300,000 active workers to other member states of the European Union (Ágnes Hárs, Endre Sik, Attila Melegh). Another smaller group of sociologists has explored the contribution of work to the production of gender regimes in CEE and Hungary, among them Maria Frey, Éva Fodor, and Beáta Nagy and the research team at TÁRKI.

Finally, it is to be noted that management studies, mostly pursued by applied economics departments and business schools, have entered the field

of industrial relations in ways reminiscent of many other post-socialist countries and old Western democracies. Yet, this does not seem to create a zero-sum game in the related field or to exert major influence on labour studies per se, or to undermine the intellectual traditions and the appeal of critical labour sociology.

Conclusions: Does Hungarian Scholarship Show an Idiosyncratic Path in the Sociology of Work?

Noteworthy traditions in sociology of work in the European arenas are often backed by either a strong labour movement, robust Marxist or other leftist intellectual engagements, or specific conjunctures in the field of critical social science (e.g. disciplinary recognition struggles, cross-border intellectual cooperation, etc.), or some combination of these. In post-socialist Hungary, the first two forces appeared to be rather modest in the first two decades following 1989.

Szelényi, Seleny, Stark and other persistent observers of pathways from socialism to post-socialism argue that the state socialist regime in Hungary experimented with economic reforms imbued with paternalism and pragmatism and that this constituted the basis of a particular social compromise. This had major consequences on the status, voice and power of industrial workers and provided the impetus for economic actors in relation to labour and capital. Hopes were high insofar as it was thought that networks and institutions beyond state control, driven both by market and by reciprocity exchanges in the 1980s, would help to establish civil society as the engine of democratization. The ties and cooperation networks in the second economy, and dual household strategies for securing livelihood, however, mobilized frames of action that induced little, if any, appreciation of working-class solidarity, collective representation, or confrontation with capital. Having little worker legitimacy, labour unions in Hungary were unable to become powerful organizations in the overthrow of the communist regimes. Thus, working-class mobilization was very modest in support of political changes in Hungary around 1989 and the connection between the labour movement and the dissident movement remained particularly low in contrast to Poland (c.f. Mrozowicki et al. 2015).

It is often argued that Marxism has become fundamentally discredited in Hungarian critical social science: a thorough and elaborate Marxist training, however, has not been part of social science education in Hungary

and few sociologists have pursued advanced Marxist scholarship. Concepts such as exploitation, class and class struggle have been referred to but often in some combination with theoretical accounts drawing on Weber and Bourdieu. Social conflicts, inequalities and injustices have not ceased to occupy research by critical scholars throughout the decades of post socialism and many are concerned with labour–capital conflicts though not as the only structuring force. Critical Marxism, Foucault's theorem of power and third-generation Frankfurt School arguments have been vital in the search for wider theoretical backing for the sociological imagination. Political and intellectual concerns with other salient social issues arising out of post-socialist capitalist transformations, such as long-term unemployment and non-employment, social exclusion, labour market segregation, ethnicity, age, gender and regional disparities in the labour market, are very prominent in contemporary Hungary. Accounts portraying these inquiries as the scholarship of identity politics, which distracts our attention from 'true inequalities', are dismissive. Few critical sociologists would deny the powerful saliency of labour relations in shaping the condition of people's lives, social positions, individual and collective aspirations, and political choices. Yet, sociologists of work in Hungary are nevertheless divided in their interpretation of the relevance of labour relations in seeking systemic explanations for dominant social structures, tensions and the direction of change (c.f. Thompson and Smith 2009).

The influence of the transnational encounters that occurred in economic sociology, predominantly with Anglo-Saxon and non-Marxist scholars, may have had a tangible impact in the early currents of the study of labour after the fall of state socialism, but by 2010, the scope for international cooperation had become more diverse. In the study of industrial relations in the 2000s, noteworthy cooperation has emerged among scholars, especially younger ones, in Central and Eastern Europe including Hungary, often through links to ETUI. Then again, growing alliances and common intellectual platforms connect a new generation of scholars who share a pronounced interest in critiquing global capitalism and its current configurations in Central and Eastern Europe. This can be witnessed in the research being conducted into variant forms of domination, exploitation and dispossession in production and other spheres of human life. Labour is emerging into the centre of these intellectual experiments and encounters. We shall see what kind of empirically and analytically robust sociological research on wage labourer and labour relations in Central and East European will emerge from these theoretical positions.

References

Bartha, E. (2009a). Would You Call Back the Capitalists?: Workers and the Beginning of Market Socialism in Hungary. *Social History, 34,* 2.

Bartha, E. (2009b). *A munkások útja a szocializmusból a kapitalizmusba Kelet-Európában*. Budapest: L'Harmattan Kiadó – ELTE BTK Kelet-Európa Története Tanszék.

Bartha, Á. (2013). Közelítések a szociográfia fogalmához. *Forrás, 45*(5), 92–100.

Bartha, E., & Bartha, A. (2015). New Perspectives on Post-socialist Labour, Discursive Governance and Roma Politics. *Intersections. EEJSP, 2*(1): 5–17. http://intersections.tk.mta.hu. Accessed 24 Mar 2018.

Bartha, E., & Varga, Zs. (2012). *Határokon túl. Tanulmánykötet Mark Pittaway emlékére.* Budapest: L'Harmattan-ELTE.

Berkovits, G. (1976). *Világváros határában*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Kiadó.

Bernaciak, M., Duman, A., & Scepanovic, V. (2011). Employee Welfare and Restructuring in the Public Sector: Evidence from Poland and Serbia. *European Journal of Industrial Relations, 17*(4), 365–380.

Bohle, D., & Greskovits, B. (2004). *Capital, Labor and the Prospects of the European Social Model in the East. Central and Eastern European* (Working Paper 58). Cambridge, MA: Centre for European Studies, Harvard University.

Bohle, D., & Greskovits, B. (2007). The State, Internationalization and Capitalist Diversity in Eastern Europe. *Competition and Change, 11*(2), 89–115.

Bohle, D., & Greskovits, B. (2012). *Capitalist Diversity on Europe's Periphery*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Böröcz, J. (1992). Dual Dependency and Property Vacuum: Social Change on the State Socialist Semiperiphery. *Theory & Society, 21*(1), 77–104.

Bruszt, L., & Stark, D. (1998). *Postsocialist Pathways: Transforming Politics and Property in East Central Europe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burawoy, B. (1985). *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes Under Capitalism and Socialism*. London and New York: Verso.

Burawoy, M., & Lukács, J. (1992). *The Radiant Past. Ideology and Reality in Hungary's Road to Capitalism*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Burawoy, M., & Verdery, K. (1999). Introduction. In Burawoy & Verdery (Eds.), *Uncertain Transition* (pp. 1–17). Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Crowley, S., & Ost, D. (2001). *Workers After Workers' States*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.

Csoba, J. (2010a). *A tisztes munka – A teljes foglalkoztatás: a 21. század esélye vagy utópiája?* Budapest: L'Harmattan.

Csoba, J. (2010b). Segély helyett munka. A közfoglalkoztatás formái és sajátosságai. *Szociológiai Szemle, 20*(1), 26–50.

Éber, M. Á. (2012). *Megkülönböztetett különbségek. Doktori értekezés*. Budapest: Eötvös Lóránd Tudományegyetem.

Éber, M. Á., & Gagyi, Á. (2015). Osztály és társadalomszerkezet a magyar szociológiában. *Fordulat, 21,* 170–191.

Éber, M. Á., Gagyi, Á., Gerőcs, T., Jelinek, C., & Pinkasz, A. (2014). 1989: Szempontok a rendszerváltás globális politikai gazdaságtanához. *Fordulat, 21,* 10–63.

Eyal, G., Szelényi, I., & Townsley, E. (1998). *Making Capitalism Without Capitalists. Class Formation and Elite Struggles in Post-communist Central Europe.* London: Verso.

Fazekas, K., Révész G., Kalász, I., & Köllő, J. (1984). Wage and Performance Bargaining on the Internal Labour Market. *Wage Bargaining in Hungarian Firms: Vol. 1, 113* (pp. 29–87). Budapest: Institute of Economics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Ferge, Zs. (1969). *Társadalmunk rétegződése. Elvek és tények*. KJK: Budapest.

Ferge, Zs. (2006). Struktúra és szegénység. In I. Kovách (ed.), *Társadalmi metszetek. Érdekek és hatalmi viszonyok, individualizáció és egyenlőtlenség a mai Magyarországon* (pp. 479–499). Budapest: Napvilág.

Gábor, R. I. (1979a). A második (másodlagos) gazdaság. *Valóság, 1,* 22–36.

Gábor, R. I. (1979b). The Second (Secondary) Economy. *Acta Oeconomica, 22,* 291–311.

Gábor, R. I. (1989). Second Economy and Socialism: The Hungarian Experience. In E. L. Feige (Ed.), *The Underground Economy* (pp. 339–360). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gábor R. I., & Galasi, P. (1981). *A „második" gazdaság: Tények és hipotézisek* [The Second Economy. Facts and Hypotheses]. Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó.

Gagyi, Á., & Éber, M. Á. (2015). Class and Social Structure in Hungarian Sociology. *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures, 29*(3), 598–609.

Galasi, P., & Sziráczki, G. (Eds.). (1985). *Labour Market and Second Economy in Hungary*. Frankfurt & New York: Campus.

Galgóczi, B. (2003). The Impact of Multinational Enterprises on the Corporate Culture and on Industrial Relations in Hungary. *South-East Europe Review for Labour and Social Affairs, 1–2,* 27–44.

Haraszti, M. (1977). *A Worker in a Worker's State*. New York: Penguin.

Hegedüs, A. (1966). *A szocialista társadalom struktúrájáról*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Hegedüs, A., & Márkus, M. (1966). *Ember, munka, közösség*. Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó.

Héthy, L., & Makó, C. (1972). *Munkásmagtartasok és gazdasági szervezet*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Héthy, L., & Makó, C. (1978). *Munkások, érdekek, érdekegyeztetés*. Budapest: Gondolat.

Huszár, Á. (2013). Class and the Social Embeddedness of the Economy. Outline of a Normative-Functionalist Model of Social Class. *Review of Sociology, 23*(4), 29–49.

Huszár, Á., & Sik, E. (2017). Rétegződés, szegementáció, prekariátus. In I. Kovács (ed.), *Társadalmi integráció*. Budapest: MTA TK Szociológiai Intézete-Belvedere Kiadó.

Juhász, P. (1981). Társadalmi csoportok együttműködése az első, a második és a harmadik ökonómiában. *Fogyasztási Szolgáltatások, 4.*

Juhász, P. (1982). Agrárpiac, kisüzem, nagyüzem. *Medvetánc, 1,* 117–139.

Juhász, P. (1986/1987). Mai képünk a parasztságról s a falusi társadalom néhány jellegzetességéről. *Medvetánc, 4*(1), 5–19.

Juhász, P. (2006). *Emberek és intézmények*. Jelenkutató Alapítvány - Új Mandátum Kiadó: Két zsákutca az agráriumban.

Kalb, D., & Halmai, G. (Eds.). (2011). *Headlines of Nation, Subtexts of Class: Working-Class Populism and the Return of the Repressed in Neoliberal Europe*. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Kemény, I., (szerk). (1971). *Pest megye munkásai*. Budapest: Társadalomtudományi Intézet.

Kemény, I. (1972). A magyar munkásosztály rétegződése. *Szociológia, 1*(1), 36–48.

Kemény, I. (1990). *Velük nevelkedett a gép. Magyar munkások a hetvenes évek elején*. Budapest: VITA.

Kemény, I. (2003). Válság után. Szegények, munkanélküliek, cigányok, versenyképtelenek. *Esély,* 2. sz., 66–74.

Kertesi, G. (2005). *A társadalom peremén. Romák a munkaerőpiacon*. Budapest: Osiris Kiadó.

Kertesi, G., & Sziráczki, Gy. (1985). Worker Behaviour in the Labor Market. In P. Galasi & Gy. Sziráczki (Eds.), *Labour Market and Second Economy in Hungary* (pp. 216–246). Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

Kertesi, G., & Kézdi, G. (2011). Roma employment in Hungary after the post-communist transition. *Economics of Transition, 19*(3), 563–610.

Kideckel, A. (2003). The Unmaking of an East-Central European Working Class. In Hann, C. ed. *Postsocialism* (pp. 114–132). London: Routledge.

Köllő, J (1984). Labour Shortage, Manpower Allocation and Wage Payment in a Cotton Weaving Mill. *Wage Bargaining in Hungarian Firms*, Volume II. Studies of the Institute of Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, No. 24: 7–68.

Köllő, J. (2009). *A pálya szélén: iskolázatlan munkanélküliek a posztszocialista gazdaságban*. Budapest: Osiris.

Köllő, J., & Nacsa, B. (2006). *Flexibility and Security in the Labour Market*. Hungary's Experience Flexicurity paper 2004/2. Budapest, International Labor Office, 200.

Kolosi, T. (1980). Új tendenciák a társadalmi szerkezet fejlődésében. *Valóság*, 3. sz.

Koltay, J. (2010). *Multinational Companies and Labour Relations in Hungary: Between Home Country—Host Country Effects and Global Tendencies*. Discussions Paper, Institute of Economics, HAS.

Konrád, G., & Szelényi, I. (1972). A késleltetett városfejlődés társadalmi konfliktusai. *Valóság, 12.*

Konrád, G., & Szelényi, I. (1979). *The Intellectuals on the Road to Class Power*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Kornai, J. (1989). The Hungarian Reform Process. Visions, Hopes, and Reality. In V. Nee & D. Stark (Eds.), *Remaking the Economic Institutions of Socialism* (pp. 32–94). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Kovách, I., & Kuczi, T. (1982). A gazdálkodói előnyök átváltási lehetőségei a társadalomban. *Valóság, 6,* 45–55.

Kovács, K., & Váradi, M. (2013). *Hátrányban vidéken*. Budapest: Argumentum.

Kővári, G., & Sziráczki, G. (1985). Old and New Forms of Wage Bargaining on the Shop Floor. In P. Galasi & G. Sziráczki (Eds.), *Labour Market and Second Economy in Hungary* (pp. 264–292). Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

Kuczi, T. (2011). *Kisvállalkozás és társadalmi környezet*. Budapest: Jelenkutató Alapítvány.

Ladányi, J., & Szelényi, I. (2006). *Patterns of Exclusion: Constructing Gypsy Ethnicity and the Making of an Underclass in Transitional Societies of Europe*. Boulder, CO and New York: Columbia University Press.

Laki, M., Nacsa, B., & Neumann, L (2012). *Az átalakuló munka világa*. Budapest: LIGA Szakszervezetek.

Laky, T. (1985). Enterprise Business Work Partnership and Enterprise Interest. *Acta Oeconomica, 34*(1/2), 27–49.

Makó, C., & Simonyi, Á. (1997). Inheritance, Imitation and Genuine Solutions (Institution Building in Hungarian Labour Relations. *Europe-Asia Studies, 49*(2), 221–243.

Meardi, G. (2007). More Voice After More Exit? Unstable Industrial Relations in Central Eastern Europe. *Industrial Relations Journal, 38*(6), 502–523.

Meardi, G., & Tóth, A. (2006). Who Is Hybridising What? Insights on MNCs' Employment Practices in Central Europe. In A. Ferner, J. Quintamilla, & C. Sánchez-Rundes (Eds.), *Multinationals and the Construction of Transnational Practices: Convergence and Diversity in the Global Economy* (pp. 155–183). London: Palgrave.

Meardi, G., et al. (2009). Varieties of Multinationals: Adapting Employment Practices in Central Eastern Europe. *Industrial Relations, 48*(3), 489–511.

Meszmann, T. T. (2016). Country report: Hungary. PRECARIR project. Bratislava: CELSI.

Moldova, G. (1971). *Tisztelet Komlónak*. Budapest: Szépirodalmi Kiadó.

Mrozowicki, A., Stewart, P., & Zentai, V. (2015). Critical Labour Studies in Hungary, Poland and the UK: Between Crisis and Revitalization. *Forum Socjologiczne, 1,* 19–34.

Munkaerőpiaci Tükör. (2000). Magyar Tudományos Akadémia. http://econ.core.hu/kiadvany/mt.html. In English: Labor Market Yearbooks. http://econ.core.hu/english/publications/lmyb.html. Accessed 24 Mar 2018.

Myant, M., Slocock, B., & Smith, S. (2000, June). Tripartism in the Czech and Slovak Republics, *Europe-Asia Studies, 52,* 4.

Neumann, L. (1991). Labour Conflicts of Privatisation. *Acta Oeconomica, 43*(3/4), 315–330.

Neumann, L., & Koltay, J. (2006). Industrial Relations in Hungary. In K. Fazekas & J. Koltay (Eds.), *The Hungarian Labor Market: Review and Analysis 2006.* Budapest: Institute of Economics, HAS—Hungarian Employment Foundation.

Ost, D. (2000). Illusory Corporatism in Eastern Europe: Neoliberal Tripartism and Postcommunist Class Identities. *Politics and Society, 28*(4), 503–530.

Pittaway, M. (1999, September) The Social Limits of State Control: Time, the Industrial Wage Relation, and Social Identity in Stalinist Hungary, *Journal of Historical Sociology, 12*(3), 1948–1953.

Pittaway, M. (2005). Introduction: Workers and Socialist States in Postwar Central and Eastern Europe. *International Labor and Working-Class History, 68*, 1–8.

Pittaway, M. (2007). The Revolution and Industrial Workers: The Disintegration and Reconstruction of Socialism, 1953–1958. *Hungarian Studies Review, 34,* 1–2.

Pittaway, M. (2012). *The Workers State: Industrial Labor and the Making of Socialist Hungary, 1944–1958.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Pollert, A. (1999). *Transformation at Work in the New Market Economies of Central and Eastern Europe.* London: Sage.

Pollert, A. (2000). Ten Years of Post-communist Central Eastern Europe: Labour's Tenuous Foothold in the Regulation of the Employment Relationship. *Economic and Industrial Democracy, 21,* 183–210.

Róna-Tas, Á. (2002, February). Economic Sociology in Europe: Hungary. *Economic Sociology: Electronic Newsletter, 3*(2), 32–38.

Seleny, A. (2006). *The Political Economy of State Society Relations in Hungary and Poland.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sik, E. (1987). A láthatatlan jövedelemről. *Mozgó Világ, 6.* sz, 85–92.

Sik, E. (1988). The Reciprocal Exchange of Labour in Hungary. In R. E. Pahl (Ed.), *On Work* (pp. 527–547). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Sik, E. (1996). Egy ló-öszvér a lovakról és a szamarakról. Adalék a második gazdaság hazai eszmetörténetéhez. *Közgazdasági Szemle, 43,* 704–725.

Stark, D. (1986). Rethinking Internal Labor Markets: New Insights from a Comparative Perspective. *American Sociological Review, 51,* 492–504.

Stark, D. (1989). Coexisting Organizational Forms in Hungary's Emerging Mixed Economy. In V. Nee & D. Stark (Eds.), *Remaking the Economic Institutions of Socialism: China and Eastern Europe* (pp. 137–168). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Swain, N. (2011). Post-socialist Capitalism. *Europe-Asia Studies, 63*(9), 1671–1695.

Szalai, E. (2001). *Gazdasági elit és társadalom a magyarországi újkapitalizmusban.* Budapest: Aula.

Szalai, E. (2004). Tulajdonviszonyok, társadalomszerkezet és munkásság. *Kritika, 33.* évf., 9.

Szalai, E. (2006). Tőke-munka viszony és hatalmi szerkezet a magyarországi újkapitalizmusban. In I. Kovách (Ed.), *Társadalmi metszetek. Érdekek és hatalmi viszonyok, individualizáció és egyenlőtlenség a mai Magyarországon* (349–373). Budapest: Napvilá.

Szelényi, I. (1988). Socialist Entrepreneurs: Embourgeoisement in Rural Hungary. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. *Szociológiai Szemle, 20*(1), *26–52.*

Szelényi, I. (1989). Eastern Europe in and Epoch of Transition Towards a Socialist Mixed Economy? In V. Nee & D. Stark (Eds.), *Remaking the Economic Institutions of Socialism* (pp. 208–232). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Thompson, P., & Smith, C. (2009). Labour Power and Labour Process: Contesting the Marginality of the Sociology of Work. *Sociology, 43*(5), 913–930.

Timár, J. (1985). Idő és munkaidő. *Közgazdasági Szemle, 32*, 1299–1313.

Tóth, A. (2013). A kádárizmus búvópatakként való visszatérése a kádárizmus csődje után a munkaügyi kapcsolatok és a szakszervezeti érdekvédelem területén (1989–2013). *Metszetek*, 2–3.

Tóth, A., Neumann, L., & Hosszú, H. (2012). Hungary's Full-Blown Malaise. In S. Lehndorff (Ed.), *A Triumph of Failed Ideas European Models of Capitalism in the Crisis* (pp. 137–154). Brussels: ETUI.

Valuch, T. (2012). Munkás-társadalom-történet: Közelítések és fogalmi kérdések. *Korall, 13*(49), 5–16.

10

Sociology of Work in Bulgaria

Vassil Kirov

Introduction

Sociology in Bulgaria emerged at the end of Nineteenth century, but until the Second World War, most of its manifestations were rather sporadic, especially concerning the world of work. Few studies on the working conditions of Bulgarian workers were carried out in the 1930s (Stavrov 1979). The communist coup d'Etat in September 1944 was a key event also for the development of social sciences. In 1948, after the consolidation of the communist regime, all the sociological activities in the country were stopped: sociological publications, sociological lectures at the Sofia University and the Military Academy, the philosophical-sociological society and so on (Koleva 2005). The reason for this development was that sociology was qualified as a 'bourgeois' science. Sociology returned in the years 1958–1959 (after the death of Stalin and the opening of the Khrushchev period) and experienced significant developments, including in the field of work-related studies. The political changes after the fall of the Berlin Wall shaped differently the sociology of work (SoW) in the country, on the one hand, emancipating it from its leading ideological role and the Communist Party, but on the other, opening new dependencies.

V. Kirov (✉)
Institute for the Study of Societies and Knowledge,
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Sofia, Bulgaria

323

The sociology of work (SoW) was defined by number of researchers in the pre-1989 period (see below), focusing both on the fundamental and on the applied research aspects. After 1989, the definition of the sociology of work is in a way enlarged and the boundaries between it and other sociological disciplines and other emerging disciplines such as HRM—blurred. The role of the state was crucial in the socialist period as the state was the only actor that can validate/prohibit the development of scientific disciplines and mobilize institutional resources. After 1989 the role of the state decreases, as a multitude of other actors enter the field. However, the state still has an important function: accrediting sociological programmes, providing subsidies (even if limited) for university training and scientific research. The institutionalization of the SoW in Bulgaria starts in the 1960s–1980s with the creation of research units in larger research institutes and university teaching, mainly in Sofia. After 1989, the professional group of the sociologists of work is relatively small. Part of the researchers is more or less integrated in different international networks. Very often, researchers carry out studies within the SoW, but in parallel in other sub-disciplines such as economic sociology, industrial relations, HRM, gender studies of sociology of professions[1]. In the 1990s and especially since the entry in the EU, the European Union is a powerful actor in the development of scientific disciplines in Bulgaria, through the financial mechanism for research funding—large projects, networks, individual grants, university curricula development and last, but not least—the research agendas and priorities, set in the national programming documents[2]. The role of the USA directly is limited, but indirectly the development of the discipline is stimulated by theoretical contributions and bilateral exchanges.

The sociology of work in Bulgaria is defined by the Encyclopaedia Dictionary of Sociology (1996) as a sociological sub-discipline whose object of study is labour in the context of the social system and as a source, or a driving force, of its self-development. The subjects of the SoW "are the labour relations that represent a common basis and a link between the relations that arise between the people in the societal reproduction process. The specific angle from which the SoW analyses the labour relations is the division of labour, as the core of its subject" (1996, p. 387). The structure of the

---

[1]In the same time there are other research traditions that are also very important, but not examined here, because of their very distant relationship with the world of work: the science and technology studies (STS)—Ivan Tchalakov and the group around him; the research on poverty and unemployment of D. Minev and M. Jeliazkova among others; the research on the agriculture and the transformation of the Bulgarian village—V. Kozhuharova and later R. Jeleva, M. Draganova, S. Stoeva; the studies on particular ethnic minorities, e.g. Romas—I. Tomova, A. Pamporov; the studies on social stratification and the middle class in Bulgaria—N. Tilkidzhiev; entrepreneurship—J. Vladimirov, and so on.

[2]Such as the National Strategy for the Development of Scientific Research in Bulgaria 2017–2030 (Национална стратегия за развитие на научните изследвания в Република България 2017–2030) or the Fund Scientific Research (https://www.fni.bg/?q=node/14) of the Ministry of Education and Science.

chapter is the following: the first part examines the SoW in the communist period (1945–1989) and its dependence on the party-state, political control and ideological orientation (Koleva 2005); the second part focuses on post-1989 developments. This includes work-related sociological research in the context of paradigmatic openness, resource scarcity and continuous integration in international research traditions and networks.

The Party-State-Led Sociological Science in the Context of Socialist Modernization

The State of the Play of Sociology in Communist Bulgaria

The establishment of the communist regime in Bulgaria began on the 9 September 1944, in the context of the Soviet occupation. This authoritarian and repressive state followed closely the practices of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in all spheres of life, including in science. Very quickly, in 1948, all forms of sociology were stopped,[3] as historical materialism was considered sufficient to explain social realities, according to the official party line. Ten years later, in 1958, the publication of two books, *Historical materialism and sociology* by Jivko Oshavkov, and the *Basis of the representatives studies* by Vassil Tzonev, announced the renaissance of sociology (Koleva 2005).

In the following years, sociology was gradually institutionalized. The Bulgarian Sociological Society (later renamed the Bulgarian Sociological Association) was established in 1959. A Sociology group was created within the Institute of philosophy of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.[4] During the 1960s, several large-scale empirical studies were carried out, for example, on the city and the village,[5] religion and potential migration from rural to urban regions. These large-scale studies were in line with the important processes of state-led industrialization and urbanization.

---

[3]A number of sociologists were persecuted because of their ideological orientation.

[4]The Bulgarian Academy of Sciences is the national research centre, including dozens of institutes in different scientific disciplines.

[5]The sociological survey "Gradat i seloto" (The City and the village) was carried out in 1967 and then in 1986. It was based on a very large sample (e.g. 18,994 respondents in 1967) and among other things, it provided interesting insights into the working population, the use of technology, educational status and so forth (http://prehod.omda.bg/page.php?IDMenu=819&IDLang=1 http://prehod.omda.bg/page.php?IDMenu=620&IDLang=1).

The theoretical debates at this time focused on structuralism and a systems approach and the concept of the "sociological system" was introduced after 1964–1965. According to Koleva (2005), this Marxist approach was based on the functionalist and structuralist tradition. It contributed to the theoretical reinforcement of the aspirations of Bulgarian sociologists for an autonomous disciplinary field. The preferred methodology at that time was that of quantitative sociological surveys, probably chosen also as a means to prove the scientificity of the discipline. The following quotation from Luben Nickolov (1992), founder and head of the sociology chair of the Sofia University, illustrates well the contradiction facing Bulgarian sociologists in this period:

> Thus sociologists were expected to give good advice, and to make proposals that were to contribute to the better functioning of the economy and the other social processes. However, their recommendations were not allowed to interfere with the existing fundamental social structure and the interests of the ruling elite. In this way sociologists participated in the process of palliative reforms which partly improved the situation of the populace, while they also led to the partial reduction of direct violence.

The institutionalization of sociology would not have been possible without the political benediction of the Bulgarian Communist Party (BKP)[6] (Koleva 2005). In 1967, the Politburo of the BKP, the highest political governing body within the party, published a document on sociology. Following this, a Sociological Group within the Central Committee of the BKP was established. The next year, in 1968, the Institute of Sociology of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences was created. It began publishing *Sotziologuicheski problemi*—Sociological Problems—the first Bulgarian academic review focused solely on sociology. The Centre for Youth Studies at the Central Committee of Young Communists (later called National Youth Institute) was also established. Again, during this period, sociology lectures at Sofia University and the Economic University had resumed. Later, in 1977, the first chair of sociology was established in Bulgaria, at Sofia University "Sv. Kliment Ohridski".

The institutionalization of sociology was accompanied by attempts to seek international legitimation. A clear sign of these attempts was the organization

---

[6]Interestingly, there were a number of famous sociologists who had acquired high-profile positions: e.g. Stoyan Mihailov was a member of the Central Committee of BKP, Niko Yahiel was a political advisor to T. Zhivkov, head of BKP from 1954 to 1989.

of the 1970 International Sociological Association (ISA) Congress in Varna, at the Black Sea. This was the first time that an ISA congress took place in a socialist country, with the participation of 3200 sociologists from 14 countries.[7] In this way, sociology was relaunched and quickly was institutionalized and developed. This more general context is necessary in seeking to understand the specific developments of the SoW, examined in the next section.

Sociology of Work: Fundamental Research and Applied Science

In the 1960s, the Bulgarian sociologists began to study the world of work. The dialectical approach determined the research. The main category of analysis was the "sociological system", defined as: "a system made up of the major social phenomena and the links between them, whose elements are in organic unity and in their interaction is carried out the development" (Mihaylov 1965). According to Boyadjieva (2009):

> …the cognitive institutionalization of sociology in Bulgaria occurred in the 1960s and 1970s. It appeared to be dual paradigmatic 'entrapped' – on the one hand, in the framework of official Marxism – on the other hand in the framework of an overall theoretical concept, pretending to be an original Bulgarian contribution justifying the field of sociology – a concept of the sociological system of society. In terms of content, this concept can generally be defined as a simplified Marxist version (without profound historicism and dialectics) of structural functionalism.

The Institute of Sociology at the Academy of Sciences, established in 1968, quickly became the leading sociological institution in the country. Not all those engaged in the creation of the newly established sub-discipline, and who contributed to its development, were sociologists, let alone sociologists of work. Within the institute, a section (department) of the SoW was established. Already in 1968, one of the departments was called the sociology of management (*sotziologia na upravlenieto*), including work groups for work research. Later, a separate department of SoW and social policy carried out activities specifically in the domain of work and policy. In 2008, this department was merged with the department of the sociology of the economy and

---

[7]http://www.bsa-bg.org/index.php/2012-05-21-15-04-57.

politics. In 2010, the Institute of Sociology itself was merged with two other research units of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.[8]

Empirical studies had also been carried out by other institutions such as the Institute for Research on Trade Union Problems (*Nautchno izsledovatelski institut po profsaiuzni problemi*), attached to the Central Board of BPS (the sole, and official, trade union during the communist period) or the Academy of Social Sciences and Social Development at the Central Committee of the BKP (*Akademia za Obschtestveni nauki i sotzialno upravlenie*). At the end of 1968, a voluntary group for sociological research, created within the remit of the trade unions in 1963, grew into the Centre for Sociological Research at the Central Council of the Bulgarian Trade Unions (see Koleva 2013). This centre quickly increased in importance and at the end of the 1980s, the Institute for Research on Trade Union Problems and the Trade Union School together employed about 300 researchers and lecturers.

At the end of the 1970s, the authors of the seminal book *The industrial enterprise - sociological system and activity at work* (Mihaylov 1965, p. 25) noted:

> In our country, up to now sociological research in companies has had as its object particular problems, phenomena and processes. Their aim is to study turnover, the relations within the working collective, the use of working time, the introduction of the five-day week, the ideological work, the social activities, etc. The information gathered mainly concerned the evaluations of the studied problems by interviewees - the state of play, the factors determining it, and the appropriate guidelines and measures to overcome existing weaknesses and shortcomings.

The main objective of this study, carried out at the company called *Elprom* in Troyan,[9] was "to reveal the character of the enterprise as a sociological system, to account for the interdependence of the construction of this system on the one hand and the work activity of the collective of the company, on the other" (Mihaylov 1965, p. 5).

In the period, prior to 1989, several authors in the Bulgarian sociological literature attempted to define in a more detailed way the subject, and the research questions, for the SoW. They included, for example, Zahari

---

[8]For more details, see http://www.old-sociology.issk-bas.org/display.php?page=section&type=30&article=119.

[9]More details about this survey in *Elprom* can be found at http://assa-m.com/npechat_st57.php#7.

Staykov, Chavdar Kuranov (1988), Krastiu Petkov, Georgui Kostov and Hristo Stoyanov (Enc. Dict. 1996). According to K. Petkov (Enc. Dict. 1996, pp. 388–389), SoW performed two main functions: theoretical-cognitive and managerial. The theoretical-cognitive function of the SoW found expression in the production of new knowledge that helped the governing bodies to better understand the nature of work, its role and place in society, and to develop mechanisms for its management. According to Petkov (1996), during the socialist period, the managerial function of the SoW became extremely important, as it sought to mark the transformation of the role of the sub-discipline into a real factor for the development of social practice—and for social change. This function was carried out in three key ways: (1) the collection of empirical sociological information and its use by management, (2) the development of plans, forecasts and programs, that is to say, societal forecasting and planning of both individual processes in the field of work and the system of societal labour as a whole, and (3) the preparation of projects designed to change the nature of the reality of labour— that is a new, still undeveloped, route designed to deepen the relationship between sociology and social practice, which can be called social engineering. Petkov's vision was that SoW could perform similar functions during the period of post-communist transformation (see more in the second part of the chapter), something that never happened.

The echo of this vision, that the SoW should have strong practical aspects in order to support the governance process, was expressed in different studies carried out in the pre-1989 period. During the 1970s and 1980s, Bulgarian SoW (see Dontchev 1988) was concerned with problems such as workers' participation in the decision-making process; the autonomy of the brigades (semi-autonomous teams); the self-realization of the individual at work; mobility at work and technology and work. (This argument is developed more fully in Kirov 2002).

Arguably, the common feature of these various research projects was the finding that the coercive models seemed to be increasingly less suitable in the mobilization of personnel in Bulgarian state-owned companies. The biggest problem faced by companies during this period was that of increasing staff turnover (*tekutchestvo*), "most visible in factories or workshops with old technologies, bad conditions, fragmentation and specialization of extreme work operations or the Taylorist organization of work" (Dontchev 1988, p. 158). For Bulgarian sociologists of work, the oppor-

tunities to solve this problem and retain the workforce were linked to the application of modern methods of working with employees: "In companies where the turnover reached up to 30% or 40% per annum, it was obvious that it was necessary to create powerful working structures that would allow staff to recover some of the functions of the existing staff directorates (*litchni sastavi*)" (Guerov 1984, p. 163) and to increase workplace democracy that would logically include workers in the functions of management.

During the 1980s, a team from the Institute for Research on Trade Union Problems carried out a longitudinal research programme titled, *Workers in the 80s*. The survey was conducted annually throughout the decade and was representative of industry and construction workers (62% of the overall employment being concentrated in these two sectors). The aim of this research was to give an account of workers' opinions on political, economic and social issues (Dimova 1989). It is interesting to note that those results were never publicly available, probably because some of elements of the analysis contradicted official ideology and the communist party line. Specifically, the issues centred on the themes of the establishment of self-management, the question of the managerial authority, production issues, improvement of discipline at work, the introduction of new technologies, professional interests and job satisfaction and, finally, the emergence of new forms of private economic initiative in the late 1980s.

The institutionalization of the discipline was accompanied by a significant growth of the sociological community. According to Boyadjieva (2009) and Michailov (2003), at the first congress of the Bulgarian Sociological Association (BSA) in 1969, 167 delegates and 120 guests participated. In 1971, the BSA already included approximately 800 members and 32 societies throughout the country. The third BSA congress in 1978 recorded 440 delegates, while at that time, there were 1140 members of the association united in 33 societies. In 1983, at the fourth BSA congress, there were 541 delegates delivering 300 papers. At that congress, it was reported that membership of BSA had now reached 1400. In the years between the last two congresses, 550 empirical sociological studies were conducted. The fifth congress of the BSA in 1990 brought together 541 delegates. However, by then, the Association's membership had already begun to decline. For more details, see Michailov (2003). Unfortunately, there are no precise data for sociologists of work as a percentage of the overall sociological professional community. After the political change of 1989, the general population of sociologists (at least as regards members of BSA) decreased sharply (Boyadjieva 2009).

In the educational sphere, in parallel with the more academic-oriented SoW, an applied SoW stream emerged. In 1981, a Chair in Sociology at Sofia University was created. The further institutionalization of the SoW was related to a decree of the Central Committee of the BKP defining the need for the introduction of positions for sociologists in large Bulgarian enterprises,[10] something that bears comparison with other former socialist countries including for example Poland, Chapter 8.[11] Thus, factory sociologists (*zavodskite sotziolozi*) began to take up positions in most of the large state-owned companies in order to carry out applied research commissioned by company management (Stoyanov 1988). Following the administrative "job distribution" of graduates, students active in this area of sociology went directly to different towns throughout the country. Certainly, the nature and quality of the research undertaken according to the requirements of local management varied considerably.

The involvement of several known Bulgarian sociologists as advisors, or senior officials of the BKP, or the State apparatus in socialist Bulgaria, contributed to the institutionalization and development not only of academic, but also of applied SoW. However, both fields were obliged to take into account ideological constraints and to circumvent certain subjects, judged sensitive, such as the issues of authority and the role of the Communist party in the enterprise.

Bulgarian sociology with an interest in work place problems was not focused solely on the national context. During the 1980s (and even before), a number of comparative studies were carried out. Examples of such studies included comparative work on Bulgaria, Hungary and France focusing on the issue of technology transfer under the direction of Claude Durand and Stefan Dontchev (see Dubois 1989; Dubois et al. 1986). Another theme was concerned with the introduction of new technologies in companies in the West and the East, carried out by Krastiu Petkov and Ken Spenner (Petkov and Spenner 1991). These comparative projects also led to

---

[10]See the interesting thematic issue concerning enterprise sociologists in Sotziologuitcheski problemi, 1988, Sofia or Stoyanov, S. Roliata na empiricthnite sotziologuitcheski izsledvania v promichlenia kombinat. in Sotzialna efektivnost na empirichnite sotziologuitcheski izsledvania. Izdatelstvo Naouka i izkoustvo (Gueorgiev, I., Fotev, G., Tchakalov, B. Eds.), Sofia: 1988, pp. 294–301, 331 p., Karagiaourova, D. Sotziologuitcheski prouchvania v edno promichleno predpriatie. in Sotzialna efektivnost na empirichnite sotziologuitcheski izsledvania. Izdatelstvo Naouka i izkoustvo (Gueorgiev, I., Fotev, G., Thcakalov, B. sous la dir.), Sofia: 1988, pp. 278–280.

[11]At the beginning of the 1990s, those sociologists were among the first to be made redundant in the framework of the mass dismissals. However, in few companies, sociologists were active even in the second half of the 1990s—e.g. in my own research, I was able to meet the sociologist of the National Electric Company and the sociologist working in the Nuclear Plant "Kozlodouy" in 1995.

a number of foreign language publications, mainly in English and French. However, they were notable also because they facilitated scientific exchange and the adoption of new methods and ideas in Hungary. Moreover, the following quotation from K. Petkov, in a newspaper publication, illustrates the fact that a number of sociologists in Hungary were permitted to pursue research and specialize in West European countries. That's not all, however. Interestingly, he highlights the interchange between sociology and other disciplines:

> I had been redirected and finished with political economy. Sociology at that time was still in the area of forbidden science. But I was lucky when I graduated from the university to be invited by Prof. Zahari Staykov to work in a section on Sociology of work at the Institute of Labour. So, from the economy, I entered sociology - through specializations in Switzerland, England, the Soviet Union. In 1968, during the Prague Spring I was in Czechoslovakia. I became aware of alternative worlds, I began to realize, and then the period of accumulation [of knowledge] began.[12]

During the 1980s, the economic system was showing considerable signs of difficulty as a consequence of which the communist party tried to introduce more workplace autonomy. It attempted this through the 1986 Labour Code promoting, at least in theory, self-management. The role of unions was extremely important with regards to self-management practices (see Petkov and Thirkell 1988, 1991).

The SoW After 1989: Academic Freedom, but Dependence on External Resources

The Changing Sociology in the Framework of the Societal Change

The political change that took place on the 11 November 1989 opened new perspectives for social sciences. Very quickly after the fall of the last Bulgarian communist leader Todor Zhivkov, universities and research institutes reconsidered officially the leading role of Marxism-Leninism. The commitment to freedom of expression and the emergence of intensive social

---

[12]http://epicenter.bg/article/Tri-dni-predi-da-go-ubiyat-Lukanov-prizna-che-se-strahuva-za-zhivota-si/63968/11/34.

movements[13] that occupied the streets and the universities, created a more favourable environment for political or civic engagement than for pure academic research,[14] at least during the first years immediately following political change.

Socio-economic development after 1989

Before the fall of communism, Bulgaria was one of the members of the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and the Warsaw pact. According to many observers, Bulgaria was the most loyal ally of the USSR. In November 1989, after an internal *coup d'état*, the long-term general secretary of the BCP was replaced by a group of reformers. Several days after the 11 November, street protests began to be organized by the new opposition movements. So too were old political parties re-established. These political changes offered space for political democracy and pluralism. The Round table from December 1989 was the forum that fixed the conditions of the transition. Soon after that, in June 1990, the first free elections were held. The first years of the post-communist transition in Bulgaria were characterized by economic and political instability. The first economic reforms from 1991 followed the economic shock (occurring first in Poland) and contributed to the de-monopolization of the state-owned economic groups, to the liberalization of prices, and to a massive restructuring of the economy. As an immediate result, the unemployment rate rose quickly, massive emigration followed and an important section of the population fell into poverty. In the winter of 1996–1997, the country was in a state of financial collapse and the protests on the streets forced the neo-communist government to resign. Since then, the stabilization efforts included the establishment of a Currency Board, the signature of agreements with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank and measures to ensure macroeconomic stabilization. The economic reforms included also the massive privatization as well as closures of enterprises faced with financial difficulties. This economic policy contributed to positive results in terms of growth and investor confidence, but came at high social price—rising poverty and unemployment. Economic growth was resumed in 1998 and continued into 2008. The unemployment trend was reversed and from almost 20% in the year 2000, it reached less than 6% in 2008. During the decade of the 2000s, there was a massive inflow of foreign direct investment (FDI) into the country (attaining almost 33% of the GDP in 2007), in many sectors of the economy. In 2007,

---

[13]Some of these movements started within the dissident groups from 1988 and early 1989.

[14]Actually, a number of famous sociologists were engaged in the newly established political movements, NGOs, trade unions and so on. It is interesting to note the largest Bulgarian opposition movement, the Union of the Democratic Forces, was established in the basement of the Institute of Sociology on 10 December 1989. Some of the significant sociologists of work also were engaged in political, trade union or civic activity: Krastiu Petkov became the founder and president of the reformed trade union CITUB (1990–1997) and later established the labour party the *Obedinen blok na truda*, Tchavdar Kuranov, after being active in the dissident movement, became candidate for President in 1990, supported by the Bulgarian Socialist Party (the new name of BKP since 1990) and so on.

the country joined the EU, one of the long-term goals for the Bulgarian political class and society more widely. However, since the beginning of the financial crisis, the economic situation in Bulgaria began to deteriorate. Inflows of FDI decreased considerably. Many Bulgarian companies were forced to downsize and restructure as a result of the loss of markets, reduced contracts from Western contractors and a problematic internal market. As a result, the level of unemployment increased to approximately 13% in 2011–2012 before falling back to around 6% in 2017. The economic difficulties were accompanied by protests from a range of different groups, increasingly dissatisfied with the high cost of living and high levels of corruption. Today, the economy remains dominated by an industrial sector (important sectors are metallurgy, machine making, textiles and clothing, the food industry and chemicals). That said, the service sector is growing. Tourism is important for employment and the Bulgarian economy more broadly, but it is subject to the weakness of seasonality. The role of the construction industry was very important in the pre-crisis years, but it was severely affected by the downturn. Finally, agriculture has revived, especially as a result of European Union funding. During the last few years, in parallel with a strong IT sector, the outsourcing of business services and call centres has also developed.

In addition, since the beginning of the transition, the role of the state in the development of scientific research within the social sciences has changed. The first dimension of the change was ideological: the political monopoly of the communist party and Marxism-Leninism was abolished. Very quickly, this led to the emergence of a plurality of theoretical and research traditions: including phenomenology, ethnomethodology, interactionism, the sociology of Bourdieu, but also of Raymond Boudon, and so on. Many classical authors of sociology research were translated (starting with Durkheim and Weber), some of them for the first time into Bulgarian (a large element of the available literature in the previous period was available only in Russian). Scholars also received a considerably larger access to publications in foreign languages. The political opening favoured scientific exchange: different exchange schemes with foreign universities and research institutions were launched and many Bulgarian scholars obtained the possibility to make short- or long-term research visits to Western Europe and North America. The plurality of theoretical approaches was also accompanied by a plurality of new institutions, mainly in the areas of applied research. Different research groups established their own, private institutes, NGOs, and so on (Koleva 2011). At the beginning of the 1990s, some sociologists also launched private public opinion poll and marketing agencies, profiting from a new market niche. Later, this approach was criticized as "one of the easiest routes" to survival, neglecting much-needed research on important aspects of social transformation (Koleva 2013):

In the face of the dynamic political and economic transformations, Bulgarian sociologists entered public space in the easiest and fastest way: by taking up the job of providing empirical data on electoral attitudes, political orientations, and commercial preferences of Bulgarian citizens. On one hand, in systematically disregarding the question as to the limitations and traps involved in this type of data, they themselves built the poll-centred image of sociology in Bulgaria. On the other hand, due to the lack of social procurement and sufficient subsidies, many aspects of the painfully changing Bulgarian society (such as social inequalities, deviant behaviour, school dropout, social injustice, etc.) have long remained underestimated and unstudied.

During the 1990s, universities also experienced significant fragmentation. Many older higher institutes for teachers (and technical schools) became universities and in some of them, sociology chairs were created. In the context of this expansion of sociological teaching, sociology programmes were introduced in 1994 at Southwestern University "Neofit Rilski" in Blagoevgrad (in 1994), at the Plovdiv University "Paisii Hilendarski" (since 1995), the newly established private New Bulgarian University, and elsewhere (see more about this process in Slavova 2014). Sociology and sociological sub-disciplines also have been taught at the Technical University of Sofia, the University of Architecture, Civil Engineering and Geodesy in Sofia, the Varna Free University and the New Bulgarian University, among others.

But in parallel with the intellectual opening at the beginning of the transition, the collapse of the state-run economy and the start of 'shock' economic reforms also meant the implementation of various austerity measures, including in the field of scientific research and higher education. State funding for research sharply decreased. It was for this reason that increasingly social science research became dependent on various foreign donors,[15] often

---

[15]As Koleva (2013) notes: "The economic transformation of Bulgarian society was favourable to the emergence of a new group of actors, willing to financially support both fundamental and applied research, regardless of the institutional affiliation of the researchers. In the first ten years of the transition, the Research Support Scheme of the Open Society Foundation made possible several hundred collective and individual projects of Bulgarian researchers in the social sciences, including sociologists. A positive contribution in this respect was also made by internationally reputed foundations such as Friedrich Naumann, Friedrich Ebert, Kondrad Adenauer, MacArthur, King Baudouin, by foreign and international funds like Fonds Marshall, the PHARE program, UNDP, the programmes for scientific cooperation of the ministries of foreign affairs of Western countries. Since the late 1990s the EU framework programmes have enabled the participation of Bulgarian scholars in European projects."

bringing their agenda and research priorities. Thus, vulnerable groups and minorities such as the Roma, civil society and so on have lost out in terms of the focus of the various research agenda. On the one hand, those donors allowed many sociologists the possibility to pursue empirical research, but, on the other hand, the quality was not always very high, focusing as it tended to do on empirical findings in particular spheres. So, after the "Velvet Revolution", the utopian autonomy of the scientist and science as "a free science in a free society" was quickly replaced by a line anticipated by the European Union (Deyanova 2008).

The Sociology of Work: From Marginalization Towards Embeddedness in European Research Traditions

At the beginning of the post-communist transition, the world of work received little attention for a number of reasons. The bulk of sociological research focused on a range of issues concerned with political pluralism and system change, the emerging civil society, ethnic relations, and the character of the rule of the law. In the field of economic sociology, the issues high on the agenda were research on poverty, studies on the precipitous rise in mass unemployment (one of the first studies on job dismissal had already been conducted in the summer of 1989, see Tzeneva and Cook 1991) and, of course, the development of entrepreneurship. With respect to the latter theme, of course for some, the invisible hand of the market was considered sufficient for solving the country's economic problems.

However, the transition agenda was not the only reason for the lack of interest in work-related problems. The resources for carrying out empirical sociological research sharply diminished immediately in the first years of the transition as has been stated. The state was not able to fund anything other than modest wages with limited budgets, in public universities and research centres. Then again, in the early transition period and the surrounding context of global change, work-related issues were in general not seen as a priority by the Ministry of Education and Science or the National Science Fund under its umbrella. Part of the funding and resources that were available therefore came from different external sources: foreign governments, the Open Society foundation, established by George Soros, bilateral programmes and other sources. Another important funder of work-related research during the 1990s was the International Labour Organisation. A number of studies were carried on the themes of flexibilization in state-owned companies, which we consider below (Standing et al. 1993), emerg-

ing collective bargaining issues (Hill et al. 1997) and the development of trade unions.

The SoW has been taught as a discipline in different universities, together with many of the other main sociological sub-disciplines. Also, master degree programmes took off, related partially to the SoW, for example, the Master Degree programme at Sofia University "Labour markets and Human resources development", established after a successful European TEMPUS project, coordinated by Jacques Vilrokx from the Free University of Brussels.[16]

The beginning of economic reforms in the country in 1991 included the deregulation of prices, the dismantling of the former large state-owned groups into independent companies able to compete under free market conditions, and the introduction of management contracts for managers. The latter would cease to be nominated politically, at least officially. These times were chaotic and coincided with the process of decapitalization, which we can understand as the transfer of resources from state-owned enterprises to the private sector. The context can be understood as one of, "an illegal mass privatization which in effect transforms official privatization into a formal act and legalizes the transfer of capital already made and [which oversaw a] deindustrialization, felt especially in the mono-industrial regions of the country" (Minev and Kabaktchieva 1996). The beginning of the 1990s was also the period which saw the re-emergence of unemployment; very quickly, this became mass unemployment (Minev et al. 1995).

Since the years 1994–1995, and bearing in mind what has just been said regarding economic change, one of the most important issues for work-related sociology became the privatization of Bulgarian companies (Keremidchiev 1995; Kirov 2001, 2002). In the context of change in property relations, the interests of actors were focused on property transfer as opposed to management practices and certainly not working conditions (Kirov 2002). Probably this was why the SoW was no longer invited to carry out its managerial function in the terms described by Petkov (1996). The process of privatization began somewhat later in Bulgaria than in the rest of Central Europe and involved a multitude of actors (foreign investors, local companies and mass privatization funds). The privatization agenda led to significant changes within all companies, e.g. re-Taylorization (Kirov 2001). It necessarily, as would be expected, involved significant restructuring and

---

[16]See more details at http://phls.uni-sofia.bg/documents/users/44/MP%20Trudovi%20pazari/Report_15.pdf.

labour force "optimization" (Kirov 2005). The key research on privatization focused on the establishment of a group of employee-owners, which was significant within the context of mass privatization. The diversity of privatizing trajectories was visible at the end of the 1990s. Post-privatization restructuring also became an important topic of research at the start of the millennium. Already, at the end of the 1990, two national representative surveys investigated, among other things, the changing nature of work-related values and the degradation of working conditions (Vladimirov et al. 1999).

Aspects of these processes were analysed in the context of global value chain restructuring (Makó et al. 2009), at a time when the share of FDI in the Bulgarian economy was rising (as was the case with all former Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries).[17] Indeed, since the end of the 1990s, FDI increased considerably in Bulgaria in many sectors of the economy, in terms of both brownfield and greenfield investment. Makó et al. (2009) have demonstrated through a number of case studies that the newest models of work organization have appeared in the region not only in the most knowledge-intensive sectors such as IT but, to a lesser extent, in traditional sectors, for example, in the clothing and food industries. Sociological research on the transfer of management methods and HRM was carried out by several scholars, but this topic was less present than in other CEEs. Publications focused on the transfer of models (Vladimirov 2011; Makó et al. 2009) and later, on particular forms of FDI, for example, the role of Chinese investment (Drahokoupil et al. 2017).

Post-privatization restructuring and the consequent socio-economic developments in Bulgaria were in line with the general trends in CEE (Delteil and Kirov 2016). One of the key developments investigated at the company level has been the process of work force flexibilization. Sociological research into the ways in which flexibilization has operated in Bulgarian companies was analysed on the basis of different case studies (Kirov et al. 2014). The analysis of the recently published book "Forced flexibility and job insecurity" has focused on waste collection and construction—economic activities usually associated in the country with insecure employment, low wages and low-qualified workforce. The thesis is that in these sectors, forced flexibility has mostly benefitted the employers. Forced flexibility leads to the dynamic development of a dual labour market and work organization that cannot compensate for the negative effects this transformation has on workers. The lack of worker voice and their limited skill development further

---

[17]This research was part of the European comparative research project WORKS—Work Organisation and Restructuring in the Knowledge Society (2005–2009).

impact the quality of work in the areas of economic activity that were the subject of the research.

That said, in the Bulgarian context, flexibilization and precarious work are related not only to the spread of atypical work (Kirov et al. 2016), but also to the development of informal practices such as so-called envelope wages. From the perspective of the study of the informal economy and informal practices, this remains a relevant field, allowing for a greater understanding of labour developments (see, for example, Chavdarova 2001, 2002). Chavdarova's contribution has been to indicate that the informal sector, in its various forms, is neither rudimentary nor limited. It especially can be seen to emerge in the way in which administrative restrictive measures, (sanctions and coercion) operate. There was a shared belief that with Europeanization and economic growth, that informal practices would be significantly limited, or even eradicated, from post-socialist countries. However, more than quarter of a century after the fall of communism, the informal economy and informal work persist in South-Eastern Europe (SEE) (Kirov et al. 2016).

Another important sub-field related to work was one focusing on industrial relations. A group around K. Petkov, professor of SoW and the formal leader of the largest trade union confederation CITUB, undertook significant research on the nature of emerging industrial relations, including at company level, from the beginning of the 1990s. Petkov was the director of the trade union research institute before the political transformations,[18] and was involved in an agenda premised on cooperation with scholars from the UK and the US. This led to a range of publications in high-profile outlets (see Petkov and Thirkell 1988). Some of the scholars, initially belonging to this group, such as Grigor Gradev, also worked on the Europeanization of industrial relations in Bulgaria and CEE in addition to researching the character of the structures of workplace representation at company level (see Stanojevic and Gradev 2003). Others, for example, Dimitrina Dimitrova, worked on the development of trade unions in SEE (Dimitrova and Vilokx 2005). However, Gradev and Dimitrova were later involved in other activities: the international/national trade union movement and international organizations and politics.

The research body of the CITUB, known as the Institute for Social and Trade Union research (ISTUR) was significantly reduced after 1989 and then during the 1990s and 2000s. With a staff of around 10 researchers, ISTUR produced some interesting texts, e.g. the research on employment

---

[18]See bio available at http://www.kpetkov.eu/avtobiografia.

relations in multinationals in Bulgaria (Daskalova and Tomev 2010), but still focused mainly on applied research analyses for the needs of trade unions.

Researchers from the Sofia University such as Petia Slavova made contributions in the domain of work practices of concrete professions, for example, in the case of lawyers and architects in the socialist and post-socialist periods (Slavova 2006). Other research on professional identities at workplace level was carried out on software workers, with a particular focus taken from the standpoint of gender (Stoilova 2008).

The SoW is also developed at the University of National and World Economy in Sofia (Rakadjiiska). However, here, research has been dominated by economic sociology, for example, labour markets studies, social capital, and small and medium-sized enterprises. Since the entry of the country into the European Union in 2007, accession has provided some structural funds allowing the support for a range of large studies. For example, in 2010, research was carried out on a representative Survey of National Working Conditions (Stefanova et al. 2012). Other large studies were conducted within the framework of large European Social Fund (ESF)-funded projects, for example, in relation to working conditions, flexibility and security, and the informal economy (Chengelova 2015). However, this field, based on the interpretations of empirical findings, has not yet produced significant academic contributions in international outlets.

Finally, recent years have witnessed the development of several research topics in Bulgaria utilizing a comparative European research perspective. These include, ageing at work, digitalization of work (Meil and Kirov 2017), employment relations in SMEs (Illessy et al. 2007), and workplace learning practices (Project ENLIVEN—https://h2020enliven.org/). Very recently, some young scholars have begun researching the nature of platform work. Key examples are Yordanova and Kirov (2017), and Dobreva in her Ph.D. thesis *Digital work in the creative industries: between exploitation and empowerment.*

The participation of Bulgarian research teams in large projects, funded by the European Commission, was an important channel for the transfer of modern theories and methodologies.[19] However, this process was not a one-

---

[19]Among these projects, I would like to mention WALQING—Work and Life Quality in New and Growing Jobs (2009–2012); WORKS—Work Organisation and Restructuring in the Knowledge Society (2005–2009); "SMALL"—Representation and voice in Small and Medium-sized European enterprises: monitoring Actors, Labour organisations and Legal frameworks (2002–2006), but also various projects financed by DG Employment of the European Commission and other donors.

way street of ideas, as was the case with economics,[20] and by contrast, it lead to particular contributions including comparative work.[21] Comparability seems to be very important from the perspective of a small country where analytical results in the SoW (but also in more general terms) have better international acceptance when set in a comparative perspective.

Critical voices in Bulgarian sociology have typically been situated at a more general level (Minev et al. 1995; Deyanova 2008), than within the sub-discipline. Concretely, in the SoW, critical voices that have existed have been concerned with the negative consequences of restructuring, with management practices leading to precarious work and with the effects of labour exploitation. (Velizarova in her Ph.D. thesis, has been analysing the problems of labour exploitation of Bulgarians in the labour markets of other EU countries). Critical work has analysed the persistence of the dangerous effects of informal employment and envelope wages associated with Bulgaria's weak regulatory framework. The work of Delteil and Kirov (2016) brought a critical analysis of the impact of Europeanization within the sphere of labour, employment and industrial relations.

In terms of methods used, the period after 1989 also witnessed a plurality of approaches. In parallel to a number of representative sociological surveys, now, many other, mainly qualitative methods are used by the sociologists of work: interviews and case-study research especially. During the last few years, there have been some attempts to use other research methods for example, action research applied in the context of a waste-recycling company (Kirov et al. 2013).

Finally, it is important also to mention the fact that after 1989, a number of Bulgarian scholars were able to pursue their post-graduate studies and, or, professional careers in other countries and some of them made valuable contributions together with scholars from countries with solid traditions in the SoW, such as the UK, Germany, France and the USA. However, by contrast with other countries (e.g. Poland, see Mrozowizki in this volume), a number of those scholars finally followed their career in other spheres such as international trade unions, foreign universities and, consequently, the transfer of their knowledge has been really difficult.

---

[20]According to Avramov (2007), the results of a study based on interviews with Bulgarian economists and sociologists, assessed the transfer of ideas from West to East. The research led to the conclusion that the Bulgarian economic research community had a propensity to confine itself to the role of recipient of theory.

[21]Avramov (2007).

Conclusion

The SoW (and speaking largely with respect to sociology as a whole) in Bulgaria has been developed in the context of profound historical disruptions. The major political events that shaped the theoretical, empirical and institutional developments of the sub-discipline of the SoW were inevitably tied to the establishment in 1944, and the subsequent fall, in 1989, of the communist regime.

While the pre-war contributions of the SoW in Bulgaria were very limited, the development of the whole sociological discipline ground to a halt entirely after World War II. Its revival at the end of the 1950s was related to the dominance of Marxism-Leninism and the specific theoretical and empirical research around the concept of the 'sociological system'. That is to say that the discipline certainly has had both theoretical and applied ambitions in the past. An overview of the research topics during that period suggested a number of research interests, connected with the everyday problems in Bulgarian companies. However, this research was carried out within specific ideological and thematic constraints. A specific contribution to the discipline was the development of the applied SoW, without analogues in the other CEE countries.

After 1989, Bulgarian SoW was emancipated from the monopoly of Marxism-Leninism. The development of the discipline continued, inspired by different theoretical traditions and approaches, including employment relations and labour-process perspectives, the French tradition of the SoW and the enterprise, being significant examples. Some research now lies at the boundary between the SoW and other sociological sub-disciplines, facilitated also by the personal trajectories of many scholars, active in more than one sub-discipline. The political change in 1989, however, made interest in research into work and labour relatively marginal, in the context of other issues, considered to be more pertinent and important for understandable reasons. In addition, there were different individual disruptions in the trajectories of scholars involved in research in the SoW. It is important to bear in mind that professional communities in small countries are also small. In the case of Bulgaria, the number of scholars working in the field of SoW remains rather limited. Within a very large scope, probably fewer than twenty persons are lecturing, conducting research, or preparing PhDs in the field. Part of this community is more or less integrated into different European networks through a range of mechanisms, which is probably the only condition for peer-reviewing and theoretical and empirical advancement.

References

Avramov, R. (2007). Знание за институциите, институции на знанието. *Sociologitcheski Problemi, 3–4*, 15–41 (in Bulgarian).

Boyadjieva, P. (2009). Shooting at a Moving Target: Rediscovering Sociology in Bulgaria. In *The ISA Handbook of Diverse Sociological Traditions* (pp. 163–174). London: Sage.

Chavdarova, T. (2001). *Neformalnata ikonomika* [The Informal Economy]. Sofia: Lik (in Bulgarian).

Chavdarova, T. (2002). The Informal Economy in Bulgaria: Historical Background and Present Situation. In *The Social Impact of Informal Economics in Eastern Europe* (pp. 56–76). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Chengelova, E. (2015). Has The Relative Share of Shadow Economy in Bulgaria Been Reduced: Labour Force Evaluations. *Ikonomiceski i Sotsialni Alternativi, 3,* 26–39.

Daskalova, N., & Tomev, L. (2010). Sociétés multinationales en Bulgarie: l'impact sur l'évolution du travail et du climat social. In V. Schmidt (Ed.), *Les syndicats face aux défis de la mondialisation* (pp. 73–84). Bureau international du travail; Réseau international de recherches syndicales.

Delteil, V., & Kirov, V. (Eds.). (2016). *Labour and Social Transformations in Central and Eastern Europe: Europeanization and Beyond*. Abingdon, UK and New York, USA: Routledge.

Deyanova, L. (2008). Le nouveau paradigme des sciences sociales vu de l'Est. *Regards sociologiques, 36,* 69–81.

Dimitrova, D., & Vilrokx, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Trade Unions Strategies in Central and Eastern Europe: Towards Decent Work*. Budapest: ILO.

Dimova, L. (1989). *Rabotchee obshtestvenoe mnenie v seredina 80 godov* [Public Opinion of Workers in the Mid-1980s], (in Russian), Synthesis report, Sofia.

Dontchev, S. (1988). *Sotziologuitcheski izsledvania na promichlenia troud* [Sociological Research on Industrial Work]. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN (in Bulgarian).

Drahokoupil, J., Kirov, V., Muntean, A., & Radu, E. (2017). Chinese Investment in Romania and Bulgaria. In J. Drahokoupil (Ed.), *Chinese Investment in Europe: Corporate Strategies and Labour Relations* (pp. 141–154). Brussels: ETUI.

Dubois, P. (1989). L'universel, le national et le cas de figure: A propos de comparaisons avec des pays d'Europe de l'Est. *Sociologie du Travail, 31*(2), 205–216 (Les comparaisons internationales: Théories et méthodes).

Dubois, P., Durand, C., & Gilain, C. (1986). *La prise de décisions dans l'industrie - Etude comparative, France-Bulgarie-Hongrie*. Paris: Groupe de Sociologie du Travail, Tome I, 345 p., Tome II, 190 p.

Entziklopedichen Rechnik po sotziologia. (1996). S. Mihaylov (Ed.). Sofia: Institut po soziologia (in Bulgarian).

Guerov, K. (1984). *Organizatzionni strukturi i upravlenie* [Organisational Structures and Management]. Varna: Knigoizdatelstvo "G. Bakalov" (in Bulgarian).

Hill, S., Martin, R., & Vidinova, A. (1997). Institutional Theory and Economic Transformation: Enterprise Employment Relations in Bulgaria. *European Journal of Industrial Relations, 3*(2), 229–251.

Illessy, M., Mako, C., Kirov, V., & Stoeva, S. (2007). Labour Relations, Collective Bargaining and Employee Voice in SMEs in Central and Eastern Europe. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research, 13*(1), 95–113.

Keremidtchiev, M. (1995). Les privatisations en Bulgarie: mécanismes et intérêts. *REVUE FRANCAISE D ADMINISTRATION PUBLIQUE*: n° 74 (avril–juin), 211–215.

Kirov, V. (2001). La privatisation des entreprises bulgares: de la contrainte exogène à l'adaptation locale. In *Communisme*, Numéro spécial 'Communisme et post-communisme en Europe centrale et orientale'. n° 64, 143–166.

Kirov, V. (2002). *La privatisation des entreprises en Bulgarie.* Thèse de doctorat en Sociologie. Soutenue en 2002 à Paris, Institut d'études politiques.

Kirov, V. (2005). Restructurations industrielles en Bulgarie: Strategie des acteurs dans le contexte de l'integration Europeenne. In M. Alaluf & E. Krzeslo (Eds.), *Protection sociale et emploi. Regards croises sur la mondialisation en Europe et en Chine* (pp. 167–184). Bruxelles: Editions de l'ULB.

Kirov, V., Markova, E., & Peycheva, D. (2013). Action Research: An Example of Adapting and Applying Active Sociological Surveying in Bulgaria. *Sotziologuitcheski problemi* [Sociological Problems], (1–2), pp. 67–90 (in Bulgarian).

Kirov, V., Markova, E., & Peycheva, D. (2014). *Forced Flexibility and Job Insecurity. Sociological Analysis of the Quality of Labor in the Construction and Waste Disposal in Bulgaria*. Sofia: East-West Publishing House (in Bulgarian).

Kirov, V., Markova, E., & Peycheva, D. (2016). Hybrid Work Organisation in the Construction Sector in Bulgaria: Employees or Sub-contractors? *EMECON Employment and Economy and Central and Eastern Europe*, *1*. (http://www.emecon.eu/fileadmin/articles/1_2016/Kirov_et%20al_2016.pdf).

Koleva, S. (2005). *Социологията като проект: научна идентичности и социални изпитания в България, 1945–1989 година* [Sociology as a Scientific Project: Scientific Identity and Social Hardship]. Sofia: Pensoft Publishers. (in Bulgarian).

Koleva, S. (2011). La sociologie en Bulgarie des années 1945 à 2010: une trajectoire disciplinaire à l'épreuve de l'histoire, *Sociologies pratiques*, 2011/2 (n° 23), 127–141. https://doi.org/10.3917/sopr.023.0127. http://www.cairn.info/revue-sociologies-pratiques-2011-2-page-127.htm.

Koleva, S. (2013). *Sociology in Bulgaria and Its Predicaments: Facing Scientific and Social Challenges Throughout History*, Third ISA National Associations Conference, Ankara. http://www.bsa-bg.org/index.php/en/isa-forums/54-third-isa-conference-2/64-sociology-in-bulgaria-and-its-predicaments. Accessed 2 June 2017.

Kuranov, T. (1988). Ръчният труд. Sofia: BAN (in Bulgarian) (The manual work).

Makó, C., Illéssy, M., Csizmadia, P., Kirov, V., & Galev, T. (2009). *Changes in Work in Transformation Economies—The Case of the New Member States*. Leuven: HIVA.

Meil, P., & Kirov, V. (2017). Introduction: The Policy Implications of Virtual Work. In P. Meil & V. Kirov (Eds.), *Policy Implications of Virtual Work*. Palgrave: Basingstoke.

Michailov, S. (2003). *Sociologijata v Balgarija sled Vtorata Svetovna Vojna* (Sociology in Bulgaria after World War II). Sofia: Izdatelstvo M-8-M.

Mihaylov, S. (Ed.). (1965). *Promichlenoto predpriatie – sotziologuitcheska sistema i trudova aktivnost* [The Industrial Enterprise—Sociological System and Work Activity]. Sofia (in Bulgarian).

Minev, D., Jeliazkova, M., & Dernendjieva, B. (1995). *Масовата безработица при трансформиране на икономиката* [The Mass Unemployment During the Transformation of the Economy]. Sofia (in Bulgarian).

Minev, D., & Kabacktchieva, P. (1996). *Prehodat – eliti i strateguii* [The Transition: Elites and Strategies]. Sofia (in Bulgarian).

Nickolov, L. (1992). Sociologists in Bulgaria Today. *International Sociology, 7*(1), 99–102.

Petkov, K., & Spenner, K. (1991). Menidjarite i posleditzite ot technologu-ichnata promiana – shodstvoto mejdu Iztoka i Zapada [The Managers and the Consequences of the Technological Change—The Similarities Between the East and the West]. *Sotziologuitcheski problemi*, n° 1, 3–17 (in Bulgarian).

Petkov, K., & Thirkell, J. (1988). Managerial Elections in Bulgaria: Interests, Conflicts, and Representation. *Labor and Society, 13*(3), 306–318.

Petkov, K., & Thirkell, J. (1991). *Labour Relations in Eastern Europe. Organisational Design and Dynamics (Social Analysis)*. London and New York: Routledge.

Slavova, P. (2006). Professional Interest Groups and Their Impact on Regulation: The Law on the Architects' Chamber in Bulgaria. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society, 7*(2), 204–220.

Slavova, P. (2014). La sociologie universitaire bulgare en transformation. *Revue d'études comparatives Est-Ouest, 45,* 91–124.

Standing, G. et al. (1993). *Labour Market and Reforms in the Bulgarian Industry*. Sofia: ILO (in Bulgarian).

Stanojevic, M., & Gradev, G. (2003). Workers' Representation at Company Level in CEE Countries. *Transfer: European Review of Labour and Research, 9*(1), 31–49.

Stavrov, B. (1979). *Bourgeoaznata sotziologia v Balgaria mejdu dvete svetovni voyni* [The Bourgeois Sociology in Bulgaria Between the Two World Wars]. Sofia: BAN.

Stefanova, M., Haralampiev, K., Tomova, T., Kalfova, E., Neykov, I., Gospodinova, Z., Petrova, P., & Dimitrov, I. (2012). *Report. National Working Conditions Survey Bulgaria*. Sofia (in Bulgarian).

Stoilova, R. 2008. Impact of Gender on the Occupational Group of Software Producers in Bulgaria. In R. Stoilova & V. Kirov (Eds.), Changes of Work and Knowledge-Based Society. *Sociological Problems, Special Issue*, 94–117.

Stoyanov, S. (1988). Roliata na empiricthnite sotziologuitcheski izsledvania v promichlenia kombinat [The Role of the Sociological Research in the Industrial Combinat]. In I. Gueorgiev, G. Fotev, & B. Tchakalov (Eds.), *Sotzialna efektivnost na empirichnite sotziologuitcheski izsledvania* [Social Effectiveness of the Empirical Sociological Surveys) (pp. 294–301). Sofia: Izdatelstvo Naouka i izkoustvo (in Bulgarian).

Tzeneva, E., & Cook, N. (1991). The Dismissals in Bulgaria. According to the Research in a Company in Haskovo. *Sotsiologicheski Problemi* [Sociological Problems] *4,* 43–54 (in Bulgarian).

Vladimirov, Z. (2011). MNCs and the Transformation of Bulgarian Employment Relations. In S. Contrepois, V. Delteil, P. Dieuaide, & S. Jefferys, S. (Eds.), *Globalizing Employment Relations* (pp. 150–164). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vladimirov, J., Todorov, T., Katzarski, I., & Badjakov, M. (1999). Bulgaria in the Circle of Anomie. In P. Atteslander, B. Gransow, & J. Western (Eds.), *Comparative Anomie Research. Hidden Barriers—Hidden Potential for Social Development* (pp. 47–72). Aldershot: Ashgate.

Yordanova, G., & Kirov, V. (2017). The work-life balance in the ICT sector in Bulgaria: The role of virtual work, non-published research report for the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (Contr. № ДФНП-155/12.05.2016) (in Bulgarian).

11

Sociological Approaches to Work in Romania Since 1945

Norbert Petrovici and Florin Faje

Introduction

In the aftermath of the Second World War, Romania's population was 78% rural (Rotariu et al. 2017). Modernization, embodied in industrialization and urbanization, could only proceed by engaging and reshaping the agricultural-rural sector. Romanian peasants found themselves 'under siege' by a state that was turning itself 'socialist' in the process (Kligman and Verdery 2011). Romanian workers were pushed to their limit by a state that extended wartime policies of economic planning and worker repression well into the post-war period (Grama 2017). Reconstruction and radical societal reform were the dominant themes entertained by the emerging socialist leaders. Bitter disputes engulfed the Workers' Party and state leadership concerning the temporality and sequencing of the envisaged transformations (Levy 2001). Nonetheless, the abolition of property rights in land, the restriction of workers' freedom and claim-making and the concentration of power in the hands of the socialist elites often obscured and trivialized the challenges that Romanian society was facing after the war. Loss of life, dire poverty, low agricultural output, a mountain of debt in war reparations due to the Soviet Union, the strength of the fascist movements from the interwar years and a muddied geopolitical conundrum were some of the

N. Petrovici (✉) · F. Faje
Department of Sociology, Babeş-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
e-mail: NorbertPetrovici@socasis.ubbcluj.ro

coordinates that gave urgency and impetus for a cohort of socialist cadres that had never held high office, to govern. To understand sociology's decisive contribution to socialist transformation, we must expand our field of vision beyond the violent and the traumatic, to more sociological indicators of tensions within a historically constituted social formation. Then as now, by analysing power-infused social relations in their spatial and temporal unfolding, sociology works to create the knowledge needed for rational social intervention. A corollary to an expanded historical and social perspective is that new questions can be raised, beyond the established interpretations of socialist transformation in Eastern Europe.

We contend that above and beyond the repression and hardship that followed the socialist takeover in Romania, there is a discernible pattern of rational societal reorganization that had urbanization and industry at its core. The rearrangements of work and work relations were subsumed to these two goals of modernization. Consequently, it is all but impossible to identify a sub-discipline of sociology of work at any moment after 1945. Nonetheless, the questions of work were abundantly present on the agenda of sociologists planning the reconstruction of the Romanian economy and society. Matters and methodologies pertaining to the sociology of work were researched and discussed in the broader fields of urban and industrial sociology, whenever the discipline was named and institutionalized. Over the last seven decades, the discipline of sociology found recognition and institutional support for only half the period. Departments and institutes of sociology functioned in the country from 1965 to 1977 and were re-established in the early 1990s. The exclusion of sociology in early and late socialism and the distinctive anti-communist key in which it was refashioned during post-socialism has undoubtedly contributed to render invisible many of the contributions of its practitioners. Foreign researchers could hardly identify sociological research as distinctively sociological, since domestic sociologists were rarely identifying themselves as such and were often holding office in the hierarchy of the party-state system. A survey of the available literature immediately conveys this point. Even the most astute and sophisticated researchers took their cues from Hungarian economists and sociologists, rather than from their Romanian counterparts, when explaining work-related phenomena in the latter country.

When critically assessing the literature on work, stratification, urbanization, or industrialization as well as the reconfiguration of the social sciences in post-war Eastern Europe, a sense of retrospection lingers in many of the contributions. The spectacular collapse of socialism in 1989 made it imper-

ative to answer the questions of what was socialism and what comes next (Verdery 1996). That is, to provide a sound account of why socialism failed. The roots of the failure were found in a combination of systemic disequilibrium and poor management, ultimately brought about by the utopian character of Marxism. Two strands of literature have tended to emphasize the former or the latter, largely a function of their privileged scale of analysis: the national economy treated as a whole, or the paradoxes of socialist management gripping production at the factory level. It is our contention that neither of these scales, nor a combination of the two, is enough to explain the dynamics of real existing socialism. As the case of Romanian sociologists involved in the planning and management of socialist economic construction and coordination shows, the point of reference and scale for their endeavours was consistently sub-national and supra-local. Post-war Romanian economy and society was to emerge out of a mosaic of regions, envisaged both as buffers between the national and the local and places where value could be most cheaply extracted from labour and accumulated by the state.

One of the critical lenses through which real existing socialism was understood was that of a modernist-utopian planning system, driven by technical apparatuses aiming to integrate a centrally coordinated economy and society (Bockman 2011; Ellman 1973, 2014). From a Foucauldian perspective, Scott (1998) depicted socialism as another instance of high-modernism that used a rational grid to systematize the chaos of the social, becoming repressive by taking its panoptic web to its logical consequence. Nonetheless, anthropologists have repeatedly shown that socialist investments heavily relied on local knowledge, practices, and skilled brokers that linked the local with the national scale (Dunn 2004; Cullen Dunn and Verdery 2015; Verdery 1996). Romanian developmentalist economic policies are a case in point for illustrating these observations (Ban 2014, 2016; Petrovici 2013). Tania Li's criticism (2005) of Scott's high-modernism thesis can be reworked for the case of Romanian socialism: the force of the socialist developmental scheme lay in its capturing of local practices for larger plans and by maintaining an open space for negotiation between the two scales.

Another critical perspective deployed in the analysis of socialism emphasized the managerial negotiation with the central state apparatus that created a vast array of seigniorial-like relations resembling those found in a feudal society (Kornai 1980; Mihályi 1992). Socialism was thus an attempt to catch up with the advanced economies through recasting a redistributive system in a modern form by a powerful political hierarchy (Szelenyi 1981; Csillag and Szelenyi 2015; Mihályi 1992). Romania was reputedly the

epitome of such arrangements, a 'sultanist power regime' of Ceaușescu, who tried to place his family in top party positions (Linz and Stepan 1996) and amassed local energies through personal relationships and negotiations, for the sake of accumulation at a national scale (Câmpeanu 2002).

While these major paradigmatic views have their virtues, many of their drawbacks derive from the scale of their analytical focus. When the focus is on the national level, the emphasis rests on the apparently all-encompassing planning system (Soós 1987, 1989, 1985). When the focus shifts to the factory, the empirical endeavour tends to question whether local managerial interests were harmonized and transformed into a coherent whole—which was rarely the case (Bauer 1978; Kornai 1980).

Instead, we argue that the analysis of real existing socialism should be conducted at the subnational level, since much of the everyday economics unfolded at the level of the regions which formed around the emerging cities. Messy local interests, practices and experiences were brought together through the mediation and articulation of industrial and agricultural chains of productions in major urban centres. The urban–rural chains of production were turned into a policy tool as early as the 1950s and gained renewed momentum in the 1970s. Finding the adequate scale to place economic policies was one of the socialist developmental conundrums and favouring the subnational had its own history. It is at this point that sociologists came most forcefully into play.

In what follows, we show that sociology was a key discipline in producing relevant knowledge for managing and reimagining socialist economic development in Romania, both before and after 1989. In the first section, we propose a re-contextualization of work in socialist Romania, showing how it acquired meaning and produced value in regional spaces emerging at the intersection of the urban and the rural. In the second section, we analyse the birth of the "urban area", an academic concept and a policy tool, developed by Miron Constantinescu and his associate Henry H. Stahl. The "urban area" formed the analytical backbone of the country's urbanization and industrialization. This was the main device that tied economic growth to the subnational level and allowed the planners to regulate the economy as a set of interconnected production chains. In the third section, we trace the ways in which sociologists fostered organizational innovation by devising techniques for improved economic coordination and leadership and how their attempt led to a severe de-professionalization of the discipline. In the fourth section, we follow the re-institutionalization of sociology in the 1990s, and present the contours of the momentous transformations experienced by labour in the new post-socialist economy.

The Transformation of Work in Socialist Romania

In socialist Romania, the organization of work along Taylorist lines took three distinct forms. The first was related to the deployment of scientific tools in the organization of labour. Cucu (2014) has shown that the central planners became aware of the need for reliable statistical data to control the construction and expansion of a Taylorist economy. Consequently, planners supplanted the planning processes with a complex system of data collection that included ethnography conducted by personnel capable of using alternative hypotheses. The introduction of sociological methodologies to planning is not surprising, given that between 1949 and 1956, the sociologist Miron Constantinescu was the president of the *State Planning Committee* and a member of the *Political Bureau* of *the Workers' Party*. From the 1950s onwards, university staff in Cluj were requested to observe work processes and to provide recommendations regarding workloads, the distribution of machines in production, to supervise the meetings of direction committees, to analyse the fluctuations of the labour force, and to explore forms of motivation (Cucu 2014; Mihu 1970a, b, 1971).

The second was the reconstruction and extension of a hierarchical system of control inside the factories. The chief mechanisms were the workers' councils and the increased disciplining responsibilities of management. As Grama (2017) shows, between 1945 and 1948, the term "communism" was a muddied signifier. The term was used in various ways by different agents. For factory workers, "communism" referred to a system in which wage negotiation, protest and workers' control over management and trade union representatives was possible. For government representatives, "communism" meant wage repression and control, the blocking of strikes, hierarchic production and trade union representatives who followed state and party policies. The Party's strategy was geared to support the profit making of firms, which, in aggregate, meant higher economic growth.

Despite multiple protests, conflicts and strikes, until the introduction of the first five-year plan in 1950, workers' councils and the trade unions became channels for the dissemination of governmental directives and bodies entrusted with the imposition of hierarchy inside the factories. Nonetheless, this process never reached complete equilibrium, precisely because trade unions were the transmission belt of worker claims (Ost 2005). This is immediately visible in the repeated reorganization of the workers' councils to make them better suited to take up and deliver

requirements and suggestions for improved productive organization, without allowing for the political aggregation of workers' voices. In Cluj's factories, the councils came into the spotlight of sociological investigations geared to improve their organization and efficiency (Mihu 1970b). For the Cluj county Party Council, the aim was clear: since the managers were granted increased responsibilities by central state authorities, which translated into a greater freedom in deciding the economic strategies best suited for their units, workers' councils received new responsibilities to control management (Marea and Mihu 1970; Constantinescu 1974; Mihu 1970b).

The third mechanism of Taylorist organization manifested itself through what Grama calls "strategies of containment", the various forms of workers' individualization and symbolic declassification (2017). On the one hand, the members of the Political Bureau and government repeatedly framed workers' aspirations to self-management as anarcho-syndicalist sectarian left-wing deviations that were threatening economic growth. In 1948, Vasile Luca, minister of the economy, alongside other government representatives, grouped such aspirations under the label of "social fascism", partly recycling Karl Kautsky's critique of the interwar liberal democracy (1920). The workers' claims came to be classified as misunderstandings of the current context, jeopardizing industrial peace through their reactionary and sectarian character (Faje 2011a). Their source was to be found in the cultural "backwardness" of the workers who were still entertaining religious ideas, or in the urges of "declassed" lumpens, or privileged "kulaks" (Grama 2017). This denigration allowed for the identification of people perceived to be in need of education, requalification, of a new political subjectivity or even of a period of unemployment. The police and judicial apparatuses were able to transform work-related requests into issues calling for disciplinary measures. The breakup of workers' organizations became increasingly strong after the tightening of policing during collectivization, from 1952 onwards (Kligman and Verdery 2015). However, these symbolic forms for the reinstitution of the rational were never detached from the managerial centre of the factory, of the party and of the state. The workers were requested to integrate in the hierarchic organization of the factory, where the chain of command and control was the main instrument to support the Taylorist division of labour.

The three forms of institutionalizing hierarchical command and control created similar effects to those of economic rationalization grasped by Foucault for Western European capitalism (2008, 2009). Concomitantly, since factories were in continual crisis in terms of labour force and skills, the

productive order was perpetually under threat. This is visible in the significant wage discrepancies and high fluctuations of employees.

East-European socialist salaries were not uniform. On the contrary, there were consistent standard deviations from the average salaries and payment inequalities similar to those in capitalist states with a sustained economic development in Latin America, the Middle East, Africa or South-East Asia, reflected in analyses of the period (Askanas and Levcik 1983; Mayo and Stein 1988). There were significant differences between the socialist countries themselves. At the middle of the 1970s, the wage difference between the first decile and the last was 3.82 in Poland, 3.2 in Russia, and 2.4 in Romania (Askanas and Levcik 1983). Moreover, there were important wage variations at subnational level, between administrative regions (Sandu 1984; Mayo and Stein 1988). These national and subnational variations were tied to the availability or lack thereof of a labour force at various levels of qualification (Mayo and Stein 1988; Askanas and Levcik 1983; Sandu 1984).

At the same time, a major body of literature documented the high mobility of workers between economic units and sectors. In 1970s Romania, up until the age of 30, approximately 15% of industrial employees had changed their profession at least once, with the salary as the chief reason of doing so (Bădina and Mamali 1973, p. 29). Alongside professional mobility, the same period witnessed an annual fluctuation of personnel in productive units of about 20–25% and an absenteeism at around 10% (Cernea and Munteanu 1971; Cernea 1973, 1971; Rusu and Mișcol 1968; Mâlcomete and Floareș 1971; Mișcol 1967; Mișcol and Rusu 1967; Enache 1975; Cazacu 1979; Mihu 1971). The chief motivations for someone changing their work were the search for improved pay—about a quarter in the questioners filled at the time—and reducing the time and financial costs associated with transport to work—around one-fifth of those planning to change their job (Cernea 1971; Bădina and Mamali 1973). Faced with the data, Cernea decried the anarchy of labour force fluctuations motivated by the search for better pay and suggested its planned repartition (Cernea 1971, 1973). The same author astutely noted that the factories were engaged in a competition over the labour force, with direct effects on wage growth and associated benefits (cantinas, associated hospitals, holidays and bonuses, housing, requalification, etc.). Cernea's observations are confirmed by contemporary studies that present the high levels of mobility between factories and argue that planned allocation did not cover the labour force needs of the firms, largely due to the personnel fluctuations (Vasile 2014; Grama 2017; Cucu 2014).

Real existing socialism did reduce workers' possibility for negotiation through their institutional bodies. However, in practice, workers had three alternatives to discretely debate salaries and labour conditions: through their territorial mobility, through mobility between productive units or by changing profession through requalification. A foreman at Remarul, an important factory in Cluj, remembered how the company depended on the availability of workers to informally mobilize in periods of increased production. Any unaddressed worker discontents would have led to a slowdown of production in crucial moments, when the fulfilment of the plan was at stake. Threats with the reserve army of labour were not a plausible strategy to be taken up by management. Keeping up production levels and the attempts to expand them were dependent on both qualitative and functional means of production, as well as on the qualified and mobilized labour force. This configuration led to the delegation of worker discipline to the workers themselves. Workers often ended up organized in collegial networks that assured coordination and the disciplining of transgressors. The directors were only left to inquire whether the work teams were content and productive enough to fulfil the plan.

As we have already intimated, the public expression of discontent was perceived as an act against the system, a form of political insubordination. The same foreman at Remarul provided an example: "I was told to make a piece and I said: 'Give me proper tools, I can't make it this way'. The next day the Securitate officer called me to his office". While individual critical voices were silenced, discipline rested on relatively autonomous collectives. Moreover, a large part of the negotiation between workers operated through a system of reciprocity based on networks of trust that went beyond legal arrangements. Ironically, worker autonomy, denied through "the strategies of containment" that were politically individualizing, came to be fulfilled in autonomous working groups, due to the dependence of management on the availability of workers. In Foucauldian terms, the worker was gradually emptied of political subjectivity in order to increase her/his productivity and to transform her/him, through integration into productive assemblages, into an economic subject. With the caveat that this economic subjectivity was fashioned through the mediation of workers' networks called to self-discipline and self-regulate.

According to the foreman at Remarul, the decision making process could last very long precisely because several people were simultaneously responsible for the same tasks, while the responsibilities were often unclear. Constrained by the plan, the managers attempted to hide their limited control by devising new regulations, through a continuous reor-

ganization and the creation of intermediary levels. These strategies led to a proliferation of rules and tasks that created enduring confusion regarding responsibilities and obligations. Ultimately, this proliferation undermined the efficiency of rational organization. However, the workers that Norbert interviewed never failed to note that two issues truly mattered: the factory's director and the workers. Intermediary managers had a limited capacity to enforce discipline and to control production, although their approval and supervision was needed.

The socialist factory directors were not deprived of means to control. Throughout the period, the central planning offices had attempted to persuade the directors to increase their rates of accumulation by producing more units and by increasing the aggregate value of their products. In this context, the managers were presented with two alternatives. The first, was to increase the levels of investment to expand production, thus creating a demand for means of production and raw materials. The second alternative was to increase accumulation through organizational and technical innovation, thus increasing outputs by using the same quantity of productive elements. Although the two strategies operated conjointly, the structures of opportunity largely favoured the former. The reasons behind this were complex.

The first reason referred to the specific forms of competition that emerged under socialism. For example, whenever the plan for construction works was not met in one county, other counties could take up the fulfilment of the plan until the end of the year. The fierce competition between administrative areas and units within those areas was weakly regulated and enforced. The Political Bureau used this strategy to introduce a dynamic element between subnational spaces, hoping to maximize the aggregate growth effects. Contrary to such strategies, studies in economic sociology insist that industrial innovation is enabled by complex forms of cooperation (Malerba and Vonortas 2009; Kamath 2015; Freeman 1995; Gereffi and Lee 2016). This was again visible in the case of in situ concrete panel blocks construction in Cluj. These production platforms required the collaboration of research-oriented academics and industrial agents. However, at national level, the socialist productive groups and the bureaucratic arms of the state were entrenched in a competition for growth that often blocked collaboration. This does not mean that the socialist economy did not witness innovation. Studies show a track record of innovation in their military arsenal (Marten 1993; Evangelista 1988), in space exploration technology (Hanson and Pavitt 2001), in industrial and agricultural machinery (Amann and Cooper 1982; Freeman 1995), in automation (Peters 2016), in financial instruments with a global reach (Higonnet 1985; Chamberlin and Yueh 2006) and in the

efficient maximization of productive inputs (Gille 2010). Nonetheless, innovation transfers, from one sector to the other and across the economy, were hampered by the weak regulation of competition between units and bureaucracies (Peters 2016).

The second reason referred to the temporality of planning. Since the plan functioned in five-year cycles, innovations for growth were tied to its temporal horizon. To innovate was a risky strategy relative to investment, not only in Romania, but across Central and Eastern Europe (Winiecki 1982; Peters 2016).

The third reason was related to the dynamic of global accumulation. Innovations rarely function independently (Freeman 1995). Innovations appear in technological blocks where agents develop interconnected technologies in order to offset the high transaction costs involved in the manufacturing of a new product (Oh et al. 2016; Gereffi and Lee 2016). Innovative products require an ecology of providers of intermediate goods and an infrastructure for consumption. Robert Brenner argues that these ecologies create new fixed capital investments, thus devaluing the competitors' blocks of fixed capital with a reduced level of technological development (2006). To avoid devaluing, dominant economic agents impose barriers in accessing the market to potential competitors that bring about technical innovation. Throughout the twentieth century, such barriers have pushed capital supporting new technologies to develop productive ecosystems in alternative geographical spaces, where the problem of devaluing existing fixed capital could not arise. Especially after the Second World War, capital seeking to accrue profit through new technologies targeted developing countries for investment, thus creating new industrial blocks, initially Germany and Japan, later followed by China, India and Brazil (Brenner 2006). Peripheral countries in the world system became markets that absorbed the goods developed by the emerging technological blocks (Arrighi 2010).

In the 1950s and 1960s, Romania imported most of its capital goods from the USSR, becoming a hinterland for the sale of innovations and technological adaptations developed in the USSR (Freeman 1995; Amann and Cooper 1982). In the 1970s and the 1980s, Romania came to import capital goods mostly from Germany and Austria (World-Bank 1978, 1986; Gatejel 2011). For a while, import substitution did work. However, throughout socialism, domestic capital goods were rather an extension of the Soviet technologic block, and later of the German one. Local engineers were making adaptations and maintenance work, but domestic technological innovation was limited.

For all the above reasons, technological innovation was blocked as a leading instrument for productivity growth. The factories behaved rather like consumers able to adapt technologies to their own needs. Requesting investment from central planners was systematically preferred. The result was an expansive managerial system seeking growth through negotiated investments and the renewal of fixed capital. In aggregate, the system of integrated Taylorist factories coordinated by central planners, in its turn, produced a demand for investment from managers. This demand was generated by managers who found themselves in a weakly regulated competition for expansion, in a structure of opportunities that placed national economic growth above all other objectives. However, yet another form of expansion was available for most factories, one less visible in the economic literature dealing with the topic.

Technological improvement is not sufficient for innovation. There is an organizational dimension to innovation. We have seen that managers had a hard time to individually manage workers, often having to deal with large numbers of employees who used their inter-organizational mobility as a means of negotiation. Nevertheless, managers could still manage totalities including large numbers of workers. From this vantage point, managers had two distinct possibilities to regulate their labour force inputs. The first was to draw on a low-skilled labour force that assured a large pool for recruitment. The second was to develop the skills of the labour force and to introduce forms of local retention through urbanization and short-distance commuting. The emergence of networks of providers and local clients gradually allowed them, besides the pooling of their economic resources and concerted political action, to develop a strategy geared to communalize the mass of employees, thus attenuating the effects of the struggle for scarce labour. Networks of kindergartens, schools for workers' qualification, hospitals, neighbourhoods, turned towns into a worker retention strategy. Internal factory tensions related to the control of the production and financial process turned into urban problems. Class tensions turned into problems of urban control.

Sociology and Urban Development

Forging a national economy able to post high rates of growth through central planning in a semi-peripheral Eastern European country in the post-war period hindered technological innovation and turned class tensions into problems of urban development. Our previous assessment of the Romanian

socialist economy and its labour force showed that inter-regional and inter-firm competition became the driving force for the concentration and accumulation of both capital and labour. The result was twofold, a proliferation of formal regulations at the intermediary levels mediating between workers, firm directors and planners and a propagation of informal workers' networks, paralleled by a concentration of power in the hands of directors and planners, above and beyond such regulations. In this section, we show that this was the context that gave ample scope for sociologists to step in, called to produce the knowledge *and* policies needed to improve institutional efficiency and worker productivity. Only by re-embedding post-war Romanian sociology in the specific political economy of Romanian socialism is it possible to explain the emphasis that practitioners placed on "management", "the management of the future" or "leadership" as well as on developing and implementing the notion of the "urban area". Consequently, one of the tasks for sociologists was to foster organizational innovation in the factories. Another one was to contribute towards the development of "urban areas", an attempt to create "spatial fixes", the prerequisites for value creation, extraction and accumulation (Harvey 2006).

Sociology was disbanded as an academic discipline in 1948, re-established in 1965 and disbanded once more in 1977. The trajectory of the discipline was intimately tied to the academic and political trajectory of Miron Constantinescu and his associates. A member of the *Political Bureau* between 1945 and 1957, Constantinescu made sure that sociology remained a central producer of knowledge through complex institutional arrangements. Various institutions employed sociologists from the interwar disciplinary establishment. Their methodological skills and theoretical endeavours were put to work in applied research. Strategic developmentalist policies in socialist Romania were strongly shaped by the reworking, in Marxist terms, of key ideas of the Gustian school of a "sociology of the nation". Consequently, sociology was tasked with producing relevant knowledge for managing and reimagining socialist economic development in Romania. The discipline played a central role in placing economic development at the sub-national level. A few biographical notes regarding Miron Constantinescu are due, before we move to analyse the birth of the 'urban area', an academic concept and a policy tool, as it was developed by him and his associate Henry H. Stahl.

Miron Constantinescu had been a member of the interwar Bucharest Sociological School, led by Dimitrie Gusti. In 1938–1939, Constantinescu participated in a research series conducted by Anton Golopenția, Henri Stahl and Octavian Neamțu. The objective had been to expand Dimitrie

Gusti's methodological and theoretical horizon. Gusti's students had sought to correct their professors' lack of methodological sophistication when categorizing villages and their connections to their locale (Sandu 2012). The research materialized in Anton Golopenția's five edited volumes, published during the Second World War, entitled *60 Romanian villages* (Golopenția and Georgescu 1941). Miron Constantinescu was one of the contributors, displaying an openly Marxist position (Poenaru 2015). Dimitrie Gusti wrote the introductory study to the first volume. He absorbed his students' critique and stressed the need to build a complex typology of villages and to create a theoretical synthesis with the objective of defining Romania's 'social regions'. Dimitrie Gusti was elected president of the Romanian Academy in 1944 and President of the National Research Council soon after. He then drafted a research project to categorize the villages in a certain region in order to facilitate inter-regional comparisons (Gusti 1946; cited in Stahl 1975, pp. 44–45).

Once president of *The State Planning Committee*, Miron Constantinescu began his mandate with a series of planning experiments. The first of these experiments was devised for Hunedoara County, part of the process of building an industrial complex where raw materials from the area's mines were processed by a dedicated industry (Mărginean 2015). Constantinescu assembled an interdisciplinary team, coordinated by architects, with members trained along lines developed by Gusti. Henri H. Stahl was assigned the key task of devising the team's methodological approach.[1] Stahl recruited geographers Vintilă M. Mihăilescu, Victor Tufescu and Ion Conea (Rostás 2000), and through the party, Miron Constantinescu assigned a young sociologist, Ioan. I. Matei,[2] to work with Stahl.

Starting from a pilot village, the research continued with the deployment of visual synthesizing methods (maps) and reporting. Researchers were thus able to trace the exchange of goods, the dynamics of the labour force and the region's integration in broader economic exchanges (Stahl and Matei 1966).

---

[1]It was not Henri Stahl's first investigation of Hunedoara County, he also conducted research in 1946 (Rostás 2000). Moreover, he had already collaborated with architects Ștefan Popovici and Adrian Gheorghiu at the *Social Romanian Institute* before the war as part of the monograph surveys (Rostás 2000).

[2]Provoked by Zoltan Rostáș's comment, Henri H. Stahl remembers that Ioan I. Matei was the prison warden where Miron Constantinescu and Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej were imprisoned as *illegalists* during the war. However, "at the right time there was an arrangement with the communists" (Rostás 2000). Throughout the interview, his references are appreciative: "Matei was second in command, Matei was a debutant. He did not even study with us. He joined us more on a political line. He had not conducted sociology with either Gusti or myself. […] I do not know how he did it. But I had no idea he even existed. A good kid otherwise. Nothing to say there" (Rostás 2000).

Moreover, Stahl proposed a means to integrate an area in a historic series of economic exchanges, suggesting possible investment opportunities based on historical trends. The systematization studies of County Hunedoara became the main instruments for the urbanization, industrialization and collectivization processes in the area (Mărginean 2015).[3] In addition, these research tools became key instruments for the studies that followed until 1955, when Miron Constantinescu was president of the *State Planning Committee*. The most notable studies conducted in a similar key at the regional level were: Dobrogea (1950), Valea Bistriței (1951), Argeș hydrographic basin (1952), Ialomița-Buzău hydrographic basin (1953), Reșița hydrographic basin (1954), Brașov area (1954), Bucharest's peri-urban area (1956), Ploiești area and Târgoviște area. In addition to these studies, Stahl also coordinated studies for guiding investment in urban development in Anina, Arad, Baia Mare, Blaj, Brașov, Brăila, Chișcani, Copșa Mică, Cugir, Caransebeș, Turda, Vaslui (Ștefan Costea 2001, p. 417).

In the aftermath of the Second World War, Miron Constantinescu was a close collaborator of both Ana Pauker and Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej. After 1947, *The Political Bureau* was the place of confrontation and debate between two different visions of economic development (Bosomitu 2014). The first solution, supported by Luca and Pauker, proposed a drive towards industrialization, through the mechanization of agriculture, followed by land collectivization. The second solution, ultimately embraced by Dej, advocated land collectivization and a push for industrialization that would create the domestic conditions for the mechanization of agriculture. As Levy points out (Levy 2001), these were not just contextual questions, but crucial decisions of economic architecture which had to be addressed in post-revolutionary Russia and elsewhere in Eastern Europe (Davies 1980, 1989; Davies et al. 1994).

In technical terms, the proposals concerned the price parity between rural and urban markets. The Pauker/Luca position implied the parity of prices, while the Dej one denied it, separating and controlling rural and urban markets, to the benefit of the consumers on the latter. During *Political Bureau* meetings, Miron Constantinescu, head of the *Committee for Monetary Reform*, opposed urban–rural price parity. However, Ana Pauker and Vasile Luca managed to initially win the fight. Consequently, the reform that Constantinescu was summoned to implement followed the principle of

---

[3]These innovations are discussed by the Gustians in a series of seminars in 1949 held by the Romanian Association of Friends of the Soviet Union (Mărginean 2015).

parity of urban and rural markets. However, with Stalin's help, Dej gradually imposed state control over agricultural production for the benefit of industrial development. From 1949 onwards, Constantinescu, chairman of the *State Planning Committee*, set up an industrially oriented annual plan, and for the first five-year period of 1951–1955, he built investment plans oriented towards the development of heavy industry. At first sight, Miron Constantinescu appeared to be a champion of investment in heavy industry that relied on peasant expropriation.

At closer inspection, Miron Constantinescu in fact succeeded in proposing an in-between concept addressing both Ana Pauker's pressure for price parity between urban and rural manufactured goods and Gheorghe Gheorghiu-Dej's push for a state-controlled rural economy able to maintain the flow of resource extraction necessary for industrialization. The solution was the "urban area" concept, which emphasized the diversity of local resources for growth and the necessity to interlink them in regional input/output relations between the emerging industries. In practice, the "urban area" meant the creation of urban–rural units in a complex national mosaic of diverse economic ecologies.

Drawing on empirical material, Constantinescu proposed a precise definition of the term. Starting from the *geographic and bioclimatic zoning* concept, he captured the specificity of local natural resources and went on to define "the natural" in relation to the capacity to produce and transform nature into resources using the existing means of production (Constantinescu 1971, pp. 145–146). His key point was that *the urban areas* were created through socialist industrialization, comprising actual cities and a hinterland area. The hinterland is an area for the recruitment of the labour force and the source for the supply of agro-food and raw materials. The concept captures the dynamic spatial relations between, on the one hand, the labour force and the suppliers of raw materials, and urban industry on the other. However, the approach assumed a high level of spatial coherence and integration. In fact, the only time Constantinescu raises the issue of geographical contiguity is in relation with the distance and the frequency of supply, thus producing three types of hinterland: immediate, adjacent, and distant.

As soon as Constantinescu proceeded to present the research results of the Slatina urban area, his analysis referred to the "labour force supply chains", produced by the establishment of new factories in Slatina and the secondary "constellations of urban localities", which gradually concentrated the urban labour force from the nearby rural area. In turn, these urban localities were to be transformed by increasing productivity through reor-

ganization and investment in cooperatives: "At the moment, in regard to construction sites, labour recruiters are currently discussing with presidents of agricultural cooperatives and during winter they make contracts to hire people from households in the constructions sites that will open in spring" (Constantinescu 1971). Constantinescu was concerned with (a) labour force supply, (b) the industry of *consumer goods* and primary agricultural products for labour force consumption, (c) the industrialized production of agricultural products in remote areas and (d) the extraction of *raw materials* necessary for the industry of intermediate goods manufactured in the central city or in its industrial satellites.

Considering that Constantinescu and his associates studied the products of the *Aluminium Factory* in Slatina and of the *Machine tools factories* in Brașov, which were distributed across the country, his regional approach may seem rather odd. However, these products were *capital goods*, necessary means of production in Roman agricultural and industrial sectors, or for export in the *COMECON* area. As soon as we begin to consider these aspects, the urban area concept starts to run against certain limits. The emerging national economy rested on at least two different agricultural-industrial inter-sectorial circuits, a circuit consisting of a local industrial supply chain of raw materials and a labour force nurtured with perishable agricultural goods, and a national circuit of production goods. Each urban area was made to specialize in industrial production according to its local resources and to trade with the other urban areas for whatever it lacked. The overall economic architecture is visible in the proposals made with respect to Slatina. An area could supposedly develop harmoniously in relation to its hinterland when it was deemed capable of integrating its human and material resources (Constantinescu and Stahl 1970, p. 368).

Henri H. Stahl, the second editor of the study on Slatina, further emphasized the role of the hinterland. Two years before the publication of the study, Stahl was invited by Miron Constantinescu to hold a series of lectures at the *People's University* in Bucharest on the 1968 Law of territorial-administrative reorganization. Henri H. Stahl was Miron Constantinescu's partner in many of his political enterprises, as an expert and researcher. Henri H. Stahl was one of the most influential sociologists in the twentieth century Romania, a prolific researcher and a remarkable thinker (Guga 2015). In 1949, Constantinescu invited Henri H. Stahl to become a member in an interdisciplinary research team working for the *State Planning Council* (Stahl and Matei 1966) and to coordinate the scientific side of the research needed for planning (Stahl 1975). Under the supervision of the *Ministry of Construction* and the *State Planning Council*, he was employed at the

Superior Institute of Social Works during 1948 and 1952, and then at the *Institute for city planning and regional development* between 1952 and 1961.[4] He received study leave for two years,[5] joined the Romanian Academy and, from 1965 onwards, assisted Constantinescu's efforts to create a new sociology faculty at the University of Bucharest (Bosomitu 2017). He retired in 1971, continuing to publish and supervise Ph.D. students until his death in 1991.

Stahl's lectures were published in 1969 in a short book entitled *The Administrative-territorial organization*. Although the conceptual stakes were high, Stahl insisted that "we can no longer distinguish, as we used to, between a rural and an urban area" (1969, p. 60). There is a very important continuity between the two, in a double sense: empirically, the continuity is an observable process, and from a normative standpoint, it is desirable to ensure a complex exchange between agricultural and industrial products through a consistent investment policy.

Stahl's urban–rural complex includes a network of localities with different functions, supported by complex transactions advantageous to all parties concerned. The archaic character of the rural areas was to be overcome through systematic investment in agriculture, while the peasant population was to be employed either in mechanized agriculture or in urban factories. The idea therefore was for rural areas to become dormitories for a labour force working in, or servicing, urban spaces. Rural communities would become satellite localities where certain branches of industry move to transform the primary resources into raw materials, later to be developed in urban factories, or they would concentrate industries to further process the industrial products assembled in the 'mother' city. Therefore, the whole lifestyle of the region undergoes changes as an effect of the material processes of economic exchange working to integrate the 'urban–rural' complex.

Sociology and Organizational Innovation

Between 1957 and 1965, Miron Constantinescu lost his position at the top of the political pyramid. Although out of high office, after his 1965 rehabilitation, he exercised great influence on the socialist economy. Between

---

[4]Bucharest University Archive, Human Resource Direction, employee dossier S2/135, available courtesy of Ştefan Bosomitu.

[5]The purpose of the leave was in order for Miron Constantinescu's to write a book on the issue of the transition in Romania (Stahl 1965).

1967 and 1972, together with his colleagues at the University of Bucharest, he began to study urban areas in order to assess the extent to which his 1950s' project had worked. This project brought about volumes on urban analysis (Bogdan et al. 1970; Brescan and Merfea 1973; Constantinescu and Stahl 1970) and a volume on a rural hinterland (Bădina et al. 1970). The research logic closely followed the style of public policy reports. The inaugural volume discussed the urban area concept and assessed the extent to which the researched cities are functional urban areas. Deviations from the model were carefully noted, and Constantinescu took time to make precise recommendations in specific chapters. In his manual on urban area studies, Stahl (1975) explained that this type of analysis had two stages: the research conducted before the actual intervention and then the research to track the effects of the intervention.

The results were not entirely as hoped for. In the first issue of the *Social Future*, Miron Constantinescu's new magazine which began publication in 1972, Alexandru Bărbat, from the University of Iași, published a caustic article on the issue of urban areas. The subtext of this intervention was clear: policies based on the concept stimulated an opposition between rural agricultural populations and urban populations and an extraction process biased towards industrial production. Reading the article revealed an underlying tension that dared not speak its name: the class struggle between farmers and workers brought about by socialist accumulation. Some of the terms used seemed to reference Nikolai Bukharin's thesis on the need for "balance between the elements of the socialist society" and the struggles between the rural and urban classes in socialism (Bukharin 2006).

As noted by Alexandru Bărbat, the urban area concept changed substantially after 1970. While Constantinescu's early hope was to mobilize local resources and create a mosaic of areas with specializations that would bring comparative advantages in a national space of collaboration, after 1970, it became increasingly clear that there was a growing hierarchy between urban areas. Uneven intra-area relations were increasingly becoming uneven inter-area relations. These unequal relations were due to changes that took place in Romania's economic architecture.

Even though the diagnosis was implicit, the proposal became more than mere sociological observation. In 1973, Miron Constantinescu used his double position in the academic system (in the *Bucharest University* and the *Social Sciences and Political Academy*) and also his political position (as member of the *Secretariat* of the *Central Committee*, vice-president of *State Council,* and president of *Central Council of the Workers Control of the Economic and Social Activity*) to initiate a "sociological and political exper-

iment in the science of leadership" in Dolj County, with the help of the County Party Committee. The goal was to build a set of methods for collecting economic data on the production of each economic unit in the county to evaluate the extent to which economic chains were produced at county level.

Working with mathematicians at the *Central institute for Management and Computer Science in Bucharest*, Constantinescu supervised the building of a set of algorithms, based on linear and recursive programming, to allow the material resources and labour force to be treated as a set of matrices between units and economic sectors, and then to model the exchange processes at the level of county production chain. These algorithms were built in conversation with the new input/output models of the neoclassical economist Wassily Leontief, a Russian émigré and Harvard professor who presented his mathematical research at the *Romanian Academy of Economic Sciences* in June 1968. Those who benefited most from this academic synchronization with neoclassical theories were the groups of programmers that had access to the data of the *State Planning Committee* (Ban 2016). In a series of meetings in Bucharest, throughout 1971 and 1972, Constantinescu supervised analyses of the major issues implied by uniform territorial development policies, which Ceaușescu had advocated since 1968. Throughout 1972, with the help of Dolj County Council, he experimented with this model and improved it by refining the parameters used. In 1974, the algorithm was taken over by the *Central Planning Committee* and used at national level. The whole logic behind this generalization was captured in a posthumous text published in 1974, in a book titled *Introduction to the Science of Leadership in Socialist Society*.

Similar to many of Constantinescu's proposals, a simple technical issue obscured the complex political negotiations implied in the design and methodology used for economic development (Poenaru 2015). Constantinescu's correction to the urban area concept from the 1970s, the attempt to turn it into a developmental heuristic, required substantial political negotiation to try to capture the interests of local party cadres. Consequently, it is not surprising that its final embodiment took shape as a set of highly technical concepts and procedures. De-politicizing the instruments of intervention was key to actual deployment. Constantinescu's political purpose might have been to win over partners from the *Central Committee* by presenting his mathematical models as a more efficient planning instrument. Notably, the state apparatus used these new sociological research techniques in disguise so as to present them as harmless, neutral operations. The 1970s and the 1980s witnessed a boom of literature dedicated to "the science of leadership"

(see Boldur 1973; Herseni 1974; Krausz 1972; Nestor 1974; Olteanu 1970; Pavelcu et al. 1973; Petrescu 1977; Popescu 1973; Tabachiu 1974; Tămaş 1978, 1980; Zamfir 1974; Mihu 1970a).

In this context, in 1975, Stahl published a volume dedicated to the methodology of "urban area" studies, the second volume of his methodological manual titled, *The Theory and Practice of Social Investigations*. This second volume had the subtitle *Interdisciplinary Area Research* and had the same purpose—how to conduct area research during the territorial planning of a region. A year later, Ion I. Matei, Stahl's apprentice, co-authored a manual on territorial systematization that completed the "de-sociologization" of planning (and of the discipline itself) by advancing specific technical concepts to be used in practice in order to silence the history of class tensions and political struggles embedded in the process.

In a post-socialist history of sociology in Romania, Ștefan Costea and his colleagues (Costea et al. 1998, p. 93) noted that sociology as a discipline fell into disgrace after 1977 following Elena Ceaușescu's observation that "sociologists are more interested in power than in science". Elena Ceaușescu's alleged observation does not seem unfair. Both Stahl and Constantinescu were acutely aware that any attempt to build a "science of the nation" on a sociological base required research tools for evidence-based policies; in their turn, such instruments required state institutions and experts capable of gathering and ordering complex data. In a re-evaluation of Miron Constantinescu's contribution, Poenaru astutely noted that his project to institutionalize sociology was, in fact, a project geared to implement mechanisms for the creation of cadres with sociological knowledge in the central planning apparatuses (Poenaru 2015).

Assessing Work in Post-socialism

The first post-socialist decade was marked by partial de-industrialization, while the second decade witnessed a steady macro-stabilization driven by an alliance of local capitalists and global capital (Pasti 2006; Poenaru 2011; Petrovici and Simionca 2011), when industrial output began to increase. After the 2008 financial crisis, the industrial sector registered a boom in production and investment. The growth was driven by the Western European companies' demand for cheap industrial facilities and labour. By 2015, one-third of Romania's GDP was produced by industry and 36% of the workforce was employed in this sector. Moreover, 40% of the GDP was produced by foreign-owned companies, and 90% of the banking system

was owned by foreign capital (Ban 2016). Romania, similar to other CEE economies, entered on the track of a "dependent market economy" (Nölke and Vliegenthart 2009). The country became an assembly line in the global production system. This was a result of radical neoliberal policies, including privatization, strong property laws safeguarding the rights of companies, minimum taxation of profits and dividends, a flat taxation system, and heavy taxation on labour (Ban 2016). Most of the economic decisions came to be controlled by multinational companies, either directly through the banking system or through intra-company investments, while the major competitive advantage of the country was the cheap labour it could provide to the transnational supply production chains.

Nonetheless, the former socialist geography of industrial development remained relevant. Eastern Europe has sustained a consistent population loss over the past decades (Kucera et al. 2000; Neyer et al. 2013), arguably the most persistent population shrinkage in the post-war era worldwide (Romei 2016). This was accompanied by one of the most sustained losses in aggregate employment (Ark et al. 2012; Bell and Mickiewicz 2013). The total number of wage earners decreased dramatically in the last few decades (Ban 2014; Petrovici 2013). The trend began during the last five years of socialism when the total number of employees decreased in the total population, from 42% in 1985 to 35% in 1990. This slump was followed by a sharp, 13% drop, during the first post-socialist decade, stabilizing around 20–22% in the second. In opposition to aggregate employment, amongst the economically active population employment remained relatively stable, at around 40% of the total population. Much of this figure is explained by strong, work-related migration. During the first post-socialist decade, Romania witnessed significant internal migration from urban to rural areas with a boom in self-employment and familial agricultural work (Rotariu and Mezei 1998, 1999; Rees and Kupiszewski 1999). During the second decade, migration was characterised by a shift to turned external migration, especially towards Western Europe, in various low-paying jobs in informal and formal secondary markets (Andrén and Roman 2016; Sandu 2010).

The decrease in aggregate employment had significant regional variations across Romania. Most employees were found in towns, where the number of those employed was at about 40% of their population. More than half of those employed were concentrated in the ten most developed counties, out of a total of 41. Some counties suffered major losses of population and jobs, while others, although hit by economic contraction, recovered more swiftly during the second post-socialist decade. For example, by 2010, in Călăraşi County, the total number of employees was at 43% of the 1990 figure. Cluj

County experienced a smaller decrease, where, by 2010, the total number of employees was at 73% of the 1990 number. Much of this disparity was enabled by socialist investment strategies and their spatial patterning.

The counties with the harshest decrease in employment were those that received the majority of investment in agriculture during the socialist decades (Petrovici 2013). Counties with investment in industry and services retained a greater share of employees in early post-socialism. Considering the structure of employment under socialism, where urban industrial workers constituted the largest pool of labour, this is somewhat paradoxical (Dobrincu and Iordachi 2009; Kligman and Verdery 2015). Nonetheless, after the demise of socialism, the counties with the largest job losses were not those with the most employees, but those with fewer employees, that is, those specialized in agriculture.

An important portion of managerial and professional positions are concentrated in major cities, while the new manufacturing facilities benefit from the cheap rural force. However, these developments created major opportunities in the service sector, which experienced a significant boost. Service sector-related exports have increased four times in the last 10 years. Business-to-business consultancy, especially in Transylvania, and engineering-related consultancy are the fastest growing activities in the service sector (Heroiu 2013). In addition, a new service sector directly linked to the global service sector, particularly the IT sector, flourished in some cities. The clear majority of them function as outsourcing outlets for companies located in Frankfurt, Dublin, and Silicon Valley. Since 2004, most of the labour that came into the first five cities comprises highly educated workers and skilled employees in search for higher paying urban jobs: managers, professionals, technicians, administrative and service workers. Therefore, the composition of the cities has become even more skewed towards professionals and service workers. In Cluj, 1 of 3 employees is a professional. In Miercurea Ciuc, Ploiești, and Târgu-Mureș, 1 in 4 employees are professionals. Between 2001 and 2011, Cluj lost more than 10,000 industrial workers and gained the same number of service workers.

The Sociology of Work Ethics

De-professionalization, coupled with the contours of work, that favoured informal organization and silent negotiation among the workers, proved a fertile ground for the post-socialist re-institutionalization of sociology without the burden of referencing or engaging the communist sociological

tradition. This in particular was due to the de-professionalization of the discipline which reached a peak during the 1980s, despite the attempt to inculcate sociology inside socialist planning by figures such as Miron Constantinescu. Post-socialist re-institutionalized sociology became the place for the depiction of members of the working-class as inadequate, needy, risk averse, and generally unable to refashion themselves into proper capitalist agents of production (see Kideckel 2002, 2008).

In the newly emerging sociological journals, the notions gaining currency in post-socialism were those of "mentality", "ethics" and "values". Culturalist interpretations of Max Weber's work were often grounding and legitimizing a research agenda pushing for a societal transformation governed by markets and unfettered competition. Symptomatic, in this context, was Monica Heintz's focus on "work ethics" where she found that Romanian workers were largely diverging from a protestant work ethic a la Weber, making the prospects of Romanian capitalism rather dim without a change in workers' values (Heintz 2006). As Simionca has astutely noted, the focus on mentalities and ethics was underwritten by a strong post-socialist alliance of neoliberal economics and an anti-communist narrative that systematically undermined the possibility of workers to articulate their critique of the transition (2012). Moreover, the uncritical adoption of certain ways of assessing workers' values and behaviour operated to reinforce the disempowerment of labour as well as providing the cloak of science to research at the intersection of sociology, social psychology and management studies (Mateescu 2016). As we shall see, the de-professionalization of sociology during the 1980s had far-reaching implications during post-socialism in spite of its re-institutionalization in the early 1990s. In many ways, the pressure to contribute to the new capitalist economy allied to diminished resources for research pushed a number of sociologists in the direction of management, human resources or personal coaching. Ironically, sociology in the public service of building capitalism is yet again pushing the discipline into irrelevance, while some of its theories and methods make for a career under different auspices.

In CEE countries, the critique of Fordism, bureaucracy and autocratic management was often conflated with a critique of actually existing socialism (Simionca 2012, 2013). Denouncing Fordist loyalties and rigid factory bureaucracies played out as a critique of "communism" (Buden 2010). The emerging employability agenda takes up a self-work ethic supported by the self-governing techniques of a flexible, skilled, learning and enterprising subject (Chertkovskaya et al. 2013; Costea et al. 2012). The new work ethic describes a subject in opposition to the communist Fordist one, cleansed of old "mentalities". Nonetheless, this is also a critique of bureaucracy, autocracy,

over-regulation on the shop floor not dissimilar to those appearing in other contexts with a history of Fordism, industrialization and urbanization (Sennett 1998). These narratives are far from exceptional. Current work arrangements in core capitalist countries connect employee criticism and discontent (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005) with the loyalties and arrangements solicited by bureaucratic organizations (Burawoy 1985; Bloom 2013; Sennett 1998) on the part of the so-called Fordist "organizational man" (Whyte 1956). Ethics of popular entrepreneurship, strivings towards independence and the desire for freedom, have been adapted to organizational ends to produce an entrepreneurial self within the confines of the capitalist firm (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005).

Such critical appraisals open new ways to question the complex relations that employees take part in and are asked to contribute to the firm. Employability does not suspend the conflict-ridden character of the social division of labour, but most of the struggles between labour and capital are deflected as tensions within the working class, understood as fluid groups formed in the division of work (Kalb 1997). The tension between highly skilled workers and unskilled workers on the shop floor are well documented (Pittaway 2007; Petrovici 2011; Burawoy 1985), as are the alliances that formed between workers factions against the employer (Ost 2002; Kalb 1997). Such tensions were strongly felt and experienced by workers themselves, as the class-based reconfiguration of football fandom in Cluj shows (see Faje 2011b). However, as employability increasingly transfers the burden of being employed onto the working subject him or herself, unemployment, precarious working conditions, working routine and job estrangement are explained away as an individual malaise, the effect of inadequate self-entrepreneurship. As with the case of the puritan subject, an inappropriate and uninteresting job is an indication of not having behaved gracefully enough on the labour market, a personal failure indicative of an inadequate work ethic. Such interpellations create a hierarchy of the chosen ones—the adequate subjects who answered the call of professionalization. Subjects are invited to evaluate and position themselves in relation to other workers, and not to question the employer through political alliances.

For the highly skilled, the inability to obtain or retain a job becomes a personal failure, and rarely translates into a critique of the company and the labour market. Three types of antiheroes have emerged: "the lazy", "the unwise entrepreneur", and "the communist". "The lazy" has difficulties finding and keeping a job because of an unwillingness to work and acquire relevant experience. These are people who did not transform their pleasure of doing something into a job of some kind. "I have faculty colleagues who

are still not working. There are cases. Some are too lazy" (M, 25, IT, tertiary education). This typical statement continues by emphasizing that there are firms in Cluj and elsewhere facing a continuous crisis of personnel. Supposedly everyone can integrate into the labour market if they make enough effort to learn and be ambitious.

The second anti-hero is the person who did not invest wisely, that is, to acquire the right skillsets. "Take Delia's example. Up until now she did not use her friends and her former connections in other firms and she did not find a job, regardless where she was interviewed, her background being only in logistics" (M, 30, Sell support engineer, tertiary education). Delia had a lot of experience in managing the logistic of a firm. However, as her former colleague argued, she had difficulties finding the next job since she invested in a field of knowledge that restricted her career field to few employers. She eventually found a position based on her expertise, but only by mobilizing her previously developed networks.

The third anti-hero is the communist in disguise. "The communist" is the worker unwilling to learn and to adapt, she is the beholder of "old communist mentalities" (Simionca and Gog 2016; Simionca 2012). No one is exempt from the malaise of not being flexible enough. Even managers, supposed embodiment of capitalism, are far from exempt of suspicion: "I can say that also in the multinationals it is the same deal as in the small firms. Yes… the managers have the same style of doing stuff: the communist way" (M, 30, IT, tertiary education). Communist mentalities could be altered through appropriate education, often taken to mean business experience and a sustained effort to adapt to the labour market. Those who do not conform to the requirements of employability find themselves relegated to the old ways of doing things.

In this context, sociologists came to thread and navigate a thin and perilous line between past and present, between communism and emerging capitalism. On the one hand, anti-communist discourse all but blocked the possibility of claiming continuities or recapturing the research agendas of sociologists such as Constantinescu or Stahl, among others. The sociological endeavour to build a socialist economy premised on urban areas was all but lost, in spite of its acute relevance for the creation of the new capitalist economy. Efforts to advance organizational innovation did survive, often by taking up a competitive and individualistic outlook. In a move similar to that of their early post-war peers, sociologists turned to Gusti's interwar school for legitimacy and guidance (Cotoi 2011; Rostás 2012; Bosomitu 2017), thus fuelling the mythology that turned the interwar period into the temporal cradle of Romanian capitalism and democracy.

Symptomatically, the efforts to retie the knots of post-war Romanian sociology were recently taken up by a group of young researchers with a distinctively anti-disciplinary outlook comprising anthropologists, historians, philosophers and sociologists pushing a materialist analysis of modernity cast in a historical and global framework. The superb assessment of Stahl's intellectual journey and legacy (Guga 2015), the reinterpretation of Constantinescu's work and politics (Bosomitu 2014; Poenaru 2015), the rediscovery of several social and political thinkers (Cistelecan and State 2015), were made by researchers and authors who found themselves outside the confines of academia, albeit loosely connected to it, in often low-level, short-term, precarious positions.

On the other hand, within the faculties and departments of sociology, calls to improve efficiency combined with cost-cutting policies pushed for the creation of specializations geared towards the needs of the labour market (see Gog 2015). Faculties of Sociology across Romania insist on their applied approach, purportedly developing skills that could immediately be put to use on the labour market. Over the last decade, specializations in Human Resources have become a mainstay of departments of sociology, usually in an alliance with psychologists and economists. Less often observed is the fact that in terms of its more theoretical and academic pursuits, sociology found itself in alliance with social anthropology and social work, in the effort to safeguard its critical and societal outlook. In the conclusion, we discuss some of the results of this alliance, where we shift attention away from these narrow and often biased preoccupations with work and self to consider the larger processes that have marked Romanian economy and society since the early 1990s. We will be concerned to explore what we take to be the limits to contemporary Romanian research in the sociology of work.

Conclusion

Sociology of work in Romania never emerged as a distinctive sub-field within the discipline of sociology. Nonetheless, during the post-war period, trained sociologists did engage with the topic of work and were prominent agents in its formation and organization. A recognizable body of work appeared in the domain of industrial sociology, which increasingly developed into a methodologically driven and policy-oriented branch of socialist planning. From the late 1940s onwards, sociologists and practitioners in allied disciplines were tasked with producing the knowledge and policies

needed to create a planned economy. Work and its organization were crucial dimensions of this enterprise, in spite of the fact that the discipline was banned. Although sociology did not exist, sociological methods and theories were conspicuous in the development of post-war Romanian economy and society. In the form of planning, management and leadership studies and urban studies, sociologists pursued research agendas that have decisively shaped Romanian social and economic space to this day.

The institutional trajectory of the discipline has been intimately tied to the political and academic fortunes of Miron Constantinescu. A sociologist formed in the tradition of the monographic school of sociology in Bucharest, developed by Dimitrie Gusti during the interwar era, Constantinescu came to political prominence in the early days of the socialist regime. Tasked with the conceptualization and implementation of the first national plans, he relied heavily on the sociological competences of several sociologists, Henri Stahl and Traian Herseni, notable among them. Having introduced sociology into the framework of planning during the late 1940s and the first half of the 1950s, Constantinescu's political standing waned in the late 1950s. He re-emerged political central stage soon after Ceaușescu's assent to power and was a chief artisan in the re-institutionalization of sociology in 1965. Tellingly, sociology was disbanded in 1977, only one year after his death.

The early period, between 1948 and 1956, presented a remarkable continuity and development of the Gustian interwar research agenda. Drawing on the methodological and theoretical advancements of the Bucharest School, while assuming a sophisticated Marxist analysis of Romanian society, early socialist planning came to be built around the notion of the "urban area". This was understood as a unit that sought to regionally integrate town and countryside based on their respective natural, agricultural and labour resources. The research that grounded the notion and subsequent development policies was distinctively sociological as well as interdisciplinary. Teams of researchers mapped most of Romania's regions and advanced recommendations for industrialization, urbanization, transportation and agriculture. Since the early debates on socialist modernization came to favour the development of heavy industry prior the concentration of land and mechanization of agriculture, the "urban area" can be read as an original resolution to this struggle. The urban–rural system comprised both towns and hinterlands, dynamically interlinked through circuits of agricultural produce, labour, and goods. Smaller towns and villages became housing spaces as well as satellites of larger industrial units based in the towns.

Romania's socialist economy was thus an assemblage of functional regions, centrally coordinated by planning and locally built around the factories and cities. In short, the planners sought to achieve aggregate economic growth by increasing productivity through competition between regions and sectors of the economy. The emerging industrial towns became hubs for the accumulation of labour, as well as places where class tensions could be defused or kept under control. This economic architecture put a premium on planners, factory directors and workers. In spite of the efforts to contain the latter, workers manifested their autonomy in urban networks premised on spatial proximity, class affinities and kin. Blocked from voicing their dissent, workers silently reacted to the constraints placed upon them by changing jobs, missing work and by pursuing their activities in the countryside. Unsurprisingly, sociologists came to analyse and debate workers' absenteeism, work force fluctuations, and to devise strategies for the organization of workplaces.

The late 1960s and the 1970s were a period of evaluation and critique. With the institutionalization of sociology, there was ample scope to test whether the implementation of the urban areas had worked, and a new generation of researchers was emerging ready to criticize the received wisdom of the previous one. The results were often surprising and ambiguous. The urban areas were marred by internal as well as external contradictions. Internally, the integration of town and countryside, of industry and agriculture, and of the workers themselves in the new economic structures proved much more difficult than expected. Externally, the factories, towns, and regions were strongly competing against each other for funding, raw materials and labour. The critique was quick to emphasize that the implementation of the urban areas had in fact spatially polarized the regions and reinforced class divisions between peasants and workers. Following the second banning of the discipline in the late 1970s, and given the previous decade of scrutiny, it is less surprising that sociological endeavours sought to address the failings of the previous ones. Increasingly, this took sociologists in the direction of methodological formalism and often with inadequate training. Moreover, they emphasized the importance of leadership and management as key sites for better economic integration.

With the re-establishment of sociology after 1989, in a distinctively anti-communist register, many of the socialist developments were sidelined. Symptomatic of the marginalization of the discipline is the fact that even foreign researchers analysing Romanian economy and society in the 1970s and 1980s rarely saw the work of domestic sociologists as sociological. Since many of them were working in planning, their political and professional

commitments surpassed their intellectual and academic ones. Sociology re-emerged by drawing directly on Gusti's monograph tradition of the inter-war period, emphasizing quantitative methodologies while delving into the discourse of "transition". Nonetheless, some of the post-1989 developments within the field present stark continuities with the socialist legacy and cannot properly be explained without it. Post-socialist economic restructuring, with its heavy toll on work and workers, cannot be made sense of fully without understanding the regional political economy of socialism. The emphasis on organizational innovation by socialist sociologists might well account for the creation of Human Resources specializations within sociology departments, rather than in business or economics departments.

References

Amann, R., & Cooper, J. (1982). *Industrial Innovation in the Soviet Union*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Andrén, D., & Roman, M. (2016). Should I Stay or Should I Go? Romania Migrants During Transition and Enlargements. In S. Esarey & A. Haslberger (Eds.), *Labour Migration, EU Enlargement, and the Great Recession* (pp. 247–271). Berlin: Springer.

van Ark, B., O'Mahony, M., & Timmer, M. P. (2012). Europe's Productivity Performance in Comparative Perspective: Trends, Causes and Recent Developments. In M. Mas & R. Stehrer (Eds.), *Industrial Productivity in Europe: Growth and Crisis* (pp. 65–91). Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Arrighi, G. (2010). The World Economy and the Cold War, 1970–1990. In P. L. Melvyn & O. A. Westad (Eds.), *The Cambridge History of the Cold War* (Vol. 3, pp. 23–44). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Askanas, B., & Levcik, F. (1983). The Dispersion of Wages in the CMEA Countries (Including a Comparison with Austria). In S. F. Frowen (Ed.), *Controlling Industrial Economies* (pp. 193–231). London and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ban, C. (2014). *Dependență Și Dezvoltare*. Tact: Economia Politică a Capitalismului Românesc. Cluj.

Ban, C. (2016). *Ruling Ideas: How Global Neoliberalism Goes Local*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bauer, T. (1978). Investment Cycles in Planned Economies. *Acta Oeconomica, 21*(3), 243–260.

Bădina, O., & Mamali, C. (1973). Tineretul Industrial: Dinamica Integării Socioprofesionale. In O. Bădina & C. Mamali (Eds.), *Tineretul Industrial:*

Dinamica Integării Socioprofesionale (pp. 27–44). Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Bădina, O., Dumitriu, D., Neamţu, O., & Aluaş, I. (1970). *Buciumi, Un Sat Din Ţara de Sub Munte: Cercetare Socio-Economică*. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Bell, J., & Mickiewicz, T. (2013). *Unemployment in Transition: Restructuring and Labour Markets in Central Europe*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.

Bloom, P. (2013). Fight for Your Alienation: The Fantasy of Employability and the Ironic Struggle for Self-Exploitation. *Ephemera: Theory & Politics Organization, 13*(4), 785–807.

Bockman, J. (2011). *Markets in the Name of Socialism: The Left-Wing Origins of Neoliberalism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bogdan, T., Cernea, M. M., Constantinescu, M., & Cristea, P. (1970). *Procesul de Urbanizare În România: Zona Brasov*. Bucureşti: Editura Politică.

Boldur, G. (1973). *Fundamentarea Complexă a Procesului Decizional Economic*. Bucureşti: Editura ştiinţifică.

Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, È. (2005). *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London and New York: Verso.

Bosomitu, Ş. (2014). *Miron Constantinescu. O Biografie*. Bucureşti: Humanitas.

Bosomitu, Ş. (2017). Sociology in Communist Romania: An Institutional and Biographical Overview. *Studia Sociologia, 62*(1), 65–87.

Brenner, R. (2006). *The Economics of Global Turbulence: The Advanced Capitalist Economies from Long Boom to Long Downturn, 1945–2005*. London: Verso.

Brescan, M., & Merfea, M. (1973). *Procesul de Urbanizare În R.S. România: Zona Vaslui*. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.

Buden, B. (2010). Children of Postcommunism. *Radical Philosophy, 159,* 18–25.

Bukharin, N. (2006). *The Prison Manuscripts: Socialism and Its Culture*. Calcutta: Seagull Books.

Burawoy, M. (1985). *The Politics of Production: Factory Regimes Under Capitalism and Socialism*. London: Verso.

Câmpeanu, P. (2002). *Societatea Sincertică. 1980*. Iaşi: Polirom.

Cazacu, H. (Ed.). (1979). *Fluctuaţia Forţei de Muncă. Teorie, Metodă, Cercetare*. Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică şi enciclopedică.

Cernea, M. M. (1971). *Resurse Umane Ale Întreprinderii*. Bucureşti: Editura Politică.

Cernea, M. M. (1973). Individual Motivation and Labour Turnover Under Socialism. *Studies in Comparative International Development, 8*(3), 303–323.

Cernea, M. M., & Munteanu, E. (1971). Methodological and Conceptual Dilemmas in the Sociological Study of Manpower Fluctuations Author. *International Journal of Sociology, 1*(2), 177–192.

Chamberlin, G., & Linda, Y. (Linda Yi-Chuang) Yueh. 2006. International Financial Markets and Curency Crises. In *Macroeconomics* (pp. 506–543). London: Thomson.

Chertkovskaya, E., Watt, P., Tramer, S., Spoelstra, S., Berglund, K., Vesterberg, V., et al. (2013). Giving Notice to Employability. *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization, 13*(4), 701–716.

Cistelecan, A., & State, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Plante Exotice. Teoria Și Practica Marxiștilor Români*. Cluj: Tact.

Constantinescu, M. (1971). *Cercetări Sociologice 1938–1971*. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Română.

Constantinescu, M. (1974). Experimentul Sociologic Și Politologic Din Județul Dolj. In M. Constantinescu & P. Apostol (Eds.), *Introducere În Știința Conducerii* (pp. 225–233). București: Editura Politică.

Constantinescu, M., & Stahl, H. H. (1970). *Procesul de Urbanizare În R.S. România: Zona Slatina-Olt*. București: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste Română.

Costea, Ș. (2001). *Mică Enciclopedie de Sociologi Români*. București: Editura Expert.

Costea, B., Amiridis, K., & Crump, N. (2012). Graduate Employability and the Principle of Potentiality: An Aspect of the Ethics of HRM. *Journal of Business Ethics, 111*(1), 25–36.

Costea, Ș., Cristea, I., & Dumitrescu, D. (1998). *Istoria Sociologiei Românești*. București: Editura Fundației "România de Mâine".

Cotoi, C. (2011). Jottings on the History of Romanian Sociology. *Studia Sociologia, 56*(1), 135–149.

Csillag, T., & Szelenyi, I. (2015). Drifting from Liberal Democracy. Neo-Conservative Ideology of Managed Illiberal Democratic Capitalism in Post-communist Europe. *Intersections. East European Journal of Society and Politics, 1*(1), 18–48.

Cucu, A.-S. (2014). Producing Knowledge in Productive Spaces: Ethnography and Planning in Early Socialist Romania. *Economy and Society, 43*(2), 211–232.

Cullen Dunn, E., & Verdery, K. 2015. Postsocialism. In *Emerging Trends in the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (pp. 1–6). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Davies, R. W. (1980). *The Industrialisation of Soviet Russia: Socialist Offensive: The Collectivisation of Soviet Agriculture, 1929–1930* (Vol. 1). Houndmills and London: The Macmillan Press.

Davies, R. W. (1989). Economic and Social Policy in the USSR, 1917–41. In P. Mathias & S. Pollard (Eds.), *The Cambridge Economic History of Europe, Vol. VIII, The Industrial Economies: The Development of Economic and Social Policies* (pp. 984–1047). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, R. W., Harrison, M., & Wheatcroft, S. G. (1994). *The Economic Transformation of the Soviet Union, 1913–1945*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dobrincu, D., & Iordachi, C. (2009). *Transforming Peasants, Property and Powers: The Collectivization of Agriculture in Romania, 1949–1962*. Budapest and New York: Central European University Press.

Dunn, E. C. (2004). *Privatizing Poland: Baby Food, Big Business, and the Remaking of Labour*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Ellman, M. (1973). *Planning Problems in the USSR: The Contribution of Mathematical Economics to Their Solution 1960–1971* (Vol. 24). Cambridge, MA: University of Cambridge.

Ellman, M. (2014). *Socialist Planning*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Enache, C. (1975). *Probleme Ale Reproducției Forței de Muncă*. Bucureşti: Edintura Politică.

Evangelista, M. (1988). *Innovation and the Arms Race: How the United States and the Soviet Union Develop New Military Technologies*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Faje, F. (2011a). Communist Deviation, Critique and Selfcritique: A Few Insights from Anthropology and History. *Studia Sociologia, 56*(2), 109–122.

Faje, F. (2011b). Football Fandom in Cluj: Class, Ethno-nationalism and Cosmopolitanism. In D. Kalb & G. Halmai (Eds.), *Headlines of Nation, Subtexts of Class: Working Class Populism and the Return of the Repressed in Neoliberal Europe* (pp. 78–92). New York and London: Berghahn Books.

Foucault, M. (2008). *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France, 1978—1979*. New York: Picador.

Foucault, M. (2009). *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978*. New York: Picador.

Freeman, C. (1995). The 'National System of Innovation' in Historical Perspective. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 19*(1), 5–24.

Gatejel, L. (2011). The Common Heritage of the Socialist Car Culture. In L. H. Siegelbaum (Ed.), *The Socialist Car: Automobility in the Eastern Bloc* (pp. 143–156). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Gereffi, G., & Lee, J. (2016). Economic and Social Upgrading in Global Value Chains and Industrial Clusters: Why Governance Matters. *Journal of Business Ethics, 133*(1), 25–38.

Gille, Z. (2010). Is There a Global Postsocialist Condition? *Global Society, 24*(1), 9–30.

Gog, S. (2015). *Competitiveness and Research-Oriented Teaching in Romanian Universities: The Neo-Liberal Transformation of the Higher Education System. Studia Sociologia* (Vol. 60). Cluj: Universitatea Babeş-Bolyai.

Golopenţia, A., & Georgescu, D. C. (1941). *60 Sate Româneşti, Cercetate de Echipele Studenţeşti În Vara 1939*. Bucureşti: Institutul de Ştiinţe Sociale al României.

Grama, A. (2017). *Labouring Along: Industrial Workers and the Making of Postwar Romania (1944–1955)*. Budapest: Central European University.

Guga, Ş. (2015). *Sociologia Istorica a Lui Henri H. Stahl*. Tact: Cluj.

Gusti, D. (1946). *Plan de Lucru Înfăţişat Consiliului Naţional de Cercetări Ştiinţifice*.

Hanson, P., & Pavitt, K. (2001). *The Comparative Economics of Research Development and Innovation in East and West*. New York: Harwood Academic Publishers.

Harvey, D. (2006). *The Limits to Capital* (New ed.). London: Verso.

Heintz, M. (2006). *"Be European, Recycle Yourself!" The Changing Work Ethic in Romania*. Münster and London: Lit & Global.

Heroiu, M. I. (2013). *Growth Poles: The next Phase* (Report No. 84327). Romania Regional Development Program.

Herseni, T. (1974). *Sociologie Industrială*. București: Editura Didactică și Pedagogică.

Higonnet, R. P. (1985). Eurobanks, Eurodollars and International Debt. In P. Savona & G. Sutija (Eds.), *Eurodollars and International Banking* (pp. 15–51). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kalb, D. (1997). *Expanding Class: Power and Everyday Politics in Industrial Communities*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Kamath, A. (2015). *Industrial Innovation, Networks, and Economic Development: Informal Information Sharing in Low-Technology Clusters in India*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.

Kautsky, K. (1920). *Reforma Socială Sau Revoluție Socială*. București: Cercul de editură socialistă.

Kideckel, D. (2002). The Unmaking of an East-Central European Working Class. In *Postsocialism: Ideals, Ideologies and Practices in Eurasia* (pp. 114–132). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Kideckel, D. (2008). *Getting by in Postsocialist Romania: Labour, the Body, and Working Class Culture*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Kligman, G., & Verdery, K. (2011). *Peasants Under Siege: The Collectivization of Romanian Agriculture, 1949–1962*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kligman, G., & Verdery, K. (2015). *Țăranii Sub Asediu: Colectivizarea Agriculturii În România (1949–1952)*. Iași: Polirom.

Kornai, J. (1980). *Economics of Shortage*. Amsterdam: North Holland.

Krausz, S. (1972). Controverse Sociologice În Problematica Tehnocrației. *Studia Sociologia, XVII*(1), 105–116.

Kucera, T., Kucerova, O. V., Opara, O. B., & Schaich, E. (Eds.). (2000). *New Demographic Faces of Europe: The Changing Population Dynamics in Countries of Central and Eastern Europe*. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

Levy, R. (2001). The Agriculture Secretary. In *Ana Pauker: The Rise and Fall of a Jewish Communist* (pp. 90–133). London: University of California Press.

Linz, J. J., & Stepan, A. C. (1996). *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mâlcomete, P., & Floareș, A. (1971). Implicații Economice Ale Fluctuației Forței de Muncă. *Lupta de Clasă, 2*(2), 101–105.

Malerba, F., & Vonortas, N. S. (2009). *Innovation Networks in Industries*. Cheltenham and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Marea, C., & Mihu, A. (1970). Aspecte Sociologice Ale Organizării Ştiinţifice a Producţiei Şi a Muncii În Întreprinderile Industriale. In M. M. Cernea, A. Mihu, Ş. Costea, & O. Bădina (Eds.), *Sociologia Şi Practica Socială: Contribuţii La Utilizarea Cercetării Sociologice În Activitatea Social-Politică* (pp. 89–113). Bucureşti: Editura Politică.

Mărginean, M. (2015). *Ferestre Spre Furnalul Roşu. Urbanism Şi Cotidian În Hunedoara Şi Călan (1945–1968)*. Iaşi: Polirom.

Marten, K. Z. (1993). *Engaging the Enemy: Organization Theory and Soviet Military Innovation, 1955–1991*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mateescu, V. (2016). Commentary On 'Study about Romanian Values and Behaviour from the Perspective of Cultural Dimensions according to Geert Hofstede's Method', by Adina Luca, INTERACT, 2005. *Studia Sociologia, 61*(2), 167–171.

Mayo, S. K., & Stein, J. I. (1988). *Housing and Labour Market Distortions in Poland: Linkages and Policy Implications* (Report INU 25, Working Paper Series). Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Mihályi, P. (1992). *Socialist Investment Cycles: Analysis in Retrospect*. New York: Springer Science & Business Media.

Mihu, A. (1970a). Characteristics of the Leader in Eight Big Factories in the City of Cluj. *Studia Sociologie, XV*(1), 45–50.

Mihu, A. (1970b). Stilul de Muncă Al Comitetelor de Direcţie În Opt Fabrici Mari Din Oraşul Cluj. *Studia Sociologia, XV*(1), 45–50.

Mihu, A. (1971). Premise Şi Ipoteze În Cercetarea Flotanţei. *Studia Sociologia, 16*(1), 21–26.

Mişcol, O. (1967). Probleme de Metodică În Cercetarea Sociologică a Fluctuaţiei Forţei de Muncă. *Filosofie, 14*(9), 979–987.

Mişcol, O., & Rusu, A. (1967). Structura Şi Motivaţia Fluctuaţiei Muncitorilor. *Révue Roumaine Des Sciences Sociales S. Philosophie et Logique, 11*(3), 275–276.

Nestor, I. M. (1974). *Psihologie Industrială: Consideraţii Practice de Organzare*. Bucureşti: Editura Politică.

Neyer, G., Andersson, G., Kulu, H., Bernardi, L., & Bühler, C. (Eds.). (2013). *The Demography of Europe—Google Books*. Berlin: Springer.

Nölke, A., & Vliegenthart, A. (2009). Enlarging the Varieties of Capitalism: The Emergence of Dependent Market Economies in East Central Europe. *World Politics, 61*(4), 670–702.

Oh, D.-S., Phillips, F., Park, S., & Lee, E. (2016). Innovation Ecosystems: A Critical Examination. *Technovation, 54*(1), 1–6.

Olteanu, I. (1970). *Conducerea Ştiinţifică a Procesului Decizional Economic*. Bucureşti: Editura politică.

Ost, D. (2002). The Weakness of Strong Social Movements: Models of Unionism in the East European Context. *European Journal of Industrial Relations, 8*(1), 33–51.

Ost, D. (2005). *The Defeat of Solidarity: Anger and Politics in Postcommunist Europe*. New York: Cornell University.

Pasti, V. (2006). *Noul Capitalism Românesc*. Iasi: Polirom.

Pavelcu, V., Natansohn, I., Zlate, I. G., & Neculau, A. (1973). *Sociologia În Acțiune. Materiale Teoretice Și de Teren*. Iași: Centrul de Sociologie al Universității Al. I Cuza.

Peters, B. (2016). *How Not to Network a Nation: The Uneasy History of the Soviet Internet*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press.

Petrescu, I. (1977). *Psihosociologia Conducerii Colective a Întreprinderii Industriale*. Craiova: Scrisul Românesc.

Petrovici, N. (2011). Articulating the Right to the City: Cluj against "Groupism" in Contemporary Social Theory. In D. Kalb & G. Halmai (Eds.), *Headlines of Nation, Subtexts of Class: Working Class Populism and the Return of the Repressed in Neoliberal Europe*. London and New York: Berhahn Books.

Petrovici, N. (2013). Neoliberal Proletarization Along the Urban-Rural Divide in Postsocialist Romania. *Studia Sociologia, 58*(2), 23–54.

Petrovici, N., & Simionca, A. (2011). Productive Informality and Economic Ties in Emerging Economies: The Case of Cluj Business Networks. In T. Bhambry, C. Griffin, T. Hjelm, C. Nicholson, & O. G. Voronina (Eds.), *Perpetual Motion? Transformation and Transition in Central and Eastern Europe & Russia* (pp. 134–144). London: University College London Press.

Pittaway, M. (2007). The Revolution and Industrial Workers: The Disintegration and Reconstruction of Socialism, 1953–1958. *Hungarian Studies Review, 34*(1–2), 115–154.

Poenaru, F. 2011. Care E Problema Cu PSD-Ul? *Critic Atact*.

Poenaru, F. (2015). Miron Constantinescu. In A. Cistelecan & A. State (Eds.), *Plante Exotice. Teoria Și Practica Marxistilor Români* (pp. 231–284). Cluj: Tact.

Popescu, M. (1973). *Conducere, Participare*. Editura Academiei RSR: Conștiință.

Rees, P., & Kupiszewski, M. (1999). *Internal Migration and Regional Population Dynamics in Europe: A Synthesis* (Vol. 32). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Romei, V. (2016, May). Eastern Europe Has the Largest Population Loss in Modern History | FT Data. *Financial Times*.

Rostás, Z. (2000). *Monografia ca Utopie. Interviuri Cu Henri H. Stahl (1985–1987)*. București: Peidea.

Rostás, Z. (2012). O Istorie Nefardată a Reabilitării Sociologiei Românești. *Revista Transilvania, 11–12*(1), 88–102.

Rotariu, T., Dumănescu, L., & Hărăguş, M. (2017). *Demografia României În Perioada Postbelică (1948–2015)*. Iași: Polirom.

Rotariu, T., & Mezei, E. (1998). Internal Migration in Roamania (1948–1995). In W. Heller (Ed.), *Romania: Migration, Socio-economic Transformation, and Perspectives of Regional Development* (pp. 121–149). München: Südosteuropa-Gesellschaft.

Rotariu, T., & Mezei, E. (1999). Asupra Unor Aspecte Ale Migrației Interne Din România. *Sociologie Romaneasca, 3,* 5–37.

Rusu, A., & Mişcol, O. (1968). Investigarea Sociologică a Fluctuației Forței de Muncă. *Probleme Economice, 5*(1968), 275–276.

Sandu, D. (1984). *Fluxurile de Migratie În România*. Bucuresti: Editura Academiei RSR.

Sandu, D. (2010). Modernising Romanian Society through Temporary Work Abroad. In R. Black, M. Okólski, & G. Engbersen (Eds.), *A Continent Moving West? EU Enlargement and Labour Migration from Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 271–287). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Sandu, D. (2012). Gândirea Regională În Mişcarea Gustiană de Ridicare a Satului. *Revista Transilvania, 11–12,* 6–13.

Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Sennett, R. (1998). *The Corrosion of Character: The Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Simionca, A. (2012). Neoliberal Managerialism, Anti-Communist Dogma and the Critical Employee in Contemporary Romania. *Studia Sociologia, 57*(1), 125–149.

Simionca, A. (2013). Development, Underdevelopment and Impoverished Roma Communities. A Case Study of High-Level Visions and Agendas of Economic Progress in Urban Romania. *Studia. Sociologia, 58*(2), 55–75.

Simionca, A., & Gog, S. (2016). Sociological and Anthropological Perspectives on Religion and Economy: Emerging Spiritualities and the Future of Work. *Studia Sociologia, 61*(2), 5–9.

Soós, K. (1985). A Rejoinder to Jänos Kornái. *Acta Oeconomica, 34*(1/2), 162–164.

Soós, K. (1987). Informal Pressures, Mobilization, and Campaigns in the Management of Centrally Planned Economies. *Economics of Planning, 21*(1), 39–48.

Soós, K. (1989). Regular Investment Cycles or Irregular Investment Fluctuations Under Central Planning? In C. Frateschi (Ed.), *Fluctuations and Cycles in Socialist Economies* (pp. 61–83). Brookfield: Avebury.

Stahl, H. H. (1969). *Organizarea Administrativ-Teritorială*. Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică.

Stahl, H. H. (1975). *Teoria Şi Practica Investigaţiilor Sociale: Cercetări Interdisciplinare Zonale*. Bucureşti: Editura ştiinţifică şi encicolpedică.

Stahl, H. H. (1965). *Contribuţii La Studiul Satelor Devălmaşe Româneşti. Vol. 3: Procesul de Aservire Feudală a Satelor Devălmaşe*. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Române.

Stahl, H. H., & Matei, I. I. (1966). O Experienţă de Documentare Sociologică În Materie de Sistematizări Teritoriale. In M. Constantinescu (Ed.), *Cercetări Sociologice Contemporane* (pp. 283–296). Bucureşti: Editura Ştiinţifică.

Szelenyi, I. (1981). Urban Development and Regional Management in Eastern Europe. *Theory and Society, 10*(2), 169–205.

Tabachiu, A. (1974). *Cerinţe Psihologice Pentru Conducerea Unităţilor Economice*. Bucureşti: Edintura politică.

Tămaş, S. (1978). *Studiul Sistemelor În Ştiinţa Conducerii*. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei RSR.

Tămaş, S. (1980). *Conducerea Ştiinţifică a Societăţi*. Bucureşti: Editura Politică.

Tania Li, M. (2005). Beyond 'The State' and Failed Schemes. *American Anthropologist, 107*(3), 383–394.

Vasile, V. (2014). The Relationship Between Higher Education and the Workforce in Romanian Socialist Industry Case-Study of the '23 August' Factory. *International Review of Social Research, 3*(2), 163–173.

Verdery, K. (1996). *What Was Socialism, and What Comes Next?* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Whyte, W. H. (1956). *The Organizational Man*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Winiecki, J. (1982). Investment Cycles and an Excess Demand Inflation in Planned Economies: Sources and Processes. *Acta Oeconomica, 28*(1–2), 147–161.

World-Bank. (1978). *Romania: The Industrialization of an Agrarian Economy Under Socialist Planing* (Report No. 1601-RO). Country Programs Department I Europe, Middle East and North Africa Region.

World-Bank. (1986). *Romania:Economic Memorandum:External Stabilizatioan and Structural Adjustment* (Report No. 5832-R0). Europe, Middle East and North Africa Regional Office.

Zamfir, C. (1974). *Psihosociologia Organizării Şi a Conducerii: Teorii Şi Orientări Contemporane*. Bucureşti: Editura Politică.

Conclusion: The Editors and the Authors

One of the notable features to emerge from the individual stories of path-dependant development of the sub-discipline of the Sociology of Work since 1945 in Europe has been the importance of links with US sociology (and the sociology of work) and, on occasion, with other North American social sciences including social psychology and economics. Beyond North America there has also been a degree of engagement, and at times an appropriation, of concepts from other disciplines such as history and political economy. Our review of the SoW also highlights two other significant findings: the subject is always, *has* always been, in a state of intellectual flux not only in every country but internally to such a degree that we might be able to argue that this state of flux, of *spread*, actually constitutes one feature of its ontology. It has no 'centre'—it is always and everywhere contested and reframed. This can also be seen with respect to institutional context within which the subject is practiced so that the institutional space, in addition to the intellectual boundaries, of the sub-discipline have also always been subject to *spread*. The other feature of the sub-discipline which our cases reveal, again with variation according to country, history and changing social relations, is that of the role of the state in relation to the way in which the sub-discipline is practiced. The latter can be seen sometimes in the extent of state provisioning of research, at other times in terms of the way in which the state frames teaching and research activities, and again, in respect of its sometimes open expectation that the SoW should be a feature of state planning.

Thus, not only is the SoW not above society (let alone the state) since we know that it obviously changes its focus as society evolves. What is also interesting in terms of a putative *sociology of the sociology of work*, as it emerges from our studies, is that the SoW presents different faces according to the what (social relations), the where (history-social and institutional space) and the who (gender, ethnicity and class position) of those undertaking research in the sub-discipline. These all matter in determining the kinds of sociology of work we are presented with and these features vary within and between countries according to time, circumstance and the historical trajectory of each country's political economy.

Taking into consideration the complexity and diversity of country stories of the development of the Sociology of Work across the 11 European cases, we present in summary the core features of the sub-discipline.

Box 1: SoW in the UK

The core features of the Sociology of Work in the UK

This contribution from the United Kingdom makes four significant claims. First, it offers a sociology of the sociology work, exploring the power bases and the social and economic structures that have shaped the discipline and led to a relative neglect of disadvantaged workers and their misrepresentation in the sociological canon. It is not that the latter have been ignored so much as that the dominant accounts of their 'place' derive from the bias of dominant discourses. Second, and relatedly, it challenges the view that the 1950s and 1960s heralded a 'golden age' of sociology of work: specifically, the chapter finds it problematic that during this era such great emphasis was frequently placed on analyses of the paid workplace environment. Third, we challenge the notion that the sociology of work is necessarily at its most vital when it is embedded in Sociology Departments and that the '*spread*' of the study of work into management and business schools was at best a distraction and at worst a degradation of the sub-discipline. Last, we reiterate the need for a focus on the role that work and employment, its nature and absence, plays in the reproduction of social inequalities, in particular in relation to social class.

The sociology of work in the UK from the end of World War II, until the mid-1960s, was primarily centred on male, manual, manufacturing employment, with an interest in the nature and form of the management of that work. This was reflected in the use of the term "sociology of industry" to describe the activities of sociologists studying employment but the descriptor remained uncertain well into the late 1960s, 70s and early 80s and, arguably,

continues to remain uncertain. Driving research in the first period were concerns over productivity, particularly with reference to what became known as 'shop floor culture'. While there are a range of texts such as *The Management of Innovation*, by Burns and Stalker (1961) and Woodward *Management and Technology* (HMSO 1958), the exemplary publications from this period are those by Trist and Bamforth, *Some Social and Psychological Consequences of the Longwall Method of Coal-Getting* (1951); Dennis, Henriques and Slaughter *Coal is our Life* (1956); Lockwood, *The Blackcoated Worker* (1958); Beynon, *Working For Ford* (1973).

The period between 1975 and the 1990s saw a major shift in the focus of sociology in the UK, away from the male manual worker toward a sociological inquiry into female employment and unpaid labour in the home. Much of this literature, now seen a classic texts, is valid today as it explores the degradation of work and the complex relationships between differing forms of social inequality. Pollert's, *Girls, Wives, Factory Lives* (1981): Cavendish, *Women on the Line* (1982); and Westwood, *All Day Everyday: Factory and Family in the Making of women's lives* (1984). Significantly, in the previous decade Oakley's *Housewife* (1974) finally shifted the emphasis of the discipline away from the study of the workplace and paid employment.

The period between 1990 and into the 2000s saw a return to the workplace in light of the emergence of neoliberal work forms as well as an examination of the consequences of unemployment, particularly for young people in areas suffering from the deleterious effects of 'post-industrialism'. Exemplary texts in this area would be, Bradley, Erickson, Stephenson and Williams; MacDonald and Coffield *Risky Business*; *Youth and the Youth and the Enterprise Culture* (1991); MacDonald, Shildrick, Webster, and Simpson (2005) *Growing up in poor neighbourhoods: the significance of class and place in the extended transitions of 'socially excluded' young adults*; MacDonald, Shildrick and Furlong *In search of 'intergenerational cultures of worklessness': Hunting the Yeti and shooting zombies* (2014).

The chapter concludes with the argument that the sociology of work must continue to focus on the reproduction of social class and other forms of inequality and consequently must engage with the nature of the neoliberal workplace and the fragile and intermittent work experienced now by millions of people. In so doing, the sociology of work would return at least to part of the core mission of a range of progenitors of the discipline itself.

The SoW in the UK has been influenced by US sociology of work in myriad ways from the start including prior to 1945. Institutionally, US influence was most evident in the support given sociologists by the British government between 1949 and 1952, financed by the Marshall Plan (the Anglo-American Productivity Council) to travel to the US to study post-war labour productivity in the hope of addressing the so-called British productivity problem. US influence continued in more obvious intellectual forms as a result of the impact of Braverman's work but the role of various readings of French critical social theory, notably Foucault, have also impacted the study of work and employment. The diversity of understanding of what is meant by the SoW is reflected the wide range of places for Sociologists of Work to publish.

Box 2: SoW in France

The core features of the Sociology of Work in France

The chapter ties France's socio-economic history to the paradigm shifts characterising the Sociology of Work. It is worth recalling that France has been a pioneer in this sub-discipline.

During its gestation phase (1945–1975), the Sociology of Work was nurtured by Georges Friedmann (and Pierre Naville), operating in an environment defined by post-war national reconstruction. The French state at the time, influenced by the country's Gaullist and Communist parties, sought to increase the productivity of labour, inspired in part by the "scientific organisation of work", an American import that had failed to take root in France before World War II. The newly reborn world of French academia was dominated by the precepts of social Catholicism, the hope being that this might lead to the re-emergence of peaceful professional relationships. It was in era when the Sociology of Work began to analyse what were perceived to be the causes to labour obstacles in the production process, a concern largely influenced by American social psychology. The latter's research methods were typically based on quantitative and empirical analysis. Notwithstanding the efforts of Pierre Naville, the workers' movement in its various guises (and Marxism) had little effect on the discipline's renaissance.

The second phase (1975–1990) coincided with a major crisis of capitalism spelling the end of France's 30 years of post-war growth. For the Sociology of Work, this made the crisis of simple labour a prime topic for analysis, with focus now shifting to industrial and office worker absenteeism, the proliferation of strikes and quality problems. Even so, the sociological analyses marking this era remained very descriptive, with the French translation of Braverman's seminal text failing in its quest to embed paradigms offering a radical critique of capitalism. The French Left's electoral success in 1981 did, however, revive the sociology of work by supporting initiatives associated with certain major social transformations occurring in the country's corporate sphere. This led to the emergence of a sociology of companies that tried to make business the key driver for all societal change relating to social development and individual fulfilment. Alongside this, sociology began to professionalise (business experts, competition for research contracts, etc.), creating an environment in which it became difficult for sociologists criticising work to receive an airing.

A third phase (1990–2015) saw the rise of the lean production model, although in France, by contrast with the UK and the US, it took some time for the world of work to fully comprehend the extent of the transformations taking place. This meant that the Sociology of Work tended to be somewhat less critical than it might have been. It was only in the 1980s after witnessing a wave of suicides and other aspects of work place stress that sociologists began to produce more critical research of work place pathologies. Yet, many of these studies were more of an attempt to observe reality than to remedy the causes of all the new social problems. Sociologists divided between two paradigms: one attentive to industrial activities and the shift towards service relationships (nurturing a sociology focused on individuals), while sociologists' linked with the Regulation School sought more systemic analyses associated with Marxism.

From the early 1990s onwards, the sociology of work diversified, fragmented and experienced several paradigmatic shifts. Irrespective of the objects of study, the dominant paradigms (uncertainty, conventionalism or interactionism, etc.) would continue to have theoretical and political affinities with liberalism, even if they denied this. Developed in opposition to critical sociology—deemed to be overly deterministic, over-arching and politicised—the dominant paradigms would be carried forward by socially and institutionally situated sociologists who, behind their expressed desire to renew theoretical frameworks, in reality were working against any movement seeking social transformation, thereby contributing to the maintenance of the existing social order.

Box 3: SoW in Germany

The core features of the Sociology of Work in Germany

Sociology of work in Germany adopted the label of "industrial sociology" as a particularly influential sub-discipline of Sociology in West Germany at the end of World War II. It divided into three sub-periods: the Fordist (1949–1975), the transformation (1975–1990) and the globalisation (1990–2015) periods, the latter marked by national (re-)unification. Industrial Sociology in Germany implies a broader scope than Sociology of Work or Industrial Relations in Latin and Anglophone countries. The main focus is on how industrial work shapes modern industrial men and women and contemporary industrial society.

The first period (1949–1975) is characterised by the context of the re-foundation of sociology after the liberation of the country from Nazi-dictatorship at the end of World War II. Sociology of Work, in terms of empirical studies on work organisation, technological rationalisation and workers' consciousness were at the centre. In Germany, Industrial Sociology was conceived as an approach to understanding the complex interaction of industrial work and societal institutions in modern capitalism. In this regard, the firm is perceived as a public affair, a constitutional social community, wherein workers receive their democratic rights and the owner has to fulfil a set of social duties.

The recovery of Marxist theory helped to overcome the traditional theoretical deficit of a phenomenological sociology which had developed its main concepts by inductive observation. Important studies on trade unions (Bergmann et al. 1975) and workers' consciousness (Kern and Schumann 1970) sought to feed the thesis of a new militancy against capital with empirical research. Marx's concept of the real subsumption of labour under capital in advanced capitalist production was linked with Max Weber's concept of bureaucratic rationalisation and Joseph Schumpeter's idea of the self-destruction of capitalism through the substitution of entrepreneurs by large industry administrations.

The second period (1975–1990) is characterised by the sudden end of the "dream of everlasting prosperity" (Lutz 1984), the crisis of the Fordist

accumulation model and the end of the "normal" employment relationship. The fragmentation of work and employment is also felt in Industrial Sociology. The social democratic government fostered a huge research programme on the "Humanisation of Work" advocated by trade unions, which was similar to programmes in other countries (Quality of Work Life Movement).

Three primary trends may be identified as shaping the sociology of work in Germany in the 1970s and 1980s. First, international and inter-sectoral comparative analyses led to an institutionalist shift focusing on the institutional settings and complementarities in the specific national and sectoral articulations of industrial order. The second trend was more focused on the organisation of firms and production, using notions such as "new production concepts" or "lean production" and a "second industrial divide" (Piore and Sabel 1984). The third trend referred to the retreat of traditional manufacturing replaced by growing service sectors and activities.

The third period (1990–2015) of an accelerated globalisation under neo-liberal dominance coincided in Germany with the (re-)unification process. Increased international competition, flexibilisation and deregulation of financial and labour markets and the TIC revolution (Technologies of Information and Communication) met with the specific German model of organised capitalism, or coordinated market economy.

Under the label of "integrated production systems", the current debate in Germany attempts to bundle a wide range of organisational concepts. If there is a general trend in the huge variety of empirical studies and theoretical efforts to make sense of the current volatility and variety, it is to understand the extended conquest of the whole person for the production of economic value. The central idea of real subsumption of work under capital (Marx), widely abandoned in the 1980s in German industrial sociology, might be more relevant than ever.

Box 4: SoW in Italy

The core features of the Sociology of Work in Italy

The specific features of the historical evolution of the sociology of work in Italy are strongly embedded nationally. The phases, the progress and even the decline in the evolution of the Sociology of Work reflected the impact of national history, political influence and the changing demands of a range of national social actors. The result reflects the combined dynamics of sociology's internal agenda and societal changes: (1) analysis of the labour process in Taylorist and/or Post-Taylorist industry as a process of work degradation; (2) sociology of labour markets and employment, and the analysis of bargaining processes including an interpretation of rules, identities and the value of work; (3) reconciliation of work and labour in organisations; and (4) reconciliation of work and family and cultural studies, including gender. These aspects represent the major fields across which the Sociology of Work developed in Italy after the war and thus represents its scientific boundaries.

What contributed to hold the sociology of work together in Italy in the post war period, as a coherent intellectual field, was as much the methods of enquiry and its topic areas. These cover diverse levels of analysis. In so doing, the Sociology of Work survived contemporary global challenges. On the one hand, methodologically, process approaches helped to overcome cross-sectional investigation. On the other hand, in theoretical terms, the social understanding of work has required the inclusion of social phenomena which traditionally have been understood as being external to immediate work settings. As a result, internal borderlines have needed to be transcended within the discipline. Thus, for example, to understand social identities and the benefit of work, it is important to consider work, organisation, education, industrial relations, domestic life and gender. Moreover, the topics covered by Italian Sociology of Work are sometimes shared with other sociologists (and non-sociologists) and within other sub-disciplines. Thus, inter-disciplinarity emerges as another illuminating and crucial factor of Italy's sociology of work. Inter-disciplinarity here is conceived in a broad sense. It is the process through which sociologists of work discuss with other non-sociologists (e.g. labour historians, labour political scientists, labour economists, economic geographers, industrial anthropologists). As such, inter-disciplinarity cannot exclude cross and intra-boundary activity. Enrichment as a result of synergies across and within the different disciplines have been fostered. In this light SoW in Italy has had the potential to widen its focus, so that the issues covered by labour sociology become increasingly more inter-disciplinary and comparative. It is important to emphasise that these are crucial points, promising changes for the future of the SoW, and particularly helping the sub-discipline in Italy to overcome challenges from the outside world as well as shaping its distinctiveness and intellectual property.

Box 5: SoW in Spain

The core features of the Sociology of Work in Spain

The professionalisation of the Spanish tradition of sociology in relation to work has been the subject of debates and interventions largely external to the functioning of the academy over time, even though the formal boundaries of the study of the sociology of work are relatively clear. Spain has experienced a series of profound political and social changes during and since the 1940s. The right-wing authoritarian Francoist regime from the late 1930s through to the 1970s not only framed the formal study of work and employment but also limited sociological approaches, preferring to focus on more legalistic—and constrained—approaches to the subject. However, during this period there was a curious development of certain managerialist, organisational and occupational psychological perspectives within the regime and its institutional allies (Rodríguez Ruiz 2014). This more individualised managerial space was able to be tolerated within the regime as it linked to certain production and developmental concerns of the state at that time. New constituencies of technocrats within the state were able to create certain spaces for the discussion of work but with a low sociological contribution due to the political context. Some

independent aspects of the study of work emerged and counterpoints within the academy, left networks and overseas universities as well as state bodies such as the ILO contributed materials and approaches.

The 1970s transition to a liberal democracy and the first 10–15 years of the new constitutional monarchy, saw debates emerge between different schools of thought—especially between a Marxist and leftist tradition, on the one hand, and a more functionalist and analytically oriented sociology mapping the so-called "real" interests and attitudes of workers, on the other. While the debate developed into an interest in employment regulation and the growing influence of American/Anglo-Saxon ideas of labour and workplace relations, there was also an emerging labour market studies of a sociological nature regarding the extremely dualist and fragmented labour market: producing a range of sociological studies of the labour market and employment experience. There were a range of private foundations linked to sectors such as banking and building societies and others that worked alongside the nascent state and had a role in terms of the study of sociology in Spain. Working conditions within the public university steadily provided more space for independent research but there have been various parallel bodies engaging with a more functionalist perspective as well. The role of trade unions and their research foundations allowed for an alternative to these highly resourced initiatives.

The past 15 or so years have seen the emergence of a new set of critical engagements with the concept of precariousness—and the 'other'—in the study of work. Questions of youth and age generally, gender and migration, have become a more systematic focus of study. However, the Europeanisation of the Spanish academy, intellectually, and links with the European Union have increased the prominence of these interests within the framework of comparative and cross-national studies, albeit financed by the state (especially the European state system) and positioned with a more formal policy narrative. Spanish sociologists have been central to the development of greater clarity and critical insight into the nature or precarious work and labour market fragmentation/marginalisation. The ongoing professionalisation of sociology through leading large scale national conferences and key journals has created a more empirical and inter-related tradition in international terms. Nevertheless, ongoing Americanisation with the emergence of neoliberal-oriented management studies and a more quantitative analytical approach has led to fragmentation in employment studies and a lack of dialogue between sociologists (and within aspects of sociology), law, economics and management. This has been compounded by the impact of post 2008 austerity measures and, ironically, the precariousness of new generations of academics themselves. This economic context, coupled with the role of social hierarchies within the Spanish academy, has led to greater emigration of academics and an enhanced degree of critical research around alternative quasi-academic spaces.

Box 6: SoW in Sweden

The core features of the Sociology of Work in Sweden

Sociology of work has been a central subfield of Swedish sociology ever since this subject became a university discipline about 70 years ago, which was late by international comparison. Already, from the beginning work-related research was at the centre, typical topics being attitudes to work, worker adaptation, job satisfaction, formal and informal work groups and information in the workplace. It was common to have a consensus perspective on workplace relations. Theoretical inspiration primarily came from American sociology and social psychology, including the Human Relations approach. Also in connection with empirical investigations, models were taken from American studies. From the beginning, Swedish sociology of work had an emphasis on empirical research, but the number of researchers was limited.

The interest in sociology increased among students as well as more generally in society in the 1960s and early 1970s. With larger numbers of students, the departments expanded by recruiting more teachers and researchers. In the mid-1960s the dominant paradigm of sociology of work began to be questioned. During the most intense phase, in principle everything that could be re-evaluated was re-evaluated. New theoretical perspectives—especially conflict and power-oriented approaches such as various versions of Marxism—made their way into the field. In the course of questioning and reevaluation, the discipline itself became more conflict-ridden. Another development was that many researchers approached trade unions, partly distancing themselves from employers. Sociology of Work became more oriented toward class struggle issues: improving physical working environments, fighting the monotony of jobs, increasing employment security, developing codetermination in the workplace, etc. In the 1970s the Swedish labour movement carried out several important labour market reforms and made funding available for evaluations and research. The Swedish Center for Working Life, later replaced by the National Institute for Working Life (NIWL), was established. It is unclear when the radical wave ebbed away, but it was no doubt over by the mid or perhaps late 1980s.

For many years, the period of reorientation left its imprint on the SoW, but gradually things began to change. Academic criteria were strengthened and differentiation and specialisation continued. Reaching out to an international audience and readership, through international peer-review journals and publishing houses, became imperative. In the mid-1980s neoliberal ideology started to gain considerable ground in Sweden. Some sociologists may have become less eager in their ambitions to contribute to improvements in working life than during the foregoing phase, but most of them kept much of their older orientations and attachments. They hardly became neoliberals, although they lived in a neoliberal epoch. It was common to remain within the paradigms one had taken on board during one's academic training, but we find a more relaxed relationship to Marxism that merely became one theory among others to provide inspiration. Still, with the liberalisation of society and economy in Sweden sociologists faced certain new topics concerning, for example, flexibility, temporary work agencies and large inflows of immigrants into the labour market. There was a renewed interest in attitudes to work and job satisfaction as well. Several journals are available for publishing articles such as *Arbetsmarknad & Arbetsliv* and *Nordic Journal of Working Life Studies.* After the closure of the NIWL in 2007, working life researchers formed an informal network that organises annual conferences.

Box 7: SoW in Finland

The core features of the Sociology of Work in Finland

The sociology of work in Finland has consolidated its position within a broader analytical and empirical framework of "working life research". Although the field of working life studies involves many disciplines in Finland, such as management, organisation, labour economics and psychology studies, there has been a strong sociological emphasis cultivated in working life research. Besides the positivist undercurrent in the 1960s and 1970s, and the Marxist orientation in the 1970s and 1980s, the dominant tone in the sociology of work in Finland since the 1970s has been reformist. The latter current manifests itself as focusing on consensual topics and approaches in working life studies, most apparent in action research. At the same time, recent decades have also witnessed an inflow of a greater variety of topics and methods in the sociology of work. For example, studies on gender at work, research inspired by the labour process debate and inquiries into the precariat have in recent years introduced a more critical undertone in the Finnish sociology of work.

In general, global tendencies in the organisation of work—the shift from Fordist to post-Fordist patterns as well as from state regulation towards global market and neoliberalist hegemonies—have guided the selection of research topics. The great turn in public discourse and policy-making in Finland, the transition from the consolidation of the welfare state of the 1980s to the promotion of the competition state of the 1990s, coincided closely with the collapse of state socialism in the Soviet Union and Central and Eastern Europe. One might well argue that with the collapse of the Eastern Bloc unitarist ideas underlying social relations have become more manifest.

The professionalisation of the sociology of work in Finland has occurred within the framework of working life research. Many sociologists of work participate in both annual national sociology and working life research conferences. Both state-administered funds and funds jointly administered by labour market parties have been important sources of research funding for sociological studies on work in Finland. Along with these, new sources of funding have also become available for researchers in recent years with Finland's EU membership, which has in part increased researchers' independence from national-level policy-makers and research administrators.

Box 8: SoW in Poland

The core features of the Sociology of Work in Poland

The Sociology of Work in Poland traditionally focused on the social character, process and consequences of human work (Sztumski 1999, p. 15; Januszek and Sikora 1998, p. 8). It was mostly connected with the research on workplaces and originally it was strongly linked to the practice of plant sociologists (Jędrzycki 1971). This original interest was strongly rooted in the managerial-psychological tradition of the US school of human relations which inspired early soci-

ologists of work in Poland, such as, for instance Aleksander Matejko, Adam Sarapata and Kazimierz Doktór. However, the focus of the sociology of work has shifted over time, in particular in 1990s and 2000s to the analysis of other areas of productive and reproductive work, such as labour markets, informal work, migration, paid and unpaid care work, as well as actions, interactions and subjective meanings of work. The disciplinary identity of contemporary sociology of work in Poland is rather weak and its realm of interests overlap with other disciplines, such as, for example, management studies, organisation studies, migration studies, psychology of work and the anthropology of work, and sub-disciplines of sociology, in particular the sociology of organisation and economic sociology. Two criteria seem to be crucial when describing research as contributing to the sociology of work: (1) the reference to the mid-range and general sociological theories by researchers; and (2) the self-identification of researchers as Sociologists of Work as a result of their education or institutional affiliation to sociological institutes or departments. The state played a very important role in the development of sociology of work in the state socialist period, not only due to financing research on "nodal problems" connected with industrialisation and support for the plant-sociologists movement in state enterprises, but also because of the censorship of research which contradicted the ideal of successful socialist modernisation. The political and economic changes after 1989 resulted in, on the one hand, the retreat of structural financing of sociological research on work and, on the other hand, greater diversification of research practice funded from rather limited statutory funds at public universities. Funding nevertheless increased due to participation in European Union, international and national projects. The main form of the institutionalisation of the sub-discipline is the Sociology of Work Section of the Polish Sociological Association, established in the 1960s and with the participation, in 2016, of 110 members from around Poland. Since 2014, the Section has organised a thematic international conference, "Social Boundaries of Work". There is also the recently established Aleksander Matejko Prize for the best Ph.D. thesis in the Sociology of Work awarded by the Polish Sociological Association. The oldest Sociology of Work journal is "Humanizacja pracy" (Humanisation of Work), while sociological perspectives on work are also promoted in English in the journal, *Warsaw Forum of Economic Sociology*.

Box 9: SoW in Hungary

The core features of the Sociology of Work in Hungary

The concise history of sociology of labour in Hungary after 1945 can be divided into two major chapters: the one which emerged during state socialism and explained labour control and the formation of the working class in a bureaucratic regime of production, and the other one which examines labour in the postsocialist transformations after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989.

The first stage emerged along the reestablishment of sociology in Hungarian academia in the 1960s and lasted until the end of state socialism in 1989. Labour-related inquiries examined labour relations at the workplace,

the social and economic status of work, and the actual lives of workers in the existing socialism. These inquiries started to challenge the ideological tenets of the party-state regime, in particular its visions of an empowered and homogenous working class. Leading scholars investigated the composition and living conditions of industrial workers, socio-economic inequalities and stratification among them, and explored the bargaining power and practices of workers against management within state socialist plants. These *critical* inquiries unveiled the often hierarchical, exploitative, and unequal relations within the state socialist industrial structures. It is important to note that labour studies coexisted with a wider field of economic sociology which examined the peculiar Hungarian economic system of late socialism imbued with experiments in market coordination and exchange in organising production and labour reproduction.

In the second stage of the observed sociological scholarship on labour, the meaning of *critical* has become multiple. A group of scholars has begun to monitor post-socialist capitalist transition in Hungary and Central and Eastern Europe from within the standards of democratic capitalist models. They have ventured to examine the impact of global capitalism and its direct and indirect effects on the status of labour in post-socialist settings. The collective representation of labour and the role of labour unions in new labour-capital relationships have become important research themes. A distinctive chapter in the Hungarian labour literature has started to explore the transformations of labour relations through the renewed concept of class and class struggles. Finally, a robust scholarship has been produced on the formations of vulnerabilities within and outside wage labour along ethnicity, migration, gender, and urban and rural divides. The transnational exchange of thoughts and research collaboration already shaped scholarship in the 1980s. Engagement in comparative, mostly but not exclusively European collaboration, has become important since 1989.

Although the literature and several chapters in this book separate scholarship before and after 2010, this dividing line seems less relevant in the Hungarian context. Institutional, political and social reactions to financialisation and neoliberalisation preceded the 2008 crisis or at any rate cannot be sharply detached from struggles related to the accumulating setbacks and tensions emerging in various domains of economy and society in Hungary in the 2000s.

It is noteworthy that growing alliances and common intellectual platforms operate that connect a new generation of scholars sharing a pronounced interest in critiquing global capitalism and its current configurations in Central and Eastern Europe by exploring experiences of domination, exploitation and dispossession.

Box 10: SoW in Bulgaria

The core features of the Sociology of Work in Bulgaria

Sociology in Bulgaria emerged at the end of nineteenth century, but until the Second World War most of its manifestations were rather sporadic, especially concerning the world of work. After the Second World War the communist regime declared that sociology is a "bourgeois" science and all teaching and research activities were forbidden in the late 1940s and 1950s. In the 1960s sociology was "rehabilitated" and work related research began to develop.

Since the end of the 1960s the Sociology of Work was institutionalised within the newly created research institutes and factory based sociologists of work became active in the 1980s. The role of the state was crucial in the socialist period as the state was the only actor that could validate or prohibit the development of scientific disciplines and mobilise institutional resources.

After the fall of communism interest in the Sociology of Work declined, while research on the new political system, the emerging civil society, entrepreneurship, the minorities, on poverty, and so on took off. After 1989 the role of the state decreased, as a multitude of other actors entered the field. However, the state still has an important function: accrediting sociological programmes, providing subsidies, while limited, for university training and scientific research. Since 1989, the professional group of sociologists of work has remained relatively small. A number of researchers are more or less integrated into a range of international networks. Very often, researchers carry out studies within the SoW, but in parallel with other sub-disciplines such as economic sociology, industrial relations, HRM, gender studies, sociology of professions. Since the 1990s, and especially following Bulgaria's accession to the EU, the European Union has been a powerful actor in the development of scientific disciplines as a result of research funding. This has provided financial support for large projects, networks, individual grants, university curricula development and last, but not least, research agendas and priorities, set in the national programming documents. The role of the USA in direct terms is limited, but indirectly the development of the discipline is stimulated by theoretical contributions and bilateral exchanges. Work-related research has developed mostly in the context of foreign donors (EU, bilateral co-operation) imposing their research agenda. The main focus of research in the last two decades has been on privatisation; new forms of organisation and human resource management; the informal economy; and post-communist industrial relations. In terms of methods utilised, the period since 1989 also witnessed a plurality of approaches. In parallel to sociological surveys, qualitative methods are used by sociologists of work: interviews, and case study research.

Box 11: SoW in Romania

The core features of the Sociology of Work in Romania

Beyond the repression and hardship that followed the socialist takeover in Romania there is a discernible pattern of rational societal re-organisation that had urbanisation and industry at its core. The rearrangements of work and work relations were subsumed to these two goals of modernisation. Consequently, it had been all but impossible to identify a sub-discipline of Sociology of Work at any moment after 1945. Nonetheless, questions concerned with work were abundant in the agenda of sociologists planning the reconstruction of Romania's economy and society. Matters and methodologies pertaining to the Sociology of Work were researched and discussed in the broader fields of urban and industrial sociology, whenever the discipline was named and institutionalised.

Over the last seven decades, the discipline of sociology found recognition and institutional support for only half of this period. Departments and institutes of sociology functioned in the country from 1965 to 1977 and were re-established in the early 1990s. The exclusion of sociology in early and late socialism, and the distinctive anti-communist key in which it was refashioned during post-socialism, has undoubtedly contributed to render invisible many of the contributions of its practitioners. Foreign researchers could hardly identify sociological research as distinctively sociological, since domestic sociologists were rarely identifying themselves as such and were often holding office in the hierarchy of the party-state system. A survey of the available literature immediately conveys this point. Even the most astute and sophisticated researchers took their cues from Hungarian economists and sociologists, who enjoyed a diverging historical trajectory, rather than from their Romanian counterparts, when explaining work-related phenomena in the latter country.

The analysis of actually existing socialism has been conducted at the subnational level, since much of the everyday economics unfolded at the level of the regions which formed around the emerging cities. Messy local interests, practices and experiences were brought together through the mediation and articulation of industrial and agricultural chains of production in major urban centres. The urban-rural chains of production were turned into a policy tool as early as the 1950s and gained a renewed momentum during the1970s. Finding the adequate scale to place economic policies was a socialist developmental conundrum and favouring the subnational had its own history. It is at this point that sociologists came most forcefully into play.

Sociology was a key discipline in producing relevant knowledge for managing and reimagining socialist economic development in Romania, both before and after 1989. The "urban area" formed the analytical backbone of the country's urbanisation and industrialisation. This was the main device that tied economic growth to the subnational level and allowed planners to regulate the economy as a set of interconnected production chains. Sociologists fostered organisational innovation by devising techniques for improved economic coordination and leadership while examining the ways in which this led to a severe de-professionalisation of the discipline. The 1990s witnessed the re-institutionalisation of sociology as a discipline concerned with interpreting the contours of the momentous transformations experienced by labour in the new post-socialist economy.

By the Editors & the Authors

Index

Note: 'n' following a page number indicates the reference is to a footnote