

## Care & service workers in Denmark and the question of trade union solidarity

*Lise Lotte Hansen, associate professor, Ph.D., Department of Society & Globalization and Centre for Gender, Power & Diversity, Roskilde University, Denmark. [Liselh@ruc.dk](mailto:Liselh@ruc.dk)*

*Work in progress – please do not quote without permission*

### Introduction

In Denmark paid domestic work, in the common use of the word, is almost non-existent. However, with a more broad definition four forms of work could be included. First, care-work including cleaning in private homes for the elderly, disabled and sick which is done by home-helpers (social- and health assistants) employed by the local authorities and paid through taxes. Childcare is also provided for by the public sector, most often in day care-centres for example kindergartens. This work is fully regulated and most workers are trade union members. Secondly, just like in other parts of Europe, the au-pair scheme is used by some families to get cheap domestic labour. However, the number of au-pairs is small all in all 2.409 and has been slightly decreasing since 2010; the far majority of the au-pairs come from the Philippines (1.950) and they are also those who are most likely to be ‘domestic workers’ (Ministeriet 2013). Nevertheless, the development in the mis/ use of the au-pairs speaks to a new tendency in the Danish labour market: the increase in ‘grey-zone’ work, the exploitation of vulnerable workers, and a rejection of both formal and informal rules and regulations by some employers. Thirdly, any additional need for cleaning, gardening, child-care, help at parties and so on for a couple of hours each week or occasionally will most often be carried out by a single person. This is often ‘supplementary work’, that is something you do along another job or when you are a student or retired. Pay is most often ‘in hand’ and contracts oral. Some of this work is done by migrants (some undocumented) or au-pairs who want to earn some extra money (this is not allowed and they risk deportation). So this type of work adds to the tendency to grey-zone work and exploitation of vulnerable workers. Finally, private sector service work, which only marginally can be included in the domestic work term, is in particular an example of the increase in informal work, self-employment and employers who do neither support formal nor informal regulations and rules.<sup>1</sup> Private sector service work includes cleaners, hotel-maids, cooks and other kitchen-staff, waiters and receptionists. Work range from fully regulated to undeclared and union membership is lower than in the public sector. Many workers are migrants or ethnic minorities and

many are women, too. Also many home-helpers belong to an ethnic minority group, and the vast majority of all workers in this field are women. Although most home-helpers are trade union members not many among the ethnic minority workers are active in their union or elected leaders. So in a Danish context it is not so much paid domestic work that is pushing for changes in labour market regulation and trade union solidarity, it is the globalization and Europeanization of work, workers and employers - *and* gendered and ethnic power regimes within trade unions and on the labour market.

In the Danish society workers' solidarity equates trade union solidarity. Danish trade unions represent an institutionalized solidarity in which the representation of interest in the bargaining system *and* political agency in the welfare society are main activities. Trade unions have both organizational and institutional power, and they are important agents for social justice in society. Yet, a major critique of traditional trade union solidarity is that it produces homogeneity and marginalization and that it is based on the interests and working conditions of the most powerful workers (Hyman 2001). Gender research shows how traditional solidarity discourses still are around in trade unions, and that democracy procedures and organizational practices contribute to the marginalization of women and ethnic minorities from leadership, and in some places even from membership (Briskin , Colgan & Ledwith 2002, Hansen 2004, Ledwith & Hansen 2013). In addition, Briskin argues that neo-liberalist globalization is not gender neutral, '*... race, gender, age and citizenship are deeply inscribed in corporate politics of competition*' (Briskin 2002:32). So the critique has become even more important when taking into consideration the processes of globalization and other parallel processes of change: The differentiation among workers and the diversity in employment, pay and working conditions have increased and so have most likely the range of interests, orientations, experiences, and norms and values among workers, too. This is also the case in the Danish LO-labour movement in which most leaders are white men over 50. Although challenged trade union culture is still very masculine, and we could add white and hetero-normative. However, the pressure from the rise in migrants and in informal work forces trade unions to rethink practices and agendas and this creates openings for change of gendered and ethnic power relations.<sup>2</sup>

Globalization is an ambivalent process. On the one hand it challenges rights, communities and social security, on the other it creates openings for new forms of action, alliances and social justice

demands; and on top of it all, it highlights the importance of solidarity perceptions and practices that cross national boundaries *and* of transnational interest representation (Foden et al 2001, Fraser 2008). According to Nolan & Slater 2010 – and in contrast to many diagnosis of society – manual work has neither disappeared nor severely decreased, but it has partly changed gender and occupation: in Britain the new manual worker is women care- and service workers.<sup>3</sup> In New York migrant women care- and service workers have mobilized and organized in trade unions and networks, and in doing so they have developed new forms of leadership practices and changed the image of a trade union leader (Alvarez & Whitefield 2013). In Denmark care-workers have been on strike fighting for higher wages, better working conditions and most remarkably for the recognition of care-work hereby challenging the devaluation of reproductive work in capitalism. So will it be women care- and service workers, of which many are migrants, who will renew the trade unions and become the basis for a new workers' solidarity?

The problem this paper wants to pursue is how solidarity among a widely diverse group of workers is produced, reproduced, transformed or even obstructed *and* with a specific focus on trade unions role in this.

The paper will discuss some major contributions in the solidarity and diversity literature in relation to migrant care- and service women workers in the Danish labour market. The objective is to make an overview of the discussion *and* to identify problems, points of tension, dilemmas, and needs for more knowledge. In bringing together different research traditions and use the migrant care- and service worker case as a looking-glass the wish is to contribute with new perspectives on workers' solidarity/ies today.

### **The question of workers' solidarity today**

One of the complications in debating solidarity is that it has both an 'is' *and* an 'ought to', both a descriptive analytical part *and* a more or less acknowledged prescriptive part: the ideal workers' solidarity. Despite that, in much of the discussion it is taken for granted what solidarity is; this in contrast to the many ways that solidarity is spoken about. The vocabulary of solidarity in IR-research includes collectivism, community, coalition-building, mobilization, identity and organising, and it touches related discussions on social in/justice, inclusive democracy and union

renewal. This makes us aware that workers' solidarity cannot be discussed without including how it is practised and how we term these forms of practice.

So this is the first two problems this paper wants to address. But also one more issue is of major interest: how do power relations influence on workers solidarity? One concern is of course the inclusion of 'the diverse' another is neo-liberal capitalism.

The following is organized into four closely related parts each addressing different parts of the solidarity discussion and each being the basis for the other.

### ***The solidarity basis and the question of ideology***

#### **The idea of solidarity**

In sociological theory the foundation of solidarity is the production and reproduction of social ties. In traditional labour solidarity the social tie was made up by the working class and the oppositional and hierarchical relationship to the capitalist class. Working-class solidarity should lead not only to the liberation of workers from exploitation and oppression, but also to the realisation of workers' interests and a new society. However, traditional labour solidarity was built on an understanding of workers belonging to one community based on likeness in working conditions and life experiences. Moreover, traditional labour solidarity was regarded as more than just a description of a specific kind of solidarity - it was turned into an ideal. Consequently leading to the understanding that labour solidarity was about to disappear when the crisis of the (European) labour movement started in the late 1980's. During the last two decades, the traditional understanding of worker's solidarity has been criticized by both IR-researchers and trade union leaders (e.g. Hyman 2001, Valkenburg & Zoll 1995, Zoll 2000).

To Hyman (1999, 2001) traditional labour solidarity had many features in common with mechanical solidarity since it was built on the understanding of relative homogeneity in working conditions, uniformity in interests and standardization of rules and values among all workers with some minor differences between trade unions. However, workers have become increasingly more differentiated, work-processes have changed, and egalitarian ideals have been eroded, all leading to a downfall of traditional labour solidarity. Moreover, traditional labour solidarity is and was imaginary: what was represented as general interests of all workers were often the representation of particular interests decided by strong groups of core workers (typically male and white). Not only did some workers'

interests count for most, also some interests were not regarded relevant for bargaining e.g. interests related to family responsibilities; the conception of a worker was a full-time male wage-worker 'in mine, mill or factory' despite the fact that many women were on the labour market, too, and moreover, many men were in more insecure jobs.

So '*If solidarity is to survive, it must be reinvented*' Hyman states (1999:107). He uses Durkheim's concept of organic solidarity to argue for a labour solidarity that is more flexible and in which coordination of the more differentiated working conditions, identities, and interests among the membership (workers) is significant: the task is to be both attentive to expectations and experiences of both members and potential members *and* to make an agenda that can unite rather than divide. It is important to be aware that this is not only the case within the individual trade union, but also between unions within the same national context and between workers (labour movements) in different countries. Hyman acknowledges that this is a very difficult task which demands continuous processes of negotiation; neither voting nor top-down decisions can create organic solidarity. However, not only organization and negotiations are needed but also a clear response to the new ideological challenges is necessary – the labour movement has to re-strengthen its ideological base and reclaim the central themes of flexibility, security and opportunity. Moreover, it is important to create structures and mechanisms which support membership participation. Finally, trade unions should become virtual and use the strengths of modern information technologies. '*With imagination, unions may transform themselves and build an emancipatory potential for labour in the new millennium*' (Hyman 1999:112).

Another rethinking of solidarity in the IR-tradition comes from Zoll (2000, with Valkenburg 1995). Whereas the feminist IR-researchers and Hyman all point to gender-power relations (and other power relations) inside and outside trade unions as the main obstacle to solidarity, Zoll points to the increasing individualization, differentiation and pluralism as a challenge to solidarity. Like Hyman, Zoll turns to Durkheim to explain the shift in solidarity and to argue for a solidarity based on diversity. However, Zoll turns to other theories on solidarity and community, too, and therefore outlines other problems and possibilities. Firstly, he argues that solidarity has to build on a basic kind of equality, not equality understood as uniformity or sameness, but equality as based on the acknowledgement of belonging to a common humanity; this will be the only way to be inclusive to the 'stranger'. Secondly, he stresses that trade union solidarity has to be practised through everyday life and be based on close relations. Accordingly, trade union leaders must act together with

members and policy development be based on dialogue not on top-down communication (Zoll 1999, Valkenburg & Zoll 1995). Valkenburg who writes together with Zoll (Valkenburg & Zoll 1995) brings the argument even further as he stresses that trade unions should take advantage of the critical reflectivity of the late-modernity individuals in policy-making and organisational development and for that create processes that would generate solidarity instead of dismantling it.

But where have all the power gone? Hyman's and Zoll's turn away from a traditional Marxist understanding of solidarity has also meant that power relations as producer of worker's solidarity fade into the background, and moreover, that power relations within trade unions dissolves if only solidarity is done in the right way.

In contrast, power, class and conflict are central to Lindberg & Neergaard (2013a). They, partly on the basis of the books 'contributed chapters, discuss how power, capitalism and workers' communities and protest should be theorized and are practiced today. Today's society is characterized by two processes: changes in production and changes in regulation. These processes produce new types of problems for workers and trade unions and they are the basis for new conflicts and struggles on the labour market. The changes in production have two sides: the organization of production in networks and the increase in informal jobs and the rise of a 'precariat'. 'The globalization of capitalism and its' 'financialization'(...) in combination with permanent high unemployment create a pressure on pay and other conditions' (Lindberg & Neergaard 2013b:15).<sup>4</sup> They are concerned with how the hegemonic discourse on the powerlessness of state regulation and the democracy covers for how states have loosened regulation of capital and a made a harder regulation '...of workers, citizens and in between people among other things in the form of less economic and social security and considerable more surveillance'(Lindberg & Neergaard 2013b:16, with reference to Sasson 2012). This situation means that trade union power, worker's collectivism and 'contracts' between employers' organizations and trade unions like in the Nordic 'class compromise' labour market model are challenged. Trade unions have to acknowledge these structural changes, and also to construct a much broader 'we'. To do this trade unions could learn from their history as social movements, but Lindberg & Neergaard also raises the question: is it all about class conflict and exploitation of workers 'in a new dress' or are the structural changes also a sign of a broader conflictual relationship, and therefore also a much broader union agenda? They, together with Bengtson 2013, turn to Polanyi and to the sociologist Beverly Silver's

combination of a Marxist and a Polanian approach. For Polanyi the major conflict in capitalism is between market and society not labour and capital. The shift from Marx to Polanyi or maybe rather the combination of the two leads to a double perspective of exploitation of workers *and* the commodification of labour, land and money as the forces of conflict, protest and workers' organization. Crisis in legitimacy in capitalism leads more or less automatically to protests and to workers organization, but whether trade unions succeed depend on their structural and organizational power resources. Structural power resources are about how attractive the group of workers is on the market and how important they are for the production. Organizational power resources are about how workers are organized, their ideological strength and their alliances.<sup>5</sup> From a gender perspective it would be worth considering if commodification of care should be the fourth force of conflict and collectivism.<sup>6</sup> The increase in the commercialization of care in the Nordic countries where a large public sector is cut down and continuously the subject of strict(er) control with employees have already led to struggles on the respect of care-work which includes more autonomy to workers, more time with the citizen and the reclaim of 'care' in care-work. Also the informalization of care-work incl. the rise in 'atypical' and grey-zone work in both North and South is the basis for conflict.

Another important contribution comes from Jodi Dean who takes her starting point in gender research. She rightly criticises conventional (interest) solidarity for producing uniformity and exclusions, but instead of rethinking interest communities to be more inclusive to diversity (like Hyman, Zoll and Briskin do) she thinks that conventional solidarity is in direct opposition to diversity not only in practice but also in principle.

Dean's concept of reflective solidarity is defined as '*the mutual expectation of a responsible orientation to relationship*'. It arises through dialogue, critique and confrontation not within a specific group: the 'we' of reflective solidarity is not 'us against them', it is a 'we' in process, constantly produced, reproduced and transformed through dialogue. It builds on two terms: '*...that of opposition to those who would exclude or oppress another and that of our mutual recognition of each other's specificity*'. Moreover, the communicative action has to include a 'third person'; this perspective of a situated third will ensure that not only I and you are included; it is a perspective of accountability that '*...enables us to move from our specificities to our interconnections*'. To Dean reflective solidarity is about coalition-building among self-reflective individuals who do not know who 'we' are; it does not presuppose likeliness or a stable community of interests rather it promotes

disagreement and critique in order to open for more complex analysis and new sites of resistance; and its most distinguished objective is to transform barriers into resources. Dean argues that we have to work towards reflective solidarity as it is the only way that we can include 'difference' in solidarity. Neither affectional nor conventional solidarities will be able to do that as they '*...have built in limits that prevent their extension beyond a particular group*'. Moreover, the demands to uniformity within conventional solidarity are challenged in late modernity. Dean suggests that we need trust, historical awareness, and to be able to include the perspective of a 'third person' to establish a communicative practice, that will lead to reflective solidarity.

In Deans understanding the production and reproduction of social ties is the result of 'a responsible orientation to relationships'. The mean is the dialogue - which shows her close relations to the Frankfurter School and Habermas' theory. The general critique, that such a thing as powerless communication is not possible at all, is of course also relevant here. However, I will, based on my own research, elaborate on that. To begin with, a traditional trade union leader is the one who shows power, strength and the ability to make fast, difficult decisions alone; so to build a leadership on dialogue will of many be regarded the same as showing weakness and will moreover, include the risk of not being re-elected. Also it is about not being able to speak the language of inclusion, not to master the dialogue – and maybe about loosing masculine identity, too. Finally, not all master to speak up for themselves especially not in conflicts with employers or in the public, in that sense the dialogue is an elitist approach; some members/workers need others to speak up for them; need someone to represent their interests (although this of course should not be a bad excuse for not empowering members to speak for themselves). However, Dean is mostly concerned with overcoming the problems of identity-politics and she does not discuss power relations building on economic structures nor political struggles related to economy. Consequently, she ignores the economic power structures in neo-liberal capitalism and how the labour market works in general: Giving up interest communities would leave workers without representation and also mean giving up an important power resource: workers collectivism. The decline in trade unionism has already led to a representation gap and an increase in income inequality in many countries (Heery 2009). At the Danish labour market this would also threaten social cohesion in society as such. In her eagerness to overcome the problems of identity politics Dean does not acknowledge how problems of diversity are the result of both misrecognition and maldistribution and how these can affect and increase each other (see also Fraser 2003). In the same line of argument it is important to ask if borders only exclude or if they may protect, too?



So just like with Durkheim's concept of organic solidarity we cannot turn reflective solidarity directly into workers' solidarity. Workers' solidarity has to be both more and less than reflective solidarity. So what can we learn from Dean? Dean's communicative practice of confrontation and dialogue as the way to establish a reflective solidarity could be a way forward: Dialogue *is* possible as a mean of inclusion and cultural change, yet, it has to be combined with strategies that supports this (Hansen 2010a). Another important contribution from Dean is her idea of non-identity coalitions. My concept of 'action solidarity' is an example of this. The inspiration comes from Young's discussion of seriality and women as a social collective (Young 1995). In opposition to theories that presuppose a community building on a common identity as the foundation for action and change (e.g. Colgan & Ledwith 2002), I see collective action as the foundation for making community and solidarity. Workers are brought together through a common feeling of injustice that arises from concrete situations of exclusion, disrespect and maldistribution at the labour market, in trade unions and in society in general. Community is created when collective action is directed against those actions that placed the workers in a common situation of injustice. This community is a liquid community that crosses gender, sex, ethnicities, education, jobs, union positions and interests. However, it could also be the basis for a more permanent 'action solidarity': that through taking part in different action communities you will extent your care, trust and feelings to a wider range of fellow workers/union members; you will through practice be able to extend reflective solidarity to include the 'stranger'; and you will regard the likeness to other workers instead of just the differences. Yet, neither Dean nor Fraser and Young discuss agency or rather they do, but not in the sense of who will make coalition-building/strategies for change/collective action happen. Apparently in their understanding we are all agents for solidarity and change, which in my understanding bears the risk of no agency. Someone has to pick up the feeling/experience of injustice, to facilitate dialogue, and to support action. It requires good leadership (Colgan & Ledwith 2002, Kelly 1998), and furthermore, it is important to have some kind of superstructure in trade unions which will make up the frame for collective action and coordination.

This corresponds very well to Briskin's concept of 'unity in diversity', *'Taking account of differences in power and experience does not create divisions among union members; rather, it acknowledges existing differences. In so doing, the unions build equality in practice, and increase the potential for a transformed, inclusive and activist union which moves beyond 'defensive'*

*solidarity*' (Briskin 1999:551). In order to address problems of diversity and competition, it will not be sufficient to call for solidarity abstractly or to seek a common denominator like class: to create solidarity and to strengthen trade unions it is necessary to address discrimination based not only on gender, but also on race, ethnicity, citizenship, ability, age, and sexuality. And this should be done both inside the labour movement and in the labour market (Briskin 2002:31). Briskin is concerned with the making of inclusive trade union structures which both give women a political base *and* do not lead to separatism. Moreover she discusses coalition-building both among women across trade unions, women's movement, community organising *and* across different equity seeking groups (e.g. women, ethnic minorities, gays & lesbians) within trade unions. She shows how coalition work among women in Canada has redefined both the ideology and the practice of union solidarity. In globalization coalition-building must expand both nationally and transnationally in order to be able to make resistance.

### ***Collectivism***

#### Solidarity in praxis

Collectivism and collective action are fundamental to the understanding of workers' solidarity; collectivism being the basic power resource for trade unions and the primary way to '*...partly offset the structured imbalance of power which confronts them*' (Hyman 1994/95: 128-129). Kelly (1998) develops with the inspiration from Tilly a mobilization theory which has in its' heart to understand '*...how individuals are transformed into collective actors willing and able to sustain collective organisation and engage in collective action...*' (Kelly 1998:38). It provides us with a general framework that comprises of interests, mobilization, organization, opportunity and forms of collective action; and a specific framework which focuses on injustice, agency, identity, and '*attributions in the ways people define their interests*' (Kelly 1998:38).

The struggle for social justice is in the core of labour solidarity and an important part in the understanding of workers' collective action according to Kelly; the interest concerns both how the feeling of social justice arises, and how it is turned into collective action. Kelly emphasis three aspects: attribution, social identification and leadership. '*It is vital that aggrieved individuals blame an agency for their problems, rather than attributing them to uncontrollable forces or events. That agency can then become the target for collective organization and action. Social identification entails the processes whereby people develop a sense of themselves as a distinct group, 'we',*

*defined in opposition to an outgroup, 'them' which has different interests and values. Both attributions and social identities are socially constructed by activists or leaders (Kelly 1998: 29-30).*

In Lysgaard's (1967) classic study of a workers' collective this is defined as an informal community among workers in a workplace/company. It produces norms and values on how to be a good co-worker, and it is a protection against the employer/the management in everyday life. Strong norms and values create an 'us', the workers, against a 'them', the management. The collective is a result partly of the working conditions and partly of three processes: the interpretation of problems, interaction, and identification. These processes are close interlinked and more or less presuppose each other. The interpretation of problems builds on the understanding that the conditions on the workplace make workers aware about the fundamental dilemmas in their employment contract. The awareness emerges from two types of social ties: interaction which is about joint action *and* identification which is about sense of community. Interaction demands some sort of nearness while identification demands some sort of likeness. The development and the reproduction of the collective depend on the collective's ability to control the three processes *and* the working conditions and the work situation in the workplace/company (Lysgaard 1967:156).

Lysgaard's research and the latter studies by Andersen (2003) and Caraker (2008) all point at the importance of homogeneity for the development of a workers' collective. But this is questioned by Healy et al (2004) who show how diversity can create the foundation for workers' collectivism. Healy et al argue that a differentiated workforce may both contribute to union renewal and develop new more creative ways of collectivism. They break down the discussion of collectivism into three: solidaristic collectivism, instrumental collectivism, and limits to collectivism. During that, Healy et al shed light on the relation between collectivistic values and the differentiation of the workforce showing that ethnic minority women relate to collectivistic values although these are not only class-based but also originate from other types of power relations and collective responses like for example women's movement or equal opportunity struggles. So Healy et al do not only show how collectivism can build on diversity, they also add an external dimension to the making of workplace collectivism – that experiences outside work can influence collectivism at work. On the whole, Healy et al emphasize the importance of power in relation to ethnic minority women's experience of marginalisation and succeeding commitment to trade union collectivism, but also in the sense of

getting power-resources both as individuals and as a collective through trade union involvement. However, they also show how gender, ethnicity and class power relations intersect and influence on equality and diversity strategies within trade unions.

McBride and Martinez Lucio (2011) underline, that collectivism has many forms and that it is both workplace internal and external. Workplace collectivism is linked to trade union collectivism and to collectivism of everyday life and can be extended to regional industry workplace collectivism.<sup>7</sup>

Klandermans (2001) asks the questions, ‘Does, did and why should class unite?’ and he answers that neither in or of itself class unites, but that solidarity can be constructed on the basis of ‘common fate’ and that this will have some relation to class. Yet, to transform discontent into social action agency is needed; he underlines that different actors are competing for ‘people’s hearts and minds’, trade unions only being one voice in the field (Klandermans 2001:331-332). The latter speaks to Healy et al and McBride and Martinez Lucio who question whether we at all can see an increase in individualism and a decline in collectivism at most workplaces today.<sup>8</sup> They argue that the term collectivism is often used in managerial literature to explain employer-led strategies ‘...to create corporate or team based loyalty’ (McBride & Martinez Lucio 2011:796). In all three contributions the point is that feelings of injustice and experiences of collectivism will not in themselves create a workers’ collective – agency, organizing, mobilization are needed, too. Healy et al (2004) underlines that collectivistic orientations have to be developed, fought for and maintained by individuals.

Moreover, awareness to gendered and ethnic power relations within the workplace and the workers collective is important (Healy et al) including making a culture of mutual respect. Hansen (2010a) shows how exchange both as dialogue and as participatory practice can create communities based on diversity.

### ***Identity & social ties among workers***

#### **The question of a common identity as the basis of solidarity**

The discussion about collectivism highlights, that identification with a workers collective is produced through many sources *and* does not only and not by itself grow from class. So has class no longer anything to do with workers’ identity and solidarity? And if not, what should then replace class?

Klandermans (2001) asks if class alone can unify today. He points out, firstly that workers' identities are intersected by many other power relations; secondly, that agency in the form of leadership is necessary if an identity as worker is to be the basis for collectivism. Gender research speaks about complex (fractured) identities and the importance of coalition-policies (Briskin 2002, Bradley 1996, Dean 1996; Yuval-Davies). In gender research the concept of intersectionality has gained increasing importance. The fundamental idea is that power relations are interwoven; it is therefore no longer meaningful to speak of a worker without including ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality and so on. However, gender research shows that gender in itself can create strong social ties among women, too (Colgan & Ledwith 2000, Hansen 2010b, Ledwith 2006). Also new forms of leadership can create new identity positions. Thus it is important to point out that a worker's identity is created in context (Ledwith & Hansen 2013), and that different contexts produce diverging hierarchies among identities even in the same person e.g. sometimes being a mother is the most important, sometimes being a worker (Klandermans 2001:328-329). The processes of identification, that has cognitive, evaluative and affective aspects, is important for the development of a class identity or any other identity and therefore to the making of social bonds within a social category or not. Also how you are treated, including spoken about, influences on the identification: if class is never spoken about, or mainly as a negative positioning like in the working class studies by Beverly Skeggs, you are less likely to identify with class/working class, or on the other hand, if you are always treated as a women or ethnic minority, but not a trade union member, this also influences the process of identification. Another important point is that competing identifications like with the company is gaining terrain while supporting sources like socialism is losing terrain (Klandermans 2001).

This raises a lot of questions:

- Should we speak of a worker's identity as the basis for solidarity among workers? And if so, how is this produced? As a result of fundamental conflicts in the labour market and society? Or as actual experiences of injustice in the work place? And what about agency?
- Could a worker's identity include interwoven power relations like in Squires and Yuval-Davies' understanding of transversal politics? Transversal policies are, according to Judith Squires (2010:87), characterized by three features: Firstly, a dialogical standpoint epistemology that acknowledges the existence of different standpoints and through dialogue between these will make a fuller knowledge and better possibilities for action; secondly, the principle of encompassment which means both to recognize that differences are important

and to let these be covered completely by a broader commitment to equality; and thirdly, a distinction between positioning, identity and values so being aware that people within the same category may have different social and political values.<sup>9</sup>

- Would it be better to talk about shifting and liquid identities? And for example in some situations how it is a common identity as women that produces social ties, and in other times as trade union member?
- Or should we rather not aim at identifying a common identity at all and then study the production and reproduction of social ties as the result of common action against experienced injustices? Which sometimes includes all sorts of workers, sometimes only manifold women and other times manifold men?
- And what about class?

Different identities and combination of identities gives different advantages and disadvantages – also inside trade unions (Bradley). So when looking for if and how a common identity is produced it is important to be aware about this. Gender research has shown how white men are privileged in trade unions and women disadvantaged, but what happens when we add ethnicity and sexuality? Intersectionality research suggests examining this on several levels: institutionally (e.g. trade union democracy, rule book, leadership), intersubjectively (relations of ‘love’ and power among actual persons e.g. among trade union leaders or/and members), and representationally (in ideologies, symbols and images e.g. class-solidarity, ‘the right leader for us’ and so on) (Yuval-Davies 2006; Christensen & Siim 2006). Another approach comes from Connells understanding of masculinities, and how some masculinities become hegemonic and others subordinated (Connell 2005); part of this discussion is also how white male manual workers are losing privileges in the labour market and in society (Faber 2006; Walby ??), and now are challenged in trade unions.

## ***Organizations***

### Solidarity organizations

The prime solidarity organization for workers is trade unions. They are the organized and institutionalized workers’ solidarity. Thus solidarity is embedded in democracy structures, leadership practices and organizational cultures as well as in ideology and union agenda.

Even though all trade unions are involved in pay-bargaining/regulation, are defending workers against employers and are part of a society which they on the one hand try to change, and which on the other hand limits trade union activities their priorities can vary (Hyman 2001:3-4). Hyman (2001) distinguishes between three different strategic orientations: ‘business unions’ which focus on workers’ interests on the market, ‘social-integrative’ unions which have a broad social justice agenda, and ‘radical-oppositional’ trade unions which see themselves as part of a class struggle. Most trade unions will be a mixture of all three, but with a preference for one or two of the orientations. Danish trade unions are oriented to interest representation on the market and social justice in the welfare society and much less, and mainly historical, to class. Hyman focuses on external power relations and activities, but trade unions are also created and maintained on the basis of internal power relations and activities. Most trade unions are representative democracies, in which members elect leaders and in which all in principle are eligible and have influence on interest representation and policy-making. It results in a focus on bureaucracy, hierarchy, centralization and service which also means that emphasis is on decision-making processes and structures maybe even more than on the result of the decisions (Colgan & Ledwith 2002, Waddington & Kerr 2000). In this model leadership becomes very important because members transfer power and agency to the leaders; moreover, members are an important power resource which can be called for in industrial action. This leads to the important question: ‘How can **all** workers ensure that power over them is used in the interest **of everyone**’ (McBride 2001:14 paraphrasing Hyman 1975). Implying that conflicts of interests are also present in trade unions, and not only between members and leaders, but also among leaders and among members (Colgan & Ledwith 2002).

However, the legitimacy of the traditional trade union democracy is challenged: on the one hand by a fall in activity among members and on the other, tendencies to one way top-down communication and distance between members and in particular national leaders (Madsen 1996). Moreover, the democracy model cannot guarantee that the leadership reflects the membership: a vast majority of the elected leaders are white middle-aged men. Informal election procedures, the image of a man as the ‘right’ leader, a strong commitment to merit as the election principle, male oligarchies and a closed union culture reproduce trade unions as white, middle-aged and masculine (Briskin; Colgan & Ledwith 2002; Hansen 2013; Pocock 1997). This has led to a discussion of inclusive democracies. Colgan & Ledwith (2002) discuss gender and democracy in British trade unions; they show how self-organisation has increased the feeling of belonging and made women more active

also in mainstream structures. Briskin (1999, 2002) also discusses inclusiveness, yet in Canadian trade unions. She is particularly interested in pro-active self-organisation and coalition-building among different ‘equity-seeking’ groups. Also leadership has been discussed and many more forms have been identified – and taught; it is discussed if women and men prefer and perform different forms of leadership and moreover, do the same type differently (Briskin; Hansen 2008; Pocock & Brown 2013). In Hansen & Ledwith (2013) it is indicated that a manifold of women has been the driving force in developing new forms of leadership. Other changes have been brought forward by union renewal strategies. Heery (2009) identifies two broad lines of arguments in the debate; the one is about re/gaining power at the labour market through organizing strategies and coalition-building, the other about strengthening unions through responding more actively to the interests of different identity-groups e.g. women workers. A new perspective is workers’ representation outside unions which has generally been seen as a way to replace unions with less powerful collectives or even individuals, but more recently it is discussed if non-union representation and union representation in some situations can reinforce each other. In the UK and the US, where trade unions are less strong than in for example Denmark, migrant networks and ethnic minority groups also engage in workers’ representation and work together with trade unions in campaigns for rights and pay. Also returning to the historical roots of the labour movement is part of the debate about trade union renewal. Hereby indicating, that trade unions should be closer to members’ and workers’ everyday life, and that they should be more like a social movement and develop democracy structures that support participation.

However, building collective solidarity is not only about organisation and structures, ‘...just as fundamentally it is part of a battle of ideas (...) Unions have to recapture the ideological initiative. To remain significant agents of social and economic mobilization, unions need new utopias...’ (Hyman 2001:173). Trade unions have to be responsive to the horizontal and vertical differentiation among workers: they must be alert to the altered expectations and needs *and* at the same time construct an agenda that unites rather than divides. This cannot be done as a top-down decision or even as a majority vote, but has to involve continuous processes of negotiation (Hyman 1999: 107-108). A starting point should be to put aside the demands and policy-goals based on male manual workers in stable employments in big industrial plants because these jobs are in the minority now and because they all the time have shadowed for the variety of jobs and life experiences among



workers; it is much more import to reclaim and reformulate the concepts of flexibility, security and opportunity from the employers and the political right (Hyman 1999), and to act transnationally.

### **Discussion: confronting the solidarity discussion with the Danish case**

So what happens to the Danish trade union solidarity when workers and members are becoming more diverse not only in culture, but also in working conditions, rights and pay? And what happens to migrants' solidarity perceptions and practices? Is something new evolving? How does it influence on the concepts and theories of solidarity? And what do we need to know more about?

The following discussion builds on previous research about gender equality policies (Hansen 2004), gender equality and fair representation in 3F (Hansen 2008, 2010a), and global domestic workers at the Danish labour market (Hansen 2010b) as well as ongoing research about the making of a diversity democracy in the Danish trade union 3F. Moreover, research reports in particular Liversage et al 2013, a student bachelor and a master thesis (Andersen et al 2012; Raunkjær & Rohde 2012) and a new book about Philippine women migrants in DK (Andersen 2013) will be included.<sup>10</sup>

### ***Migrant care- and service workers on the Danish labour market***

Labour market regulation in Denmark is to a wide extent the result of agreements based on collective bargaining between employers' organizations and trade unions. This depends on an organized labour market and it makes trade union membership very important for the individual worker. Both are challenged by the increasing migration and rise in informal work, and furthermore, a rising disloyalty to the model from some employers. In continuation of the tradition trade unions have chosen to strengthen the organization of migrant workers, but some workers are difficult to organize (Hansen 2010; FAOS). Furthermore, the rise in grey-zone work undermines both pay and working conditions, but often in a way that trade unions have problems going up against with the means and rights they have now. This situation makes it difficult for trade unions to defend all workers *and* it affects their strength in the labour market. However, some trade unions have chosen additional strategies. FOA offers the au-pairs membership despite their lack of a working permit. 3F has agreed on a diversity strategy in which the objectives are equal representation of all membership groups and a more inclusive union culture.

***From hotel maid to au-pair: Philippine women migrants from the 1970's to now***

In the beginning of the 1970's a big group of Philippine women workers arrived to Denmark to work as hotel maids. The women from this first wave of Philippine women migrants tell about a close community between them, and also about being organized in trade unions almost automatically. It is even said that it was the employer who enrolled them in the union (Andersen 2013: 144), however, the relationship between the migrant workers and the trade union was not without problems, and many of the women did not find out what a union really was before they changed jobs and joined the KAD (The Women Workers Trade Union in Denmark). But at the workplace the collective was strong; and here the women stuck together for their rights and for making the workday easier. Also in their spare time the Philippine women had a strong community, many lived in the same neighbourhood and went out dancing with each other or organised social events between them. Later in life some also made friends with work-mates from other migrant groups or Danish women, and some married Danish men. Many stayed on and the Philippine community in Denmark has now more than 10.000 members and about 10 organisations founded by Philipines either alone or in cooperation with Danish organisations and individuals.

But what about the Philippine women migrants of today? The immigration regime has changed since the 1970's. Work migration inside the EU, or in the right terminology: the free movement of goods and labour, has become easier and in particular workers from the former East-Europe go to Denmark; on the other hand work migration from countries outside the EU has become very difficult. This is one of the reasons why most Philippine women migrants enter Denmark as au-pairs. Another is that there is a market for au-pairing: For families (dual as single) with several children and demanding jobs it is difficult to manage the home too, and often also to live up to their own expectations of for example how long many hours their children should stay in the kindergarten. On top of that many families think it is too expensive to pay for a house-keeper or a nanny if necessary in combination with a cleaner (Liversage, Bille & Jakobsen 2013).

In contrast to the first generation of women migrants, the au-pairs enter into an unsecure situation. They are in a grey-zone in which many think upon themselves as workers and are treated so, however, their residence permit is tied to a cultural exchange scheme. This means that they are neither protected by labour market regulation and collective agreements, nor can they be ordinary union members and have direct interest representation. This reinforces the permanent imbalance in

the relationship between the women who are migrated to help their families or themselves to a better future and the Danish families of which most have good educations and are in high-paid and secure jobs. Despite the wish of many families to treat the au-pair on equal footing, it cannot remove the basic unequal and hierarchical relation. Living in enforce the dependency: so it is not only about having to earn money and make your way in a new country, it is also about having a home in which you feel safe and comfortable. However, the Nordic striving for equality (Liversage et al 2013) and the lack of acknowledgement of the employment relationship make to a high degree the inequality and the dependency invisible. Very many of the problems reported by au-pairs and the host families relate to the invisible inequality in their relationship e.g. that the au-pair does not dare to say no to a job or does not want to ask for help, and on the other hand that host families expect the au-pairs to do so. Other problems arise if there is too much difference in the expectations to the arrangement for example that the family wants the au-pair to be part of the family and the au-pairs only wants an employment relationship. Only very few among the Danish au-pairs are directly assaulted by their host families, but some are misused and exploited: they have to work many more hours than agreed sometimes 50-60 hours a week or they have to do jobs they are not obliged to according to the agreement. The flexibility in the living in and the family role of the au-pair make it difficult to separate what is work from family time e.g. on holidays. Some have also experienced to be threatened with being sent home or reported to the police for working extra if they refuse to do a job or to be available all the time (Liversage et al 2013).

Most au-pairs do not report the misuse, but use their network to find another host family or go to the trade union FOA (Trade & Labour) or any of the au-pair help organizations. FOA offers the au-pairs membership despite their lack of a working permit, but they have only limited means to defend the au-pairs' rights and interests. The au-pairs have their own network in the union for mutual support, and FOA helps by confronting families/employers who break the au-pair agreement or by taking cases to court. Especially the contact with host families has been successful, and some au-pairs use their contact with FOA's to make the families respect their rights. In the beginning it was difficult to get the au-pairs to be active, but now the network is up and running; this was very much because of a great effort from one Philippine au-pair who is now employed by FOA to take care of both organizing and assisting au-pairs (see also Andersen 2013). Moreover, FOA has been a very important part in getting and keeping the au-pair problem on the agenda in the labour movement and in the public debate – they have, together with other agents - to a high degree been

able to define the agenda. FOA works at getting the au-pairs recognised as domestic workers, but it is a 'long and bumpy road'. Partly together with the LO (The Danish Confederation of Trade Unions) and the ITUC they push for including the au-pairs in the ILO convention 'Decent Work for Domestic Workers' and to make Denmark sign the convention. FOA works together with Philippine networks and organisations, including transnational, and with one of the Catholic churches in Copenhagen. Union leaders also take part in meetings and other social events in the migrant communities. The male union leader responsible for the au-pair field emphasizes that he has learned a lot about this new way of organizing and in working together with CSO's, yet it has also been difficult sometimes (Hansen 2010); it has been an eye-opening experience and an opportunity for the trade union to reinvent the union in changing the focus to the everyday life of the members which includes all aspects of life and not only pay and working conditions (Andersen 2013:245). FOA is cooperating with KIT (The Church Integration Service) about the Au Pair Network, included in the network are also Ukraine and Philippine organisations. The network organizes information meetings for families *and* au-pairs, social events and language courses. It makes contacts between families and au-pairs, has a help-hotline and offers legal help. The NGO the Danish Refugee Council runs the 'Au pair Support' which also offers information and counselling. Yet, internally the social ties among the members and leaders in FOA could be stronger - maybe produced in a mutual struggle for respect of care work and workers *and* higher pay. This would also strengthen the prime trade union power resource: the collective.<sup>11</sup>

Much of the research about collectivism has been made in big and often industrial workplaces. So does a workers' collective evolve when you work alone 'caring, cooking and cleaning' in a private home and if so, how? Just like in the literature solidarity and collectivism have many sources and forms. The au-pairs do not have the nearness of working together, but many have comradeships outside the home and meet up in their spare time or in language school, a kind of everyday collectivism. They use each other to discuss 'work' problems and find solutions which in some sense correspond to Lysgaard's three social processes of interaction, identification and problem interpretation although the last process is less structural and more practical. In the problem interpretation the agency of FOA plays an important part, too. Also the mutual migrant history within the Philippine migrant community is a source of solidarity experience and memoirs. They have a tradition of successful fights for their rights both together and in trade unions. Also the

tradition of helping each other to jobs and other forms of support as well as the strong family ties carry experiences of social injustice and the need for solidarity.<sup>12</sup>

The first generation of Philippine women workers had and has strong networks among themselves in the workplace and outside. Despite their original plan many of them settled down in Denmark and some married Danish men. Many of the au-pairs have family relations to the first generation and therefore they also have access to strong networks in Denmark. Besides providing company and support, the networks may help finding a new family when needed. Some of the networks are informal between friends and former colleagues while others are formalized organisations. They make cultural and social arrangements and inform about rights, but they do not directly representing Philippine workers' interests. This is still a case for the trade unions. The tendency is not that the networks and the trade union compete with each other, but rather works together. They are more like parallel solidarities, and maybe even mutual supporting solidarities.<sup>13</sup>

However, some au-pairs are isolated and not taking part in any of the organized activities and not all in the old Philippine community were happy about the arrival of the au-pairs. They feared that their privileged position among work migrants in Denmark was threatened of these 'precarious workers'. In the same way as many Philippines hotel maids have experienced in the hotel-business where Eastern Europe workers are taking over often to a lower pay and with more unsecure rights (Andersen 2013); the Eastern European workers are also difficult to organize and are often outside the workers collective, and therefore they make up a threat to the rights and pay of all the workers (STUDENT). But in general the Philippine workers are a strong community across generations and jobs mainly because of their mutual migrant history (Andersen 2013).

### ***3F – the making of a diversity democracy?***

The trade union 3F (The United Federation of Danish Workers) decided at their congress in 2010 an agreement on diversity. The agreement replaces the Agreement on Fair Representation which expired by the end of 2012. The FR-agreement was an important part of the merger between the two unions for unskilled and low-skilled manual workers the SiD (the General Workers Union in Denmark) and the KAD (the Women's Workers Union in Denmark). The Agreement secured the continuation of KAD's values, it determined several gender equality policy initiatives, and introduced proportional representation on all leadership levels. The proportionality related to the former trade unions (the KAD: 20%, the SiD: 80%). Afterwards several unions have joined the 3F,

the largest are the RBF (the union for restaurant and brewery workers) and the TIB (the union for carpenters and factory workers in the wood industry). 3F still has a male majority, but the FR-Agreement has to a high degree secured women's proportional representation. Moreover, the merger created openings for negotiating leadership practices and union culture in branches. In some branches the renegotiation resulted in interactive and transformative leadership styles, in participatory democracy practices, and in openness to many different working and life experiences. Yet, in others traditional leadership styles and a closed union culture were reproduced giving women leaders from the former KAD a hard time (Hansen 2008, 2010).

In 2013 3F has 324.455 members of which 28% are women and 13% are ethnic minorities. 3F is the biggest union in Denmark.<sup>14</sup>

The main objective in the Agreement on Diversity is '...to reflect the membership, to create commitment and equal worth and to develop the membership democracy'. The union must 'promote real and equal access to elected and employed posts to increase the representation of underrepresented groups'. These are identified as women, ethnic minorities, young people, and in addition representation on the background of job should be included. It is underlined that this is going to happen in all committees and boards on all levels of the organisation. The representation should be proportional in relation to the composition of the membership. Gender is traversing all the other categories and written down for example 'representation of younger women and men', and 'women and men with ethnic minority background' both in relation to their share of the membership within the specific area.<sup>15</sup> Gender equality and the respect for diversity have both its own section in the policy programme and are mainstreamed into most other policy areas. Furthermore, 3F has decided two other strategies at the congress in 2010: the development of the organisation and the democracy, and the renewal of the organizing strategy. These are not directly linked to the Agreement on Diversity, yet, both are important if 3F should develop a real diversity democracy. According to Jane Korczak diversity is the pivot of the local democracy because the agreement requires that all branches ask themselves: 'Have we included the women? Have we included the ethnic minorities? Have we included the young people? Have we included all service groups? Have we included the geography?'

With these three new strategies 3F has joined the union renewal 'wave'. However, the strategies are not followed by clear objectives or tools to make them a reality nor are they coordinated. On the

other hand local leaders have a high influence on all three strategies. In the case of the Agreement on Diversity branches decide themselves how to implement the agreement. Moreover, the gender & diversity team and the leader in charge have organized a lot of meetings with the purpose to develop and exchange good local practices. They have also made several pamphlets directed to employee representatives and branches, and they have started a debate about diversity democracy taking the agreement one step closer to more radical changes.<sup>16</sup> Until now the implementation process has resulted in rulebook changes to secure representation of underrepresented groups in a few branches, a network for ethnic minorities, a LGBT network in the pipeline, reaching out for CSO's in some parts of the union, one branch with a strong participative and inclusive profile has continued its work, training of 'integration' workplace representatives, a rising awareness of being 'actively' inclusive and finally, the introduction of a broad understanding of gender equality.

All in all this is not much, and the reasons for that are manifold. The process is slow, partly because both branch and national leaders are very busy and moreover, some have no or only very little interest in gender equality and diversity. In addition some of those who are interested think the agreement is too difficult to implement and ask for more clear directions like in the former FR-agreement. Yet, it is also because of the nature of the process: it is building on dialog and debate including informal negotiations, and moreover, on the development of local ways to make diversity democracy. This is a consequence of both missing targets and tools *and* of the organisational structures in 3F. But, it is also following the tradition of policy debate which Hal Koch formulated and which is still central to the movement of 'people-enlightenment' in which the labour movement plays an important part.<sup>17</sup> In general debate, dialogue and negotiations are seen as a much stronger foundation for democratic changes than quotas and likely policy instruments, and sometimes this *is* opening for a manifold of experiences and interests, but only if it is followed by institutional/structural changes (Hansen 2010). But many reject radical tools like for example proportionality, and therefore changes in democracy structures are contested despite the success of the proportionality measures in the FR-agreement. It points to the problem of making change in favour of diversity in a highly masculine organisation and with a centrally placed masculine oligarchy mainly focused on staying in power. Besides the resistance to radical tools it shows in lack of action in relation to the diversity agreement, and in cut down in resources, including staff, in the work with equality and diversity and international solidarity. Also the union agenda has become narrower partly returning to traditional union objectives and does not offer new readings of the society or alternative utopias. On the other hand, the policy programme 2010-2013 has a strong

diversity profile, the organizing strategy takes its' starting point in, often migrant, workers' everyday life, a democracy workshop with branch leaders has come up with a lot of ideas on how to support participation and make change locally, and the ethnic minority network and training have strengthen both the individual member and their identification with the union. But then a again, ethnic minority members and employee representatives have experienced not to be elected to boards and committees despite the agreement, and branch leaders have experienced how difficult it is to make close links to (some) minority communities.

So has 3F produced a new form of more inclusive and pro-active solidarity - 'unity in diversity'? Not yet, and whether it will happen depends very much on internal struggles, alternative power-coalitions and the pressure from below.

### **Conclusion. Workers' solidarity today: reproduced, transformed or obstructed?**

The purpose of this paper is by bringing together different research traditions and confronting them with a case: women migrant care- and service workers and Danish trade unions, to learn more about how workers' solidarity is produced, maintained, challenged, and changed, and furthermore, how we should theoretically frame this. An in-depth analysis of workers' solidarity and concept-building is yet to come.<sup>18</sup> So what can we learn?

In contrast to the general discourse on workers' solidarity, the discussion indicates that it is not diversity (nor individualization) in itself that challenges trade union solidarity. On the contrary, diversity can be the basis for both collectivism and renewal of trade unions. The crucial point is the problem identification and the 'reading' of the contemporary society as well as the choice of strategies from trade union leaders and other agents. This is the first point. The next is that workers' solidarity is dynamic: it is constantly 'on the move' and constructed in context. Of importance here are changes in the regulation of the market, discourses on trade unions in society, and workers' degree of vulnerability or/and power resources. The state of workers' solidarity and the challenges it meets is depended on time, place – and agency. Agency is central to the third point: that workers' solidarity does not on any level evolve in itself, on the contrary if solidarity is not cared for constantly the social ties start untying. Strong, persistent and wise agency on all levels is absolutely necessary: in the 'reading' of the society, the interpretation of problems and in renewing objectives, in the making of a workers' collective, in creating a 'differentiated workers' identity', and in organizing and making an active union. The fourth point concerns power structures and interwoven



power relations. Gendered and ethnic power relations in the labour market and in trade unions have to be fought against. In the labour market experiences of injustice based on gender, ethnicity and migration status make up a strong basis for collectiveness and organizing. Inside trade unions this could be the basis for coalitions for change. Finally, in a Danish context – even though more research is needed – we do see a tendency to women care- and service workers, of which many are migrants, pushing for changes and while doing that, also changing focus, practices and activities in trade unions. On the one hand often supported by their trade unions, but on the other also often in a constant struggle with ethnic and gendered power relations in trade unions, in the bargaining system and in the labour market.

The discussion raises some new questions in particular about collectivism and identification: when you are not working in a big industrial plant but in service or care in private homes or in small workplaces are the processes for a workers' collective the same? How are these/any collective made into a power resource for trade unions? Does this 'loose' collective protect the au-pairs against the employers? And does the trade union collective transverse minority and majority groups?

### ***And what about class?***

When interviewing about trade union strategies to include migrant domestic workers none of the leaders mentioned class; rather they spoke about social justice, social ties based on common experiences as women, and the need to have all workers organized to prevent the establishment of a non-organized and non-regulated labour market (Hansen 2010).

The literature on workers' solidarity reveals that the relationship between class, collectivism and workers' solidarity has always been ambiguous and that this ambiguousness includes both the perceptions and the practises of class. Some important discussions are: Does solidarity develop from the conflict relations between the capitalist and the working classes *or* through conflicts of interest on the market with blue-collar workers on the one side *and* managers and company owners on the other? And what about gendered and ethnic conflicts in society and on the labour market *or/and* the commodification of care? To what degree trade unions are agencies of class or rather mediators between capital and workers? Are all workers included in the working class or do white-collar workers make up a class in themselves? And has working-class ever been a collective social action group? Or should we rather speak about social identity?

## References

Alvarez, S. & Whitefield, P. (2013): 'Rethinking Organising and Leadership: Lessons from Non-Traditional, Women-Centred, Labour Campaigns in New York City' in Ledwith & Hansen (eds): *Gendering and Diversifying Trade Union Leadership*, Routledge

Andersen, S.S., Bundsgaard, M.T., Grann, A., Nielsen, A.D. & Podraza, J.J. (2012): *Ikke-vestlige indvandrere i 3F. En undersøgelse af faglig organisering blandt ikke-vestlige indvandrere*, Bachelor Thesis in Social Sciences, Roskilde University

Andersen, N.T. (2013): *Profession: Filippiner*. Kvinder på arbejde i Danmark gennem fire årtier, Tiderne Skifter

Andersen, P.T. (2003): *Retten til at vælge fællesskab – Yngre ufaglærte kvinders opfattelser af og praksis om fællesskab og solidaritet*, GEP, Aalborg Universitet

Bradley, H. (1996): *Fractured Identities. Changing Patterns of Inequality*, Polity Press

Briskin, L. (1999): 'Autonomy, diversity, and integration: union women's separate organization in North America and Western Europe in the context of restructuring and globalization' in *Women's Studies International Forum*, Vol.22 No.5

Briskin, L. (2002): 'The equity project in Canadian unions. Confronting the challenge of restructuring and globalisation' in Colgan & Ledwith (eds): *Gender, Diversity and Trade Unions. International perspectives*, Routledge

Caraker, E. (2008): *Industriarbejdere mellem tradition og forandring – om interesser og læreprocesser blandt danske industriarbejdere*, Ph.d.-serie, Institut for Økonomi, Politik og Forvaltning, Aalborg Universitet

Colgan, F. & S. Ledwith (2000): 'Diversity, Identities and Strategies of Women Trade Union Activists' i *Gender, Work & Organization* vol 7 no 4

- Colgan, F. & S. Ledwith (2002)(eds): *Gender, Diversity and Trade Unions. International perspectives*, Routledge
- Dean, J. (1996): *Solidarity of Strangers. Feminism after Identity Politics*, University of California Press
- Durkheim, E. (1984/1930/1902): *The division of labour in society*, Macmillan
- Foden, D, J. Hoffmann, R. Scott (eds.) (2001): *Globalisation and the social contract*, ETUI
- Fraser, N. (2003): 'Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics' i Fraser & Honneth: *Redistribution and Recognition?*, Verso
- Fraser, N. (2008): *Scales of Justice. Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*, Polity Press
- Greer, I., Ciupijus, Z. and Lillie, N. (2013): 'The European Migrant Workers Union and the barriers to transnational industrial citizenship' in *European Journal of Industrial Relations vol 19 no 1 pp 5-20*
- Hansen, J.A. & N.W. Hansen (2009): *Polonia i København. Et studie af polske arbejdsmigranternes løn-, arbejds- og levevilkår i Storkøbenhavn*, LO-Dokumentation nr.1/2009
- Hansen, L.L. (2010a): 'Køn & kærlighed i 3F- nye perspektiver på ligestilling i fagbevægelsen' in *Kvinder, Køn & Forskning vol. 19 no. 4*
- Hansen, L.L. (2010b): 'Global domestic workers in Denmark. Labour market regulation, union representation, and solidarity' i L.W. Isaksen (ed.): *Global Care Work. Gender and Migration in Nordic Societies*, Nordic Academic Press
- Hansen, L.L. (2012): 'Including all workers? Strategies of inclusion and representation in Danish trade unions', *Paper for ILERA world congress*, July, Philadelphia, USA

- Hardy, J., Eldring, L. and Schulten, T. (2012): 'Trade union responses to migrant workers from the 'new Europe': A three sector comparison in the UK, Norway and Germany' in *European Journal of Industrial Relations* vol 18 no 4 pp 347-363
- Healy, G., H. Bradley, & N. Mukherjee (2004): 'Individualism and collectivism revisited: a study of black and minority ethnic women', *Industrial Relations Journal* vol. 35 no. 5
- Heery, Edmund (2009): 'Debating Worker Representation: Current Themes and Controversy'. *Paper for IIRA- congress, Sydney, August 24-27, 2009*
- Hyman, R. (1997): 'Trade unions and interest representation in the context of globalisation' in *Transfer* vol 3 no 3 pp 515-533
- Hyman, R. (1999): 'Imagined Solidarities: Can Trade Unions Resist Globalization?' in Leisink (ed.): *Globalization and Labour Relations*, Edward Elgar
- Hyman, R. (2001): *Understanding European Trade Unionism. Between Market, Class & Society*, SAGE
- Isaksen, L.W (ed.) (2010): *Global Care Work. Gender and Migration in Nordic Societies*, Nordic Academic Press
- Kelly, J. (1998): *Rethinking Industrial Relations: Mobilization, Collectivism and Long Waves*. London: Routledge
- Klandermans, B. (2001): 'Does Class Still Unite? Concluding Remarks' in G.v.Gyes et al (eds): *Can Class Still Unite? The differentiated work force, class solidarity and trade unions*, Ashgate
- Ledwith, S. (2006): 'The Future as Female? Gender, Diversity and Global Labour Solidarity', in Phelan (ed): *The Future of Organised Labour: Global Perspectives*, Peter Lang

Ledwith, S. & Hansen, L.L. (eds.)(2013): *Gendering and Diversifying Trade Union Leadership*, Routledge

Lindberg, I. & Neergaard, A. (eds.)(2013): *Bortom Horisonten. Fackets vägval i globaliseringens tid*, Premiss Förlag

Liversage, A., Bille, R. & Jakobsen, V. (2013): *Den danske au-pair ordning*, SFI, 13:02

Lysgaard, S. (1967): *Arbejderkollektivet*, Universitetsforlaget

McBride, J. & Martinez Lucio, M. (2011): 'Dimensions of collectivism: occupation, community and the increasing role of memory and personal dynamics in the debate' in *Work, Employment & Society* vol.25 no.4 pp 794-805

Ministeriet for Flygtninge, Indvandrere & Integration (2013). *Tal & fakta på udlændinge området 2012*, [www.nyidanmark.dk/da-dk/Statistik/SearchStatistics.htm?searchtype=statistics](http://www.nyidanmark.dk/da-dk/Statistik/SearchStatistics.htm?searchtype=statistics)

Moore, S. (2011): *New Trade Unionism. Class Consciousness or Social Identity?*, Palgrave MacMillan

Nolan, P. & Slater, G. (2010): 'Visions of the future, the legacy of the past: demystifying the weightless economy' in *Labor History* vol 51 no 1 pp 7-27

Raunkjær, K.E. & Rohde, A. (2012): *Stuepigerne og de nye uniformer – et casestudie af organiseringsarbejdet I 3F Hotel & Restauration KBH*, Master Thesis in Social Sciences, Roskilde University

Stenum, H. (2008): *Au pair i Danmark: Billig arbejdskraft eller kulturel udveksling*, FOA

Stenum, H (2010): 'Au-pair strategier i danske familier – privat husarbejder eller maternalistisk mikrostyring' in *Kvinder, Køn & Forskning* vol.19 no 4 pp 52-61

Valkenburg, B. & R. Zoll (1995): "Modernization, Individualization and Solidarity" in *European Journal of Industrial Relations* 95/1

Waddington, Jeremy & Allan Kerr (2000): 'Towards an organising model in UNISON?: a trade union membership strategy in transition' i Terry, Michael (ed) (2000): *Redefining Public Sector Unionism. UNISON and the future of trade unions*, Routledge

Zoll, R. (1999): 'Differenz und Solidarität – oder: Was aber ist Solidarität heute?' i Kaiser et al (eds): *Auf zu neuen Ufern – Gewerkschaftliche Organisationsmodelle in Österreich und Europa*, OGB-Verlag

Zoll, R. (2000): *Was ist Solidarität heute?* Suhrkamp Verlag

Yuval-Davies, N. (2006): 'Intersectionality and Feminist Politics' in *European Journal of Women's Studies* 13(3)

---

<sup>1</sup> The same development is influencing the construction sector, farming and market-gardening

<sup>2</sup> The pressure also includes union negative regulation, internal gender equality agency, and a decline both in members and in activity.

<sup>3</sup> Nolan & Slater interest is to reject the 'weightless' world diagnosis and show how manual work still matters. In Britain manual work is still the dominant source of male employment.

<sup>4</sup> The book is in Swedish and all quotations are in my translation.

<sup>5</sup> Silver's understanding of power resources originates from E.O. Wright 2000.

<sup>6</sup> It is partly included in Lindberg and Neergaard's discussion about social reproduction. The commodification of care should not be mistaken for the professionalization of care-work on the basis of education and employment. This relates to the commodification of labour.

<sup>7</sup> In this McBride & Martinez Lucio also draw on Stephenson & Stewart (2001)

<sup>8</sup> In Caraker (2008) some of the examples on the rise in individualism among workers could be seen as an example on what happens when gendered power relations within the workers collective are ignored in the analysis with the result that women's interests are misunderstood as a sign of individualism.

<sup>9</sup> In her discussion of transversal politics Squires refers to Yuval-Davies, Hill-Collins and Benhabib

<sup>10</sup> Andersen is a journalist, so the book is not based on research, but it is well-documented and offers rich and very informative life stories of women migrants from the Philippines. The student reports are supervised by the author of the paper (Hansen). The reports are very informative and got the highest marks. The reports are included in the lack of empirical data and analysis in the field.

<sup>11</sup> This point also needs more research. FOA is primarily a public sector union, and on the background of large conflicts at the public sector bargaining rounds in 2008 (strikes) and in 2013 (lock-out) it is discussed if traditional trade union power resources have the right effect in the public sector.

<sup>12</sup> The research is insufficient on this matter because it is not made with the purpose of researching collectivism.

<sup>13</sup> All in all the research in migrant networks and the relations between them and trade unions is very limited. The above builds on the Andersen 2013 and Hansen 2010 and focuses on Philippine networks. The on-going research in diversity

---

democracy in 3F shows problems for local trade union leaders in working together with for example the local mosque. It points at differences between migrant communities and groups.

<sup>14</sup> Numbers derive from different tables and years (2010, 2012, 2013). The share of women decreased when TIB, an almost male only union, amalgamated with 3F. The share of ethnic minorities might be larger since it is believed to have been increasing as the result of the focus on organizing. Source: 3F ligestilling and 3F i tal, [www.3F.dk](http://www.3F.dk), and the GE&D team directly

<sup>15</sup> This varies from service groups to other groups e.g. based on education or trade

<sup>16</sup> The author of this paper is involved in the discussion of the making of a diversity democracy. The process takes its' inspiration from action research (please see Hansen forthcoming).

<sup>17</sup> People-enlightenment (folkeoplysning) is often translated non-formal adult education, but it is a more radical and broad understanding of education than what you would usually associate with adult education.

<sup>18</sup> In-depth qualitative research is planned but awaits research grants.