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Introduction
All around the world the same organisational trends and production philosophies have a substantial impact. One such major trend is lean production. The concept is not only a way of organising production but it also includes a production philosophy with its root in Japanese society and working life (Krafcik, 1988; Womack et al., 1990). There are different interpretations of the lean concept but it usually contains aspects such as standardized production, line work, small buffers and continuous improvements. In Sweden however, another organisational trend has been strongly rooted since the 1960-70’s, that is socio-technically inspired production models with a very different way of organising with its focus on enriched work, increased autonomy, participation and authority for operators as regards decision making and work performance (Sandberg, 1995; Engström et al 1996; Néepe & Molleman 1998; Oudhuis 2004a; Oudhuis 2004b). As shown by Engström et al. (2004) and others (Berggren, 1992; Berggren 1994; Börnfelt 2006) these production models have in many ways proved successful with greatly increased working conditions for operators as well as an increase in productivity.

However, also in Sweden the impact of lean inspired production models have successively become more influential and companies are to a great extent involved in changing the way production is carried out. The reasons for these changeovers are multifaceted. Sometimes the changes are due to Swedish companies being taken over by foreign companies, sometimes company leaders don’t want to be seen as slow and unwilling to test new organisational models or leadership styles or whatever is fashionable at the time; whether proven successful or not (Björkman 2003; Rövik 2000). Other reasons have to do with the belief that lean
production models will lead to increased efficiency and quality. However, yet another cause might have to do with work organisation differences related to the two models described above, i.e. differences as regards operators’ autonomy and authority. This is at the fore in this study.

The purpose of the article is to understand the reasons for a changeover from a socio-technically inspired station assembly production model to a lean inspired model at a Swedish manufacturing plant. The main focus is on stated reasons for the changes but also and foremost on consequences for and reactions from operators in connection with performed changes.

**Theoretical background**

Theories on worker collective, self-organization and organizational misbehaviour are the main theoretical points of departure. Starting with Lysgaard (1971) the function of a worker collective has to do with its purpose of being a buffer between human needs and the technical-economical system. As a buffer the worker collective is developing rules and norms as to how to act and behave, for example how to be a good co-worker, but it’s purpose is also to protect the individual and collective and to plead the collective’s cause. This is done through making sure workers adopt a common and shared interest instead of asserting one’s own interest or act in a way that gives management a possibility to divide the counter power that has been built up. The prerequisites for a worker collective to arise are threefold: 1) to be close to one another, 2) to experience a certain situation similarity, and 3) to adopt shared problem awareness. These findings are verified by Mayo (1945), Blumberg (1971), Roethlisberger & Dickson (1964) as well as by Edwards et al (1995) and Houghton & Yoho (2005).

Another useful concept is self-organization, defined by Ackroyd and Thompson (1999:54) as “the tendency of groups to form interests and establish identities and to develop autonomy based on these activities”. Self-organization is thus an umbrella term identifying collective actions aiming at establishing or maintaining control over work. Common informal norms are developed through self-organization, which are setting the rules for which inward and outward actions should be regarded suitable and which should not. The aim of all processes and work efforts involved in self-organization has to do with establishing autonomy in relation to ones superiors. According to Ackroyd and Thompson (1999) misbehaviour emanates from four different aspects: work, time, product and identity. The fight between
management and employees thus circle around these four aspects, but also includes the extent to which employees identify with the organisation and with management. As regards work, management tries to control work content, the amount of work that should be done, and how work should be performed. This is achieved through job descriptions, line work and so forth. The employees in turn try to achieve as much autonomy as possible, trying to control those very same aspects.

If the autonomy of the worker collective is perceived as threatened, actions such as resistance or misbehavior are common answers. Misbehaviour is then defined as “anything you do at work you are not supposed to” (Sprouse, 1992 in Ackroyd & Thompson, 1999). Even though misbehaviour or resistance might occur due to changes taking place at the workplace, employees do not necessarily resist change in itself, but rather what the change might lead to as regards status, economy or working conditions (Dent & Goldberg, 1999). Furthermore, dissatisfaction with the situation at work can lead to structural resistance involving survival strategies as a way to create space and autonomy from an otherwise controlled and governed existence (Edwards et al, 1995). These strategies are often associated with power and control. Power and control are here to be understood as “the ability of managers to obtain desired work behaviour from workers” (Edwards, 1979:17). Such a power relation is manifested as ‘structured antagonism’ (Buroway, 1979; Edwards, 1979), where the core conflict has to do with management and workers competing for control over the work process.

**Methodology**

This study builds on interviews with management on different levels, such as the plant manager, the manager for production engineering, production line leaders and representatives for the local labour union. However, indirectly it also builds on observations, on formal and informal meetings with management as well as with union representatives and other employees at the plant. Besides, the study as a whole also includes an employee survey, i.e. both blue and white collar workers and schematised layouts of the production system itself. Still, this specific paper primarily draws on interviews conducted with above mentioned managers and a labour union representative.
The case study description is built on respondents’ statements on how they have experienced the situation at the company including their view on the implementation and change process. The text is presented in a storytelling form.

First, a background is given as to the former production model and work organisation including the process that led to the change of production model. The next section contains the interviewees’ stated reasons for the change followed by sections that comprise reactions to and consequences of the change of work organisation and production model. Finally, in the the result is discussed in relation to above theoretical perspectives.

The manufacturing company – background

The manufacturing company is since 2005 part of a foreign owned global combine. The number of employees is currently around 300. The company has undergone some rather extensive changes during the last five to six years, due to a still ongoing implementation of a lean inspired production model. That is to say, there has been a process from a station assembly production model to a specific interpretation of an established Japanese manufacturing praxis, which has been applied and refined further\(^1\). Apart from practicing a set of commonly known tools associated with lean production, work organisation has been reformed in a number of different ways as will be evident below.

In order to understand the context within which the changes have taken place and the reasons for the changes in question a background picture is given, starting with the situation at the end of the 1990’s.

At that period in time a major change of the shop floor work organisation was carried out. Previously, the shop floor work was more or less totally individualised. That is, each operator was in most respects minding his own business while building his own product\(^2\), which at times required a whole week’s work, depending on the size of the product. There were three main product segments from bigger to smaller machines. The production department was headed by a production manager. Each production segment in turn comprised production and

---

\(^1\) The process of change is still going on, which means that station assembly still exists as regards heavy products. In order to get the whole change process moving, management decided to start with the smallest products when switching to line production. The change of work organisation however includes all operators.

\(^2\) Since most operators are men they will in this case be referred to as ‘he’.
construction for each product segment and were in accordance headed by three different production line managers. In fact one could say that there were three production departments and three construction departments. This organisational model was thus in use during the years 2000-2005.

During the five years this work organisation model was in use, teams were brought in and a particular sort of group work was introduced. This was done even though the same production system, featuring individualised work in the sense of building complete products, remained. This new organisation thus comprised both individual and collective work and responsibilities along the praxis at hand in many Swedish manufacturing plants during the period of time now discussed.

Hence, operators were given different roles and responsibilities for tasks such as co-ordination, planning and quality along socio-technical lines while being told that these were things they were to decide about. Tasks were also delegated from the purchasing department. Moreover, a competence matrix was handed over to the teams with the challenge to fill them up making sure there would always be a number of persons available to do what needed to be done. According to the production engineering manager “some of the operators went for it and became truly skilled”. Moreover, team leaders were introduced, however not as part of management but as part of the teams, which was strongly against the will of the production engineering manager. The former production manager however had simply refused due to economical reasons, it would be too expensive, he argued. This would prove a fatal mistake.

After some initial turbulence the new team work organisation turned out very successful as regards both efficiency and profitability. Many team members showed great enthusiasm and were highly motivated and as the production engineering manager declared:

As a result there was a tremendous increase of efficiency as well as delivery security and everything really; including quality. And without changing the way production was carried out, nothing like that, it all had to do with increased motivation.

Moreover, this new work organisation meant that constructors and operators were working very tightly together. Also customer adjustments on products were delegated to these joint
teams of constructors and operators. That meant according to the production engineering manager that “we felt we owned the product in a different way”. Besides, according to the interviewees operators were not only given a chance to make career through bringing in administrative tasks but it also created a better work environment. At the same time the teams successively grew stronger and more autonomous, setting up their own informal rules distancing themselves from management during the process. The strongest team members, those building the heaviest products, took charge of the process towards independence, autonomy and self regulation (cf Hodson, 1995).

The big improvements as regards profitability and efficiency however levelled off after a few years and therefore management, with the new plant manager as a driving force, started to discuss a change of production model.

In 2005 these discussions successively led to the changeover to a lean inspired production model as well as to a new work organisation, which included the introduction of production leaders as an extra level between production line managers and operators. It also included a more centralised organisation, consisting of but one production department, one construction department, one purchasing department, and so forth. This organisation was set in September 2005.

All in all these changes of work organisation meant that delegated tasks gradually were taken back from the operators, creating a less full work content, less responsibilities, authority and autonomy and in that very same process ultimately a loss of power for the operators.

The new Japanese lean inspired production system in turn contains four different product segments. Two of these product segments are made up as serial product flows in the form of short assembly lines (7 – 11 workstations in series with one operator per product) with work cycle times of 30 to 45 minutes. Most operators are positioned within a distance of eye contact of each other. The other two product segments are still produced in so called parallel product flows where up to four working days at times are needed to assemble the products in question. Eventually all products will be assembled in assembly lines.

The new production system has continually been developed and refined. One such development has meant that all truck drivers today have been brought together in one department,
serving all lines. In that way, the production manager argues, production is less vulnerable; if one truck driver is sick the others take over, making sure everyone gets his or her material instead of one of the operators having to fill in as a truck driver. Another change is that very little material will be placed beside the lines; instead it will be delivered just-in-time from a centralised stock department.

Why these changes?

Why change the production system and work organisation? The plant manager gave different explanations. One reason, he argued, was the need to increase productivity in the face of globalisation and the risk of losing production to other countries. In order to be more efficient and thereby keep production in Sweden the plant manager aimed at a lean inspired production model that was “more of setting a standardised working method” and to bring about order and neatness. This aimed for model meant a change to line work, a change he felt was absolutely necessary to fulfil above demands, i.e. increased productivity and efficiency. Those were also the arguments put forward to union leaders and employees.

The need for bringing in standardised worksheets also had to do with creating a less vulnerable production system. Since each operator was responsible for building a whole machine himself, at times using days, the vulnerability became apparent at absences and sick-leaves:

How do we know what he has done and what he hasn’t done?
If he has worked on it for eight and a half hours and maybe he has built it in a different order than his colleague. How will he know where to start, what to do?

Using standardised worksheets also had to do with quality issues. Before, “at times there was nothing really between drawing and assembly work”, which meant that each operator built the product the way he saw fit. As a consequence the products at times were assembled in very different ways, which was not acceptable in the eyes of the customers.

However, apart from a need for a more efficient production system there was a strong need for regaining control over production. This in turn is a consequence of how the team work organisation was functioning at the time. As the plant manager pointed out:
The team work organisation was fantastic and has given us a lot, but I think that certain things went too far. That’s what I feel. The teams were given a lot of responsibilities together with an increased work content. They became very strong… which in itself is an advantage. But they can not become so strong that they take over, becomes a unit of their own in such a way…that.. they did what they wanted.

Deciding when and who would do overtime is but one example:

Every Saturday and every Tuesday and Thursday they worked overtime. Without the boss having any control over the need for it. And when he did know there was a need for overtime they sent a list around where each individual indicated if he could do overtime or not.

Even as regards production goals and so forth there were problems, since operators and management both felt they were to be responsible and in charge for setting the goals. A connected stated reason had to do with management’s lack of knowledge and thereby lack of control as regards production itself and the time needed to build a product. Management was for instance not able to answer the question why some operators needed more time than others to build the same product. Furthermore, one didn’t know if priorities set were carried out, which created a situation that in the eyes’ of management was untenable. All in all, a situation was at hand where management experienced a lack of control over production and where operators successively had gained more and more power. That’s when the plant manager decided it was time to set a new agenda:

So… one could joke and say ‘reclaim the workshop’, i.e. managers were not positively looked upon. Today we can go out into the factory and have a chat, joke and work together. We are dependent on each other in a different way.

How then to regain power and control? One way was to set an organisation where production leaders were brought in between production line manager and team leaders. This was around
2002-2003. The teams consisted of five-six up to ten-fifteen operators. Some teams were stronger than others. The ones building the heaviest products were highest in status and rank and the ones building the smallest products the lowest. One therefore decided to start with the smallest products when bringing in the line concept.

This means that a continuously ongoing fight saw the day of light. According to the plant manager it took a lot of discussions and 3-4 years before the organisation was totally set and in function. It has not been easy he says; he had to take on real fights with some operators, even pursuing some of them to leave the company all together.

In summary, most arguments for the change of work organisation and production system design thus deal with a strong sense of having to deal with a situation where the teams in the eyes of management, especially the new plant manager, had grown too autonomous and gained too much power and their corresponding lack of knowledge and thereby of control and power.

Reactions
In this section I will discuss managers’ own reactions as well as their view on reactions and consequences from operators due to the changes taking place.

Resistance and organizational misbehaviour
According to the plant manager one main reaction to the change of production system and work organisation was open refusal to go along with proposed changes, which would cause a loss of autonomy and power. Since so much authority had been delegated to the teams, the plant manager both during and before the changeover to a lean inspired production model had met reactions at the shop floor such as: “Should someone come and tell me how and what to do? Wouldn’t think so.” The degree of resistance and misbehaviour had to do with status, the higher status one had the more power one risked to loose and the more resistance one consequently put up, the plant manager argues: “In the strongest teams there were individuals who were very, very strong. And they had the most to loose. They were regarded as some kind of heroes.”
Other forms of misbehaviour the plant manager met when walking around the shop floor, where he was met by silence and ignorance. This was an uncomfortable situation: “Not that I was afraid, but it was not nice. Nobody said hello and such things”. Unconsciously that made him and other managers keep away from the strongest teams. Today however the atmosphere is totally changed as will be evident below. Everyone says hello and management and operators are talking and joking during walks around the shop floor.

The strongest operators with informal leadership positions were doing their best to maintain the former work organisation with all its authorities delegated to them by setting group norms for the teams. This is all in line with findings already in the famous Hawthorne Bank Wiring-room study (Mayo 1945; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1964; Blumberg 1971), but also with Lysgaard’s theory on a worker’s collective and Ackroyd & Thompson’s (1999) theory on organizational misbehaviour (cf. Karlsson, 2011).

Resistance and misbehaviour thus included the whole spectrum from setting ones own norms and rules, to not say hello to managers, and finally to refuse to go along with management’s proposals, ideas and, in the eyes of the operators, management’s interference with authorities delegated to them. In the end some operators put up such a fight management decided they had to leave the company.

**Why resistance and misbehaviour?**

Why did the operators put up such a resistance? According to the plant manager resistance and misbehaviour had to do with management’s attempt to regain power and control over production, and not so much with the change of production system itself, maybe apart from setting standards. Loss of influence and power was the main reason: “Before operators owned their own time completely”, which meant as shown above that he as plant manager had no control over what the operators really were doing. The former work organisation had been taken far too far, the plant manager argued.

From a union perspective I would however suggest that apart from a loss of autonomy, authority and power also work environmental issues as well as a loss of work enrichment have to be included as reasons for resistance and misbehaviour. However, also production issues in relation to the new production model are at hand. As the vice chairman put it:
We have always commented on the fact that in connection with switching to line work there was all of a sudden a need for more people. We could easily have achieved the same if we had kept our station assembly model, since we now need so many more people.

The argument for a change to line assembly in order to create a more efficient production is not valid according to the vice chairman. According to the manager for production engineering, the fact that operators are no longer involved in calling off material, has also lead to a less efficient and qualitative production. He had therefore himself tried to maintain it that way; but with no result.

**Consequences after the change of production model and work organisation**

The changes of production model and work organisation have brought about both positive and negative consequences. Consequences differ greatly depending on whether the overall work situation for operators is in focus or issues like production and productivity, but also on whether a management or union perspective is taken.

**Negative consequences**

The negative consequences pointed to by the managers mostly concern work related issues for operators, more specifically the loss of ownership of production, and the loss of authority and of competence. The loss of competence in turn has to do with the fact that work content has impoverished compared to how it used to be, even though the shortest work cycles still add up to 30 minutes. Still, compared to a work content of days the difference is considerable. Moreover, the different roles were removed from the operators; they experienced a loss of co-operation with the construction department and the possibility to call off material by themselves, all leading to less varied work tasks and less multifunctional operators.

The production engineering manager also points to the fact that rotation between different lines is not enough to ensure a good ergonomic work environment, a statement underlined by the union vice chairman. Previously the intention with rotation was “to rotate between assignments such as assembly work, to drive fork lift trucks, and administration”.
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Besides, a more stressful work situation has been created due to the line work, which will make it more or less impossible for some operators to continue as they grow older. Management however tries to handle this situation by giving operators above 55 to 60 years of age other types of assembly work. Another stressful factor has to do with operators being much more bound to one place; they cannot leave their station without having someone to replace them. Stress also has to do with dependency within teams, since everyone needs to finish his or her work cycle at about the same time. If someone is slower than the rest there is a risk for tension within the teams. Or even for being unwanted as a team member. Operators’ loss of self determination is also pointed to by the plant manager. Still, he argues, management has tried to keep operator autonomy to some degree also in the new system.

**Positive consequences**

A more efficient production and improvement of quality are but two of many positive consequences after implementing the new production model according to management. A much better order at the shop floor has been achieved; the work place is today both nicer and cleaner compared to how it used to be. As a result an improved physical work environment for all has been achieved. Again according to management.

The previous problems with lack of material have been solved, creating a much better flow and reduced irritation among operators. Planning the production is done in a much more orderly fashion: “Today we know which products we are building weekly” as one of the managers put it. And, as the union vice chairman points out, production is much more governed today due to the need for a more perfect material fit before it reaches the lines, whereas before operators had to make the necessary adjustments themselves.

Another positive consequence the interviewees point to as a very important quality issue concerns the use of standardised work sheets with the result that machines are built in the same way. It also makes it much easier to go between departments, if necessary, when having standard sheets right through, with work instructions looking the same, even if products differ. Before there was a big difference as regards instruction sheets depending on which department one was working at. As the vice union chairman points out:
Often, you were happy as long as there was a work instruction sheet at all. And even then, it was not worked at and not updated.

Furthermore, a much less vulnerable production situation has been achieved. When someone is on sick leave or otherwise not present there is no problem in keeping production going, there are others who easily fill in, which was not the case before. The plant manager also wants to underline the improved work environment:

Clean and nice... today you elevate the unit, turn it upside down precisely the way you want to in order to be able to assemble. Before when the objects were standing on the floor one had to crawl around them and...

However, as the union vice chairman strongly argues, a great deal of these positive consequences would have been possible to achieve while still holding on to the previous work organisation including the station assembly production model. That is to say brought about changes are not dependent on line assembly, but could have been implemented in the former production model as well.

A final comment: After management’s regain of power and control management today are on top as regards issues such as priorities set, if overtime is needed and so forth. Besides, a much friendlier work environment as regards the relationship between management and operators has been achieved at the shop floor, a change I will comment on below.

Discussion

Now, how shall we understand this whole series of events and changes taken place? Was it really necessary to surmount so much of what had been achieved as regards motivation, work satisfaction, engagement and skills? All aspects well-known for their contribution to efficiency and productivity (Berggren 1992, Berggren 1994; Houghton & Yoho 2005; Engström et al 2004; Rolandsson & Oudhuis 2009; Tengblad 2003). Let us examine what has really been going on.
The plant manager has given a number of different arguments and reasons to why he felt it was absolutely necessary to carry through the change of work organisation and production system design; some of them having to do with pure efficiency- and quality issues. I will not contradict these arguments, since obviously there were some problematic elements in the former production model having to do with a lack of systematisation (lack of work sheets to mention but one) and a general need for more order and neatness and so forth. Still, as argued by the union representative these lean elements would most likely been possible to implement also within the former production system. As regards reasons for changing the work organisation these are of a different kind.

One major reason I would like to argue had to do with their usefulness as tools for reclaiming power and control. For the new plant manager this was his way out of a situation he felt was intolerable. A situation where things had gotten out of hand since operators had taken charge to such a degree that managers on different levels felt uncomfortable walking around the shop floor, since operators felt management interfered when wanting to set production goals, since management had but little knowledge of production as regards time spent on building a product, if priorities set were carried out and so forth.

There are many angles to this issue, to why teams developed such strength that they were able to set their own rules and norms, to how they came to gain such a high level of autonomy and control over production issues, ultimately leading to this strong feeling of ownership over production. I would like to suggest that management was not able to handle the kind of leadership one was supposed to pursue, finally leading to the upcoming of an extraordinary strong collective (Blumberg 1971; Lysgaard 1961; Mayo 1945; Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1964; Edwards et al. 1995, Houghton & Yoho, 2005). The response from the present plant manager can therefore best be understood as a three to four years long Battle of Power. A battle fought through bringing in control tools inherited in the new line production system and by removing autonomy-establishing elements in the new work organisation. However, also other measures were used such as letting off the strongest team members. How then was the formation of such a strong collective possible?

Coming back to Lysgaard (1971) the three prerequisites for a worker collective to arise: 1) to be close to one another, 2) to experience a certain situation similarity, and 3) to adopt shared problem awareness all seem to be have been at hand during the process described above.
Responsibilities and tasks had been handed over to the teams while letting them know that “these things are for you to decide”. Besides, the operators had reached a job richness that exceeded what they had ever experienced before and the co-operation between production and construction departments led to a feeling of ownership and pride as well as a gradual increase of autonomy, independence and self-leadership (cf. Houghton & Yoho, 2005). This was in itself in accordance with the set work organisation expectations. It seems however as though management was not able to pursue a leadership that could embrace delegated authorities while still be in control and be able to exercise a decision making power in accord with the worker collective. Instead, a process towards a ‘we’ and ‘them’ scenario between top management and operators saw the day of light. As a consequence a situation was ultimately created where management didn’t know if the intentions and actions of the teams were for the best for the organisation or not. Thus, a strong feeling of insecurity was created in the process and as a consequence a strong sense of distrust from both parties.

Moreover, as with Lysgaard, there was a continuous negotiation process going on between the technical-economical system and the worker collective, in which the employer was working towards achieving a direct link with each individual without the intermediation of a worker collective. I would like to suggest that this is what management finally managed to do. This was achieved through weakening the worker collective by reducing their autonomy, authorities and self-governing capabilities. The power of the teams has also diminished by the reduction of work richness by bringing in a line design and by taking back delegated tasks. Another individually oriented action I would argue was to let the strongest and by their co-workers most respected members leave the company all together. By this action not only did the leaders of the resistance and misbehaviour disappear, but it also made everyone aware of a threat towards oneself (to lose one’s job) if they were to continue the road of conflict.

Another useful concept for understanding the upcoming situation would be self-organization (Ackroyd and Thompson, 1999:54) in relation to operators’ established autonomy. This is a very credible explanation as to what took place at the plant in question. When bringing in the new team work organization, successively more and more control over the work process was handed over to the operators through delegating authorities and work enrichment elements. Engagement and a feeling of responsibility for work and workplace gradually increased, as were informal norms and rules of conduct, making team members more and more feel that they were the rightfully owners and in charge of the work process. They had the capabilities
and the right to set goals and act on behalf of the Production department. Therefore, management had better keep to themselves, they should not ‘interfere’.

Since management on the other hand felt they should be in power and in control of production as well as of behaviour and attitudes of subordinates in order to make sure their work efforts would generate profit, structured antagonism would be a likely response, in itself a form of power relationship (Burawoy, 1979; Edwards 1979), especially in this case where both parties felt they were in the right to control the work process (cf. Dent and Goldberg, 1999).

To maintain long term efficiency, team autonomy has to be high enough to ensure team members’ overview and control of the work process as a whole (Castka et al., 2001; Trent, 2003). However, as is evident from this study, there is a risk of teams becoming autonomous to such a degree that the team-energy is directed inwards protecting the autonomy instead of being focused on the organisation as a whole (Larsen, 2003). To create well-functioning communication channels between teams and management therefore seems to be a crucial element in order to ensure both parties to agree upon what is expected of them for the benefit of production as a whole (cf Gustavson & Kleiner, 1994).

Still, the question remains, was it really necessary to surmount the former team work organisation model and switch over to a lean inspired organisational model including a new work organisation? Or would it be possible, as the vice union chairman argued, to keep the former station assembly production model while still implement and make use of appropriate lean tools in order to gain the advantages thereof while holding on to the earlier team model with all its advantages as regards operators’ engagement, developed skills, and so forth?

I would like to suggest that this would be possible to accomplish by using a leadership that would allow a shared ownership between a worker collective and management, building on the creation of a common interest, in itself the base for an effective organisation (Ackroyd & Thompson, 1999; Friedman, 1977). To succeed however it takes a maturity and realizing the win-win situation this would create from all parties involved, from management on all different levels down to worker collective members. This is the big future challenge!
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