<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

The Sociology of Work in Finland

Sippola, Markku Matias

Palgrave Macmillan
2019

Sippola , M M & Alasoini , T 2019 , The Sociology of Work in Finland . in P Stewart , J-P Durand & M-M Richea (eds) , The Palgrave Handbook of the Sociology of Work in Europe . The Palgrave Handbook of the Sociology of Work in Europe , Palgrave Macmillan , Cham , pp. 225-252 . <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93206-4>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/327760>

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93206-4>

unspecified

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

The sociology of work in Finland

Abstract: This chapter looks into the development of the sociology of work in Finland. In the process of the development, two phases are considered: 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. Although the Finnish sociology of work has been equally influenced by positivist, reformist and critical approaches, it has maintained its fundamentally consensual nature through both periods, and critical paradigms challenging the social order have never assumed a central role. There appears to be a considerable “reformistic” 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.

Introduction

This chapter explains the post-WWII 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 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, organization 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 the rising Finnish sociology of work, 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 on work. External influences were now sought, besides the USA, also 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 organizations. This development owes 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 thematic and methodological broadening of the sociology of work. Until the 1990s, much of the Finnish sociology of work was home-made 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.

BOX 1: 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, organization, labour economics and psychology studies, there has been a strong sociological emphasis in the working life research cultivated. Besides the positivist undercurrent in the 1960s and 1970s, and the Marxist orientation in the 1970s and 1980s, there has been a reformist main tone in the sociology of work in Finland since 1970s. 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 precariat have in recent years introduced a more critical undertone in the Finnish sociology of work.

In general, global tendencies in the organization 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 – almost coincided 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 manifested.

The professionalization 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 come 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.

In the following sections, the development of the sociology of work in Finland is elaborated on 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 clearly lagged behind the other Nordic countries. The backwards 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 WWII 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 industrialized late compared with many Western European countries. In terms of the proportion of people working in manufacturing of all employed persons, the industrialization 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) investments in industrial production, characterized 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 characterized 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 WWII, but fluctuated until the end of 1960s, before a new growth in unionization took place. The unionization rate soared and surpassed 70% by the 1970s. The new growth was the result of a radicalization of the political climate, unification of the biggest trade union central organization (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 organizations. The first such agreement was signed in 1968. This practice of centralized 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 WWII, sociology was taught in Finland as what today would be called social anthropology and ethnology. Only after WWII did industrial society and especially Finnish society become 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 industrialized 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 WWII. 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 specialized 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 modernization of production processes and a radicalized social atmosphere since the late 1960s led to an aggravation of work-related problems in Finland. These problems also stemmed from bad working conditions, Fordist work organization, 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 organizations 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 to 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 organization 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 WWII 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 WWII. 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 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 organization is often considered the first Finnish industrial sociological interview study. It was preceded by Jouko Siipi’s (1954) dissertation on the entertaining of 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 WWII.

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 institutionalization 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 1971-75 that was conducted by a group of researchers at the University of Jyväskylä (Kirjonen 2010). The objective of METELI was to examine, in a versatile 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 organization, 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 stereotyped object of study in the Finnish sociology of work for long. 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 the manufacturing industry reached its saturation point and the growth of jobs began to expand solely 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 conceptualizations 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 the 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 organizational culture and the development of human relations and resources as productive forces (Seeck 2008). In the late 1980s and early 1990, about 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 organizations from many different sectors. The dominant position of the manufacturing industry and a 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 characterized as the consolidation of neoliberalism and the rise of a competition state as the new *raison d'être*. 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 liberalization from OECD countries, the abating of ideological contradictions in Finnish politics after the demise of the Soviet Union and a deep economic recession that destabilized 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 individualization of work. In its extreme form, the new doctrine implied that systems for the assessment of individual-level work performance and individualized reward systems should be developed, competition between workers, teams and work units should be encouraged, and flexible, agile and project-based forms of work organization 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 parties¹ 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 work 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 organizations on both sides were closely involved. In 2004, the two programmes were combined under a new seven-year continuation

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".

programme with increased financial resources, entitled the Workplace Development Programme TYKES. From 1996 to 2010, over 1,800 development projects at private and public workplaces and over 100 applied research projects conducted by universities and 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 organizations. 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 2008-11. 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 (2004-07), Finnish Companies and the Challenges of Global Competition LIIKE (2001-04), Business Know-How LIIKE2 (2006-09), Life as Learning LEARN (2002-06) and The Future of Learning, Knowledge and Skills TULOS (2014-17). 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, the 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 organization 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 organizations and local councils. In line with the 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 PhD 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 organizations.

Main directions of research and prominent persons and projects

Drawing a fully-fledged picture of the 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 form. 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 the 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 the 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 criticizes 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 the Finnish sociology of work can be linked to the current ongoing debate in other Western countries, of which also many Finnish labour intellectuals seek to understand. 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 recognize the changed world of work characterized by new spaces and paces of work, the dissolution of national labour markets, feminized work and the blurring of 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 evidence² (Kinnunen and Suikkanen 2009). 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 polarization (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 recognizing of non-market forms of work as socially acceptable, legitimate

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.

work, the remuneration for which could be ensured by means of social security or some other form of distribution of income.

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 (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 the 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 health-care work done by non-Finnish workers subject to institutional racism. A related theme in Finnish gender-based sociological analyses has been the work-family balance. The work of Kinnunen and Mauno (1998) on antecedents and outcomes of the work-family conflict 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 organizational changes, flexible forms of labour deployment and the adoption of post-Fordist forms of work organization. Here, the influential work by Raija Julkunen (1987) of the University of Jyväskylä has been a major Finnish point of reference for many later sociological 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 revolving 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 knowledge 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 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 analysis on how the idea of a “negotiation society” and the “double bond” between the State and the labour market organizations that contributed to the development 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 competition 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 organization 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 the 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 Hearn 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 have 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 organizational innovations and innovation systems in Finland.

The rise of action-oriented research since the late 1980s and the governments' various programmes for the development of working life since the 1990s has 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 & 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, it should not be forgotten the roles of the Universities of Helsinki, Jyväskylä and Turku and that of the Finnish Institute of Occupational Health as other key research sites. The focus of research in the Finnish sociology of work has been on 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 organization 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 emphasized 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* sociological research on work, because Finnish scholars have, to a great extent, adopted the ideas to their studies from abroad. To look at it more closely, there appears to be a considerable "reformistic" 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. 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 utilized such data have not typically aimed at developing sociological theories, but producing applicable information for policy-makers and labour market organizations 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 abating 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 been capable of undermining critical labour research in Finland. However, such a conclusion may be too hasty. Despite the more cooperative relationships between employers and labour researchers now compared with the 1970s and 1980s, there still exists an important undertow of critical approaches in the Finnish sociology of work, embodying 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 impetus has the fact that the agenda for working-life studies in general has been largely defined by governmental bodies in Finland had for the sociology of work? One could argue that, especially in the era of a competition state, the Finnish sociology of work has increasingly been in the role of solving or fixing societal problems defined by actors outside the academic world, rather than acting a driving force of societal change itself. On the one hand, by adopting this role, the 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 taken a more active role in questioning the sustainability of the prevailing hegemonic discourse that revolves around the idea of a competition state in solving many of the current societal problems, thus 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, Helsinki: Aalto University, School of Science, Department of Industrial Engineering and Management.
- 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: Alapuro, R., Alestalo, M., and Haavio-Mannila, E. (eds) *Suomalaisen sosiologian juuret*. Porvoo: WSOY, 1-26.
- Anttila, T., Oinas, T., Tammelin, M. and Nätti, J. (2015) 'Working-time regimes and work-life balance in Europe.' *European Sociological Review*, 31(6): 713-724.
- Aro, J. and 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](https://www.sbs.ox.ac.uk/sites/default/files/research-projects/CRESSI/docs/CRESSI%20Working%20Paper%20Finland%20Social%20Innovation%20Policy%20Aro%20Heiskala.pdf) Accessed 22 November 2017.
- Bergholm, T. (2005) *Sopimussyhteiskunnan 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., Nikula, J., Tyrkkö, A., Keinänen, P. and Julkunen, P. (1984) *Suomalaiset luokkakuvassa: luokkaprojekti*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

- Blom, R., Melin, H. and Pyöriä, P. (2001) *Tietotyö ja työelämän muutos: palkkatyön arki tietoyhteiskunnassa*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Erola, J. and Räsänen, P. (2014) *Johdatus sosiologian perusteisiin*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Eskola, A. (1973) 'Suomalaisen sosiologian uudistuminen.' In: Alapuro, R., Alestalo, M. and Haavio-Mannila, E. (eds) *Suomalaisen sosiologian juuret*. Porvoo: WSOY, 269-317.
- General Intellect (2008) *Vasemmisto etsii työtä*. Helsinki: Like.
- Heiskala, R. and Luhtakallio, E. (eds) (2006) *Uusi jako: miten Suomesta tuli kilpailukyky-yhteiskunta?* Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Heiskanen, T. and Hearn, J. (2004) *Information Society and the Workplace: Spaces, Boundaries and Agency*. London: Routledge.
- Heiskanen, T. and Rantalaiho, L. (eds) (1997) *Gendered Practices in Working Life*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ilmonen, K. and 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: della Porta, D., Hänninen, S., Siisiäinen, M. and Silvasti, T. (eds) *The New Social Division: Making and Unmaking Precariousness*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 177-196.
- 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: Guardiancich, I. and Molina, O. (eds) *Talking through the Crisis: Social Dialogue and Industrial Relations Trends in Selected EU Countries*. Geneva: ILO, 83-105.
- 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., Nätti, J. and Anttila, T. (2004) *Aikanyrjähdys: keskiluokka tietotyön puristuksessa*. 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.

- Järvensivu, A. (2010) *Tapaus työelämä ja voiko sitä muuttaa?* Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Kalliola, S. and 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. and 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. and 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. and Suikkanen, A. (2009) 'Johdanto.' In: Kinnunen, M. and Autto, J. (eds) *Tänään töissä: sosiologia näkökulmia työhön*. Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press, 9-19.
- Kinnunen, U. and 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 työvoimapolitiittisia tutkimuksia 47. Helsinki: Työvoimaministeriö.
- Koistinen, P. (2009) 'Yhteiskunnallisen työn muodot.' In: Koistinen, P. (ed.) *Työn hiipuvat rajat: tutkielmia palkkatyön, hoivan ja vapaaehtoistyön muuttuvista suhteista*. Helsinki: Tilastokeskus, 7-15.
- Koistinen, P. (2014) *Työ, työvoima ja politiikka*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Koistinen, P. and Lilja, K. (1988) 'Consensual adaptation to new technology: the Finnish case.' In: Hyman, R. and Streeck, W (eds) *New Technology and Industrial Relations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 263-271.

- 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: Czarniawska, B. and Höpfl, H. (eds) *Casting the Other: The Production and Maintenance of Inequalities in Work Organizations*. London: Routledge, 119-137.
- 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. and Wrede, S. (2010) 'Työkäytännöt ja institutionaalinen rasismi – lähihoitajien työ.' In: Wrede, S. and Nordberg, C. (eds) *Vieraita työssä: työelämän etnistyvä eriarvoisuus*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 172-192.
- Lehtonen, J. and 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. and Sippola, M. (2011) 'National unions and transnational workers: the case of Olkiluoto 3, Finland.' *Work, Employment and Society*, 25(2): 292-308.
- Melin, H. (2009) 'Luokat ja työ.' In: Blom, R. & Hautaniemi, A. (eds) *Työelämä muuttuu, joutaako hyvinvointi*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 56-77.
- Miettinen, R. (2002) *National Innovation System: Scientific Concept or Political Rhetoric*. Helsinki: Edita.
- Moen, E. and Lilja, K. (2005) 'Change in coordinated market economies: the case of Nokia and Finland.' In: Morgan, G., Whitley, R. and Moen, E. (eds) *Changing Capitalisms?*

- Internationalization, Institutional Change, and Systems of Economic Organization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 352- 379.
- 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.
- 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.
- Näre, L. (2012) 'Hoivatyön uudet paradoksit.' *Niin&Näin*, 1/2012: 92-96.
- Oinas, T., Anttila, T., Mustosmäki, A. and 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. and 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. and Alasoini, T. (2006) 'Interactive research in Finland: workplace research from the 1940's to the present day.' In: Aagaard Nielsen, K. and Svensson, L. (eds) *Action and Interactive Research: Beyond Practice and Theory*. Maastricht: Shaker Publishing, 158-169.
- Saloniemi, A. and Virtanen, P. (2008) 'Joustavan huomisen varjossa?' In: Heiskanen, T., Leinonen, M., Järvensivu, A. and Aho, S. (eds) *Kohti uutta työelämää?* Tampere: Tampere University Press, 78-108.
- 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: päätetty ja sukupuoli sopimustyhteiskuntaa edeltävissä työmarkkinakäytännöissä*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Sutela, H. and 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. and 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. and Kotiranta, A. (2011) *Final Evaluation of the Employment Policy Research Program (2003-2007)*. Publications Employment and Entrepreneurship 16/2011. Helsinki: MEE.