Document Study

Home Thoughts From Abroad on the Changing Role of Trade Union Leaders: Charles McCarthy in Norway with Tavistock Institute Researchers, 1965.[1]

Introduction

Accounts of the development of social science research in Ireland contain scarcely any reference to the contribution made by the trade union movement.[2] Yet the early stimulus to carrying out such research derived in substantial part from a productivity drive promoted by U.S. government policy in non-Communist Europe after World War Two, and delivered through international organisations that owed their existence to the U.S. aid programmes that began in 1948 with the Marshall Plan. Within U.S. aid recipient states this productivity drive usually operated through National Productivity Centres in which nominees of 'free' trade unions, business organisations and governments came together to promote efficiency-enhancing changes across the economy whose benefits were supposed to be equitably shared out between capital, labour and the national community as a whole.[3] With U.S. funding support, a European Productivity Agency (EPA) operated between 1953 and 1962 as an autonomous agency within the structure of the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC), a body originally created to provide overall coordination in the implementation of the Marshall Plan. EPA was intended 'to federate and guide the national productivity centers, as well as to service them.'[4] Alongside programmes of productivity education for management and trade unionists, EPA provided 'sponsorship of academic research in the social sciences, a new departure in many European countries' with a particular emphasis on studies seeking 'to promote scientific knowledge of the problems of work.'[5]

In Ireland, the first Inter-Party Government approved the setting up of an Irish national productivity centre in June 1950, but it was not until the spring of 1959 that such a body came into operation. During the EPA's early years of existence an uninterested Department of Industry and Commerce was the Irish contact point for the Paris-based agency and Irish involvement in EPA activities was minimal. Support for more positive engagement came initially from the fledgling Irish Management Institute and, despite the debilitating effects of a split into rival congresses, from the trade union movement, particularly once a Provisional United Trade Union Organisation (PUTUO) had been formed. That there was no national productivity centre in two small peripheral member states – Portugal being the other – was a situation that leading EPA figures like Alexander King also actively sought to change. A turning point came on 6 May 1957 when EPA's Director made 'a personal request' to the Head of the Irish Delegation to OEEC 'for your co-operation in putting into operation as quickly and efficiently as possible the Agency's programme for the human sciences and their application in industry.' This set in train a sequence of events that led to the formation in late 1958 and early 1959 of two bodies on which the trade union movement had substantial representation – the National Joint Committee on the Human Sciences and Their Application to Industry (HSC) and the Irish National Productivity Committee (INPC).[6]

In the early 1960s both the international and the national contexts of Ireland's productivity drive changed significantly. With post-war European recovery effectively complete, the EPA was disbanded as the OEEC transformed itself into the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. This cut off the flow of resources from external sources into the Irish activities that depended on the productivity drive for their existence. However, just before this took effect, Ireland applied in 1961 to join the European Economic Community (EEC) as a full member. Such a move

involved exposing its heavily protected industrial base to the rigours of free trade. Adaptation that would increase the survival chances of firms and industries in such competitive conditions quickly came to form part of the official preparation for entry agenda. Productivity and technical assistance measures previously undertaken on a small scale with resources from abroad were now expanded with funding provided from Irish state coffers. As restructured in 1963, INPC operated an advisory service targeted at small and medium enterprises, provided general information services, engaged in promotional activities through a network of productivity committees organised on both an industrial and a regional basis, supported educational activities and promoted research. In relation to research, agreement had been reached to reconstitute the HSC as a sub-committee of the new INPC. Initially this sub-committee had five Labour and five Management members together with eight 'people qualified in the Human Sciences field'. When it was created the Chairman of the old HSC, UCD's Professor of Logic and Psychology, Fr. Feichin O'Doherty, stepped down to be succeeded by a trade union leader, Charles McCarthy, General Secretary of the Vocational Teachers Association and the 1964 President of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions.[7]

An ongoing project that the reconstituted HSC inherited from its predecessor was a study of the morale of Dublin bus workers which was being carried out by the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations. The study was funded by the bus company, and its trade unions with the HSC had been invited to endorse it through sponsorship, a status that brought Charles McCarthy onto the steering committee overseeing the project. With over 20,000 employees at the start of the 1960s, Córas Iompair Éireann (CIÉ), the state-owned bus, canal, railway and road freight company was the largest single enterprise in the Republic of Ireland. Under the terms of the Transport Act 1958 the company was to receive an annual subvention of £1.75 million for a five-year period after which it would be expected to pay its own way. Provided with a large measure of commercial freedom, the new Chairman of the CIÉ, Todd Andrews, set about a programme of massive railway line closures and organisational reinvigoration in pursuit of this goal. A fateful year for this project was 1961: Andrews records in his memoirs that 'by 1961 we were within a quarter of a million pounds of breaking even financially' and 'had a quiet time on the labour front' until the early part of that year.[8]

However, during 1961 a dispute over payment for weekend work led to a lockout of Dublin busmen (whose services ran at a profit) by CIÉ. In May 1962 the company moved unilaterally to begin to introduce one-man buses into its fleet. When busmen who refused to work the new system were dismissed, an unofficial strike immediately brought the city's services to a halt. This strike saw the emergence of divisions within the union to which a majority of the busmen belonged, the Irish Transport and General Workers Union (ITGWU), as disciplinary sanctions were imposed by its officials on members deemed guilty of taking part in unauthorised demonstrations. Failing to achieve what it considered to be satisfactory negotiated progress on the one-man buses issue, the company attempted to unilaterally extend their use a year later: the strike that followed differed from that of the previous year in being official. The stoppage in April and May 1963 was to be a critical one. As Charles McCarthy later wrote: 'the company lost heart with regard to one-man operations and never extended the system very much further'. Yet the dispute's eventual settlement also 'created a crisis in the relations between the men, and the Irish Transport in particular, which was to lead to a breakaway movement and the establishing of a new union for busmen.'

Against this background of industrial conflict, the initiation of an action research study came about as 'CIÉ and the unions were deeply troubled by the strong feelings which lay behind the [1963 one-man buses] dispute, and, perhaps believing that they had done all that was expected of them, they began to look for the cause in some deeper malaise among the men.'[9] The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations, which was commissioned to carry out the research, had been created after the Second World War to apply systematic expertise – sociological, anthropological, psychological and psychiatric – to the problems of peacetime social life. By the early 1960s studies in work situations

as diverse as British coal mines and Indian textile mills formed the basis of its distinctive synthesised set of socio-technical systems, principles which centred on reconciling enterprise efficiency and worker well-being through the creation of semi-autonomous work groups which gave workers an increased degree of control over their work situations.[10] Based in London and enjoying an international reputation, Tavistock Institute staff members were frequently invited speakers at INPC conferences and HSC seminars once these got under way. Local academic connections were also established when the Institute enlisted the help of UCD psychologists to collect Irish data for a consumer research project carried out for Guinness.[11]

The first phase of the CIÉ study, which was carried out by a team of five researchers directed by Hans Van Beinum, got under way in September 1963. Apart from some additional work carried out in 1965 on trade union organisation, its fieldwork appears to have concluded in the summer of 1964. The key issues investigated in this first phase were the socio-technical characteristics of the jobs that the busmen had to carry out; the management the busmen experienced, directly and indirectly; the relationship between the busmen and their unions and the shared attitudes of busmen towards these matters and towards their position in general. The data collection ranged across semi-structured group interviews with drivers and conductors, observation of a sample of different types of bus "run" and extended interviews with the observed crews, interviews with management at different levels, and interviews with trade union officials and representatives. The second phase of study was conceived as one in which management and unions, guided by socio-technical systems theory, took joint action to address the problems identified by the first phase findings. But, amid escalating management-union recrimination within the company and the emergence outside company union group and ICTU structures of the breakaway National Busmen's Union, this second phase was never carried out.[12]

A report of the study's first phase findings went through three drafts between late 1964 and the end of 1965. It was eventually published in 1967 amid CIÉ briefing of journalists to the effect that '(a) . . . the report was four years old and, therefore, out of date and (b) that the conditions which now exist in Dublin City services have altered materially for the better from those of four years ago.'[13] While this report's drafting and redrafting was in progress, a three-person Irish group travelled to Norway in June 1965, a country which had creatively adapted to its needs the U.S. productivity gospel in the 1950s, and in the 1960s initiated an Industrial Democracy Programme that was to have far-reaching effects on its policy and legislation with regard to workplace organisation.[14] From the outset, the Tavistock Institute was one of main providers of research inputs to this Norwegian programme. The document reproduced below contains the reflections of one member of the Irish party, Charles McCarthy, on the visit. Together with a covering letter to ICTU General Secretary, Ruaidhri Roberts, dated 29 September, it is to be found in the ICTU papers deposited in the National Archives of Ireland. Whether the document was more widely circulated is unclear.

McCarthy's account does not discuss the ongoing CIÉ project but does briefly describe the experiment being conducted at the Christiania Spigerwerk plant which served as the basis of the joint discussion between the visitors and their hosts. He notes that a stable work situation was the reason the Norwegian factory was chosen for an experiment whereas a succession of disputes provided the background to the initiation of the CIÉ study. He also considers that term 'industrial democracy' unhelpful in promotion the idea of 'local responsibility' in Irish workplaces. Nonetheless, this terminology did become current in Ireland within a few years and McCarthy himself would, in 1971, write a pamphlet discussing the socio-technical systems approach, the co-determination institutions of West Germany and the self-managed socialism of Yugoslavia which had *Industrial Democracy* as its title.[15]

McCarthy goes on in his document to note the contrast between the position of the Irish trade union movement and that of its Norwegian counterpart. The latter had well-resourced structures,

the support of a predominantly Social Democratic political culture and a context of continuous economic growth – all of which the former lacked. Yet the document does not dwell on Scandinavia as a model that Ireland might aspire to emulate; rather, it focuses on the dilemmas facing any national trade union movement, be it relatively weak or relatively strong, when it becomes involved in the planning machinery of a modern capitalist economy. Are trade union leaders to be partners in the planning process or representatives of members to whose security the changes endorsed by planners may constitute a threat? McCarthy concludes that the worker's representatives 'must clearly stand with him before they stand with anyone else', and that 'the trade union leader cannot to be fixed with the image of an amiable partner in modern planning and nothing else.'

McCarthy was to relinquish the role of trade union leader and become a university academic in the 1970s. A historian of the Vocational Teachers Association writes of him that he 'was intensely ambitious in both a personal and a professional sense: he wanted to become a leading figure in the trade union movement of a modernising society... he was compassionate and humane and he had a strong social, if not socialist, vision.'[16] Given the extent to which this vision derived from Catholicism – McCarthy was a Catholic Workers College lay lecturer and an enthusiastic supporter of Second Vatican Council changes within the Church – it is perhaps surprising to find such a strong emphasis on the centrality of social division in his reflections on the visit to Norway.

In his later writings, he revisited the CIÉ story with a number of different emphases. The theme of a gulf separating the economic planning elite from the mass of the people in the Irish context was to run through his 1968 book *The Distasteful Challenge*, a work in which the CIÉ study and the Norwegian visit are very briefly alluded to.[17] Surveying Irish industrial relations in the 1960s in *The Decade of Upheaval* (1973), he includes a longer account of the episode. Here he emphasises the incomplete realisation of the Tavistock study's design and is critical of the ITGWU leadership for having lost touch with their members – ' . . . they were impressed, in the public interest, by the argument that CIÉ should pay its way, and they were disposed to accept the guarantees against redundancy in the matter of the one-man operations; CIÉ's record was good in this regard ... [B]y reason of its public policy, [the ITGWU] was obliged to be a mouthpiece for the company's economic woes.'[18] Earlier in the 1971 *Industrial Democracy* pamphlet, he argues that Christians as well as trade union leaders had lost their way, since so 'many accept in practice the irrelevance to business of the deeper Christian message.' Congruent with this message, in his view, was the proposition that 'if one organises work in a way which releases personal initiative and responsibility at all levels, not only are industrial problems far less, but productivity also finds a new breakthrough.'[19]

Document

Irish- Norwegian Meeting, in conjunction with the Tavistock Institute of Human Relations 1-3 June, 1965

1. This report is an attempt at an evaluation rather than a description of our visit.

2. The Participants

   The Irish members consisted of two trade union representatives (one being the industrial officer of the I.T.& G.W.U concerned with *inter alia* the city services of C.I.É.) and one management representative, also a member of C.I.É. We met the employers' organisation in Oslo; the trade union Congress (L.O.) representatives in conjunction with the shop stewards involved in the experiment, which we later describe; and we visited Christiania Spigerwerk, the very large iron and steel works where the experiment took place. We were accompanied by the Tavistock social

scientists concerned both with the C.I.É. experiment and with the Christiania Spigerwerk experiment. Much of our time was spent in joint discussion, prominently with the Norwegian trade union representatives who were led by the Vice-President of L.O. who was once a shop steward in Christiania Spigerwerk.

A description of the Norwegian experiment

3. We do not feel it necessary in this report to describe the C.I.É. experiment. However we believe that a brief summary of the Norwegian experiment would be helpful.

4. In Christiania Spigerwerk there is a large wire drawing shop. The object is to run wire through a series of dies thus reducing its circumference. Each machine draws the wire from a very large spool, runs it at high speed through a number of dies of narrowing gauge and winds it onto another very large spool. The worker therefore welds the wire from a new spool to the remaining wire when necessary, and at the end of a phase removes the wound up spool with a large hoist. In between while the machine is running he sits watching it, his principal function being to mend the wire if it should break. Up to the time of the experiment, the system was run on a one man one machine basis; in fact one man, in a special case, looked after two but this was exceptional.

5. The purpose of the experiment was to give the workers more job satisfaction, greater earning capacity and more sense of participation. Therefore six machines were selected and the five men concerned were asked to operate these machines as a team. The period of the experiment was three months; they had agreed to revert back to the old system in any event after that period while the assessment of the experiment took place; there was a guarantee against redundancy; there was a guarantee against a fall in income; the workers who took part in the experiment were volunteers; and an additional sum per hour was offered to them as an inducement.

6. We had arrived just after the three months period had been completed; the workers had just reverted back to the old system and the period of assessment between management and labour had just begun.

7. Another experiment was taking place in a paper and pulp works but we concentrated exclusively on the Christiania Spigerwerk experiment as a basis for our joint discussions.

8. Contrasting the experiments

An important contrast between the Norwegian experiment and the Irish experiment lies in this. In C.I.É. the Tavistock survey derived from a realisation of the instability in the work situation in C.I.É., and a desire to understand it more fully. In Norway on the other hand, the survey derived from a priori – even a doctrinaire – concept of industrial democracy. The trade unions as a matter of policy sought that actual representatives of the workers should be on the boards of management; certainly of public industries and desirably of all industries. The first survey of the Tavistock Institute therefore was to determine whether such representation led to an improvement of the workers' lot on the shop floor. It appeared to us that the result here was largely negative. Therefore another concept of industrial democracy emerged, that of greater participation by the workers in their work task essentially by creating a work situation which released a worker's initiative and creativity. There is no gainsaying the extraordinary importance of this objective; it is surely the keystone of industrial harmony. But there is a certain artificiality in calling it industrial democracy in the sense in which the phrase was originally used, although there may be a good reason for it in Norway.

First Conclusion

9. Our first conclusion then is this. A proper philosophy of work requires that the job be organised in a way that will permit the worker to exercise as much initiative as possible; but in developing this idea of local responsibility in Ireland, we should avoid the term industrial democracy because of its confusing overtones.

10. A further contrast between the Irish and the Norwegian experiment is this. While in C.I.É., the survey derived necessarily from the unstable work situation, in Norway the places chosen for examination were chosen precisely because the work situation was stable; because these workshops had enjoyed good industrial relations for a long period of time.

The philosophy of the Norwegian trade union movement

11. The Norwegian trade union movement is organised in the largely monolithic way which many of us are familiar with in Sweden and in some of the other European countries. It possesses large gracious buildings, it works closely with a Socialist government of long standing, and good sense and good order appear to prevail at all levels in its manifestly rational structure. Much of our time was spent in trying to determine how the worker on the shop floor far from the centre of important trade union activities, fitted into this structure, and whether, when all was said and done, he differed very much from his Irish counterpart.

12. Industrial negotiations proceed in Norway on the basis of regular agreements on wages and conditions, perhaps every two years or so against the background of a continuously growing economy since the war, the GNP increase per annum ranging from 4 to 7%. There is a much more sophisticated system of price control than we possess; and an escalator clause if the cost of living gets out of hand during the period of an agreement. By reason of the system of piece rates, there is fairly substantial wage drift, running to about 3% per annum. (In recent years as well the cost of living in Norway has risen somewhat more rapidly than in other European countries.) State mediators exist in order to assist in resolving disputes and a Labour Court sits for the purpose of determining differences in interpreting agreements.

13. The shop steward is of great significance. Normally he comes from the shop floor. He deals with the application of wages and conditions and the work situation generally. There are also production committees, tripartite bodies such as our productivity committees which, also like our productivity committees, may not invade the field of industrial relations. There are industrial branch committees which appeared to us to be similar to our adaptation committees; but in Norway they are tripartite, the unions being full members. There are no top level consultative committees, such as exist in C.I.É.

14. We explored the question of trade union membership of the industrial branch committees or what we would describe as adaptation councils. We asked how they would resolve a situation in which, by reason of their recommendation, 95% of the workers would benefit but 5% would be sacked. Where would they stand? They said it was far better to be within than without, and they would always be guided by the advice of the shop steward. This, however, does not resolve the dilemma; if indeed it is resolvable at all except in terms of our own solution of being associated with these councils but not being part of them. This is an aspect of the basic problem we now discuss.

15. The Trade Union in modern society

We offered the following proposition to our Norwegian colleagues. The function of a trade union on the shop floor is to represent the workers. Workers are normally conservative; they are fearful

of their security; they will tend to resist change. Trade unions must represent these fears in an articulate way; they must translate the problems and difficulties of the workers into terms which are meaningful to management and to planners; and they must insist that the workers' voice is heard in the workers' terms and his rights vindicated. On the other hand the trade union movement stands for progressive ideas in society for the benefit of the worker as a member of society generally. In order to achieve this, the trade union movement had to seek a radical change in society. While we pursued these changes at national level and while we pursued an improvement of the workers' position at shop floor level all was well. But now a new kind of planning of the shop floor is under way which frequently runs counter to the instincts of the worker. Where does the trade union stand then? Does the worker see the trade union as defending his interests, or does he see it as part of the planning machine, against which he must defend himself no less than against any other invader of his security. In this kind of situation whom can he trust?

16. We put the proposition another way? Isn't there a sense in which trade union leaders are among the privileged, part indeed of the establishment? On the other hand are not workers essentially not part of the establishment, tending to see themselves at times as the unsuccessful, in our society, as against the successful, the excluded against the included, the deprived as against the privileged? We emphasised that in this we did not urge any doctrinaire polarisation of society into haves and have nots, and we did not wish to urge that there was inherent unrest in such a situation. But workers needed to feel some security in a changing situation, and they had to look somewhere for this security.

17. It was clear from the reply from our Norwegian colleagues that they were fortunate in that a continuously expanding economy in Norway permitted growing incomes and compensations to act as a prop to the security of the workers. Nevertheless they too were profoundly conscious of this dilemma and it certainly had not been resolved.

18. In the Christiania Spigerwerk experiment, despite the guarantees and the money inducements, it had been difficult to get volunteers and they frankly confessed that in the last analysis the money inducement was probably the strongest factor in the workers' consenting.

19. They agreed with us that all this tended to create two kinds of trade union official, the planner, administrator and theoretician on the one hand, and on the other hand the shop floor representative, the shop steward. They agreed that they were growing apart and at times were not speaking the same language. Some of the Norwegian trade unionists believe that this must be resolved by training well-educated young men (not necessarily from the shop floor) in trade union schools directly for shop-steward work, but others took the opposite view, insisting that shop stewards should spring from the shop floor.

20. We pursued in the discussion the first suggestion asking if this did not mean the management of workers by trade unions rather than their representation by trade unions. To some of our trade unions colleagues the concept of trade unions managing workers came as no surprise.

Some general conclusions

21. It appears to us that the most important function of a trade union is to represent the aspirations and the needs of the workers in an articulate and meaningful way, and to insist vigorously, in justice and in prudence, on the vindication of their rights. This requires an identification of the

trade union official with his workers, and a relationship of trust between them which is paramount to all other considerations.

22. It is on the other hand essential that the trade union take part in national planning for economic and social development. The long-term interests of the workers and the interests of society demand it.

23. Yet a union representative must derive his point of view, and his source of activity from the shop floor (we use the term here generally) hot from his position as a joint member of a planning team. This may mean a slowness in cooperation at certain points, an irritating non-commitment, and may expose him to a charge of conservatism and lack of courage – even a charge of lack of leadership. Yet he owes his very presence at this level to his representative character.

24. It has been suggested to us that in distinguishing in this way between representing workers and managing workers we are overlooking the concept of leadership. We believe leadership can exist in both situations. Leadership in a more representative situation means understanding and interpreting the workers' views and giving them their maximum constructive expression, with a degree of inspiration which all leadership requires. But the starting point lies in the workers' views [,] not in one's own. On the other hand leadership in management means, as well, interpreting the workers' views and giving them constructive expression, but within a framework of objectives already determined. Here we must plead for humility. There are no grounds for believing – as this implies – that the worker is necessarily wrong if he adopts a contrary point of view.

25. One of the Tavistock research team in Norway, Dr. Emery, summarised the real problem on the shop floor as follows. Everybody will accept the idea of more freedom on the job. The real difficulty is in the translation of this into practice. In attempting to defend themselves in the past [,] workers tied the job down in strict terms, in what he called self-defence terms. If the worker is to achieve more freedom he will now have to throw away this major line of defence and accept another – perhaps less obvious line of defence as a substitute.

26. We believe that he will not do this unless he has representatives whom he trusts and who have explored the problem fully on his behalf. But this means his representatives must clearly stand with him before they stand with anyone else, concerned first with him before any other considerations. The national economic and social programme of the trade union movement must therefore be pursued within this framework, which means that the trade union of the future may well be an organisation of considerable internal tension and complexity. The trade union leader cannot afford to be fixed with the image of an amiable partner in modern planning and little more.

Peter Murray

Notes

1 National Archives of Ireland, Irish Congress of Trade Unions Papers, Box 218, File 3509 I.N.P.C. Human Sciences Committee, from December 1963 to December 1974.

2 See, for example, J.A. Jackson, "Research Policy and Practice in Ireland: A Historical Perspective" pp. 23-40, in M. MacLachlan and M. Caball (eds.), *Social Science in the Knowledge Society: Research Policy in Ireland* (Dublin: Liffey Press, 2004); B. Fanning and A. Hess, *Sociology in Ireland: A Short History* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2014).

3 See A. Carew, *Labour under the Marshall Plan: the Politics of Productivity and the Marketing of Management Science* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1987).

4 B. Boel, *The European Productivity Agency and Transatlantic Relations, 1953-1961* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 2003), p. 136.

5 A. Carew *Labour under the Marshall Plan*, pp. 192-3.
6 P. Murray, *Facilitating the Future? US Aid, European Integration and Irish Industrial Viability, 1948-73* (Dublin: UCD Press, 2009), pp. 41-4 and 74-81.
7 Ibid. pp. 66-72.
8 C.S. Andrews, *Man of No Property* (Dublin: Lilliput Press, 2001), p. 254 and p. 261.
9 C. McCarthy, *The Decade of Upheaval: Irish Trade Unions in the Nineteen Sixties* (Dublin: Institute of Public Administration, 1973), pp. 58-65.
10 See E. Trist and H. Murray (eds.), *The Social Engagement of the Social Sciences: A Tavistock Anthology* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990): also E. Miller (ed.) *The Tavistock Institute Contribution to Job and Organizational Design* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999).
11 P. Miller and N. Rose, "Mobilising the consumer: assembling the subject of consumption", *Theory, Culture and Society* Vol. 14, No. 1, 1996, pp. 19-23.
12 H. Van Beinum, *The Morale of the Dublin Busmen: A Socio-Diagnostic Study of the Dublin City Services of Córas Iompair Éireann* (Dublin: Irish National Productivity Committee, 1967): C. McCarthy, *The Decade of Upheaval*, pp. 65-6.
13 P. Murray, *The Pitfalls of Pioneering Sociological Research: The Case of the Tavistock Institute on the Dublin Buses in the early 1960s*, National Institute for Regional and Spatial Analysis (NIRSA) Working Paper, No.25, 2005, p. 13.
14 R.P.Amdam and O. Bjarner, "The regional dissemination of American productivity models in Norway in the 1950s and 1960s", pp. 91-112, in M. Kipping and O. Bjarner (eds.), *The Americanization of European Business: The Marshall Plan and the Transfer of US Management Models* (London: Routledge, 1998); M. Elden, "Sociotechnical systems ideas as public policy in Norway: empowering participation through worker-managed change", *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, Vol. 22, No. 3, 1986, pp. 239-255.
15 C. McCarthy, *Industrial Democracy* (Dublin: Catholic Communications Institute, 1971).
16 J. Logan "The making of a modern union: The Vocational Teachers Association 1954-1973", pp. 157-203, in J. Logan (ed.), *Teachers' Union: The Teachers Union of Ireland and its forerunners in Irish education, 1899-1994* (Dublin: A. & A. Farmar, 1999), p. 199.
17 C. McCarthy, *The Distasteful Challenge* (Dublin: Institute of Public Administration, 1968), pp. 100-2.
18 C. McCarthy, *The Decade of Upheaval*, p. 70.
19 C. McCarthy, *Industrial Democracy*, p. 39.