Culture Control and Commitment: A Study of Work Organization and Work Attitudes in the United States and Japan.

Review Author[s]:
Carmi Schooler

The American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 96, No. 6 (May, 1991), 1600-1602.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9602%28199105%2996%3A6%3C1600%3ACCACAS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-1

The American Journal of Sociology is currently published by The University of Chicago Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org/
Fri Jul 29 14:48:21 2005

others associated with the *Marketplace Exchange* newsletter as well as the work of many associated with the Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics. To be fair to Biggart, it should be noted that many of these authors have only recently emerged. There is the added fact that Biggart comes to her subject from an organizational background, whereas much of the uncited literature has its roots in symbolic interactionalism and political economy.

To a large extent my criticism reflects my desire for more. I would have liked to hear more from those who have left the various DSOs. I would also have appreciated hearing more about the ways individuals have forced DSOs to change over the years. Since most DSO salespersons work part-time, I would also have been interested in getting a better handle on the other types of employment that they might pursue. While these may be considered critical comments, they reveal the interest generated by the book. Socioeconomics in general and the sociology of markets in particular have reemerged in recent years as important areas of sociological concern. Biggart's book underscores the value of pursuing this trend.

Culture Control and Commitment: A Study of Work Organization and Work Attitudes in the United States and Japan. By James R. Lincoln and Arne L. Kalleberg. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. Pp. xii + 291. $44.50.

Carmi Schooler
National Institute of Mental Health

Culture Control and Commitment deals with an extremely timely subject—the determinants of work attitudes in the United States and Japan. In contrast to many books on this subject it uses a state-of-the-art data base for sampling and for gathering individual and organizational data. Factories and their employees in a selected set of industries in two comparable regions (Indianapolis and Atsugi) were sampled. Of the selected factories, about 45% participated (52 in the United States, 46 in Japan) and allowed researchers to gather data about plant structure, technologies, management practices, and so forth. About 70% of the sampled employees (4,567 in the United States, 3,735 in Japan) filled out a questionnaire on their work attitudes, job situations, and backgrounds. These data were collected with a sophisticated awareness of the difficulties that beset cross-cultural studies. The research and analytic designs evidence an almost total command of the literature on organizational research in general and on Japan in particular.

These resources are used to test the theoretically and practically important hypothesis "that the dedication and commitment of Japanese workers derive from Japan's leading edge status as an adopter and imple-

menter of a new and highly successful technology of organization and control" (p. 28). Examining the organizational differences between Japanese and U.S. plants in their study, James R. Lincoln and Arne L. Kalleberg observe: "What we find striking are the parallels between the portrait of the Japanese organization and structures and practices which other streams of organizational theory and research identify with commitment-maximizing corporatist forms of organizational control" (p. 180).

When they go on to look at the degree to which organizational features affect employees' organizational commitment and job satisfaction, they find that "whether in Japan or the US, 'Japanese-style' decision-making . . . and welfare services . . . enhance commitment and . . . satisfaction" (p. 247). Lincoln and Kalleberg conclude: "As in any large-scale empirical study . . . our findings are complex and lend themselves to few pat interpretations. Nevertheless, they have yielded a portrait of the Japanese workforce as more committed to the company. . . . Moreover, our findings of Japan-US differences in the decision-making structures and welfare programs of firms and in the responses of employees to these structures provide strong evidence that at least part of any commitment advantage enjoyed by the Japanese manufacturing economy derives from wider implementation of certain elements of welfare corporatist control" (p. 254).

Although they are not strong enough to lead to a basic rejection of Lincoln and Kalleberg's empirical findings, I have reservations about these conclusions. Among my methodological concerns is that LISREL analyses are used to do things that cannot be done with the data (e.g., the appropriate instrumentation is insufficient to permit the modeling of the reciprocal effects of organizational commitment and job satisfaction). On the other hand, LISREL is not used to develop multiple-item indices of variables causally prior to organizational commitment or job satisfaction, although error in causally prior measures leads to greater distortions in causal estimates than does error in causally later ones. I am also concerned with the subjectivity of the job-complexity scale. It certainly would not have hurt to subject it to confirmatory factor analysis along with the closeness of supervision and autonomy scales.

As someone who has spent decades demonstrating that people's occupational conditions (e.g., substantive complexity) affect their psychological functioning and values, I also have trouble in accepting Lincoln and Kalleberg's "overarching hypothesis . . . that facets of the work role such as complexity, supervision, or autonomy have relatively little to do with the shaping of values which to a large degree are formed outside the workplace" (p. 127). Accepting such an hypothesis may simplify causal analyses, but it leaves me wondering about the degree to which reported relationships reflect hidden reciprocal effects of occupational conditions on values.

My final concern is brought about by the number of quotations of the "expert" views of various *Wall Street Journal* reporters in the concluding

section. Somehow, having carried out what is certainly the most extensive and, for all of my complaints, the most methodologically sophisticated comparative study of the effects of work organization in Japan and the United States, the authors should have been able to relate their conclusions more closely to the body of empirical research on how cultural, institutional, economic, and psychological levels of phenomena interact in Japan. Perhaps this is too much to ask. Even without doing so, Lincoln and Kalleberg have added much to what we know about culture, control, and commitment in Japanese and American workplaces.

Gay Priests. Edited by James G. Wolf. New York: Harper & Row, 1989. Pp. xxiii + 216. $17.95.

Bob Blauner
University of California, Berkeley

In 1984 James Wolf, then a graduate student at the University of Chicago, was asked by a group of gay priests to conduct a survey on sexuality and the priesthood. When his first attempt at a random sample of all U.S. priests produced only a 31% response rate, he decided to use a snowball sample instead. In a long opening chapter, Wolf both summarizes the data from the 101 self-identified gay priests who completed his questionnaire and provides a concise summary of the Catholic church's position on homosexuality.

The heart of the book is the essays that follow, in which four priests reflect on the sociological, theological, and personal aspects of their experiences in coming to terms with the contradictions inherent in their conflicting statuses. The consensus from both these essays and the survey is that the vast majority of gay priests have come to accept their homosexuality. Because of the unusual circumstances and the depth of their vision, these coming-out stories have a special power and poignancy. And, although most feel that the ideal of a celibate priesthood needs revision, for straight as well as gay Catholics, some gay priests apparently have chosen to adhere to it, whereas others believe in acting on their needs for love and sexual expression. Even if these men do not experience guilt and self-rejection, their conflicts are still considerable. Celibacy seems to take a special toll on gay priests. They experience the loneliness of not being able to consummate relationships, the loneliness of having to hide an essential part of their being from all but a few intimates, and a more general feeling of being "abandoned by God," a statement with which 43% of the sample concur (p. 22). They deal with this loneliness through therapy, through counseling with spiritual advisers (usually other gay priests), and through clandestine support groups.

Yet they remain committed to the church and the priesthood and gain great satisfaction from their ministries. They view gayness as a special

Culture, Control and Commitment: A Study of Work Organization and Work Attitudes in the United States and Japan.

Review Author[s]:
Ellen R. Auster

Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 36, No. 2 (Jun., 1991), 306-309.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0001-8392%28199106%2936%3A2%3C306%3ACCACAS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-V

Administrative Science Quarterly is currently published by Johnson Graduate School of Management, Cornell University.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/cjohn.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org/
Fri Jul 29 14:45:09 2005

Where Okimoto strays from a concentration on Japan, the results are even less satisfactory. He credits "the comparative weakness of organized labor" with far better Japanese performance than European "welfare states" (p. 233). This comparison is not pursued in any systematic fashion. Europe for Okimoto is essentially England, with an occasional reference to France. Surely a careful consideration of Germany (FDR) and Sweden would suggest that high levels of overt labor representation in government policy and a high level of welfare expenditure are not inherently incompatible with solid economic growth and considerable success in technologically advanced industries.

As with any work treating contemporary Japan, obsolescence is built in. According to Okimoto, "Japan has not forced other countries to swallow VERs (voluntary export restraints)" (p. 109). Recent agreements between Japan and South Korea are in fact VERs in everything except name. More can be expected in the future.

One major compositional error mars this otherwise attractively produced book. All of the percents in table 4.2 (p. 217) are given with the decimal point shifted two places to the left i.e., 74% appears as 0.74%.

As a one-volume summary of the English-language literature on industrial policy, this book is readable and useful. Unfortunately, it is not in any sense an advance in existing scholarship.

Earl H. Kinmonth
Senior Lecturer
Centre for Japanese Studies
University of Sheffield
Sheffield, England

Culture, Control and Commitment: A Study of Work Organization and Work Attitudes in the United States and Japan.
James R. Lincoln and Arne L. Kalleberg. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990. 291 pp. $44.50.

Japanese management practices and their effects on employee commitment and productivity have been a topic of considerable intrigue over the last decade. Managers and scholars driven by both envy and admiration have looked to Japan, searching for solutions that will recoup America's manufacturing prowess. At the root of this interest is the unanswered question of whether Japanese management practices can be transferred to the U.S. and whether, once imported, American workers will achieve the high levels of labor productivity, diligence, and devotion of their Japanese counterparts. Initially, analysts were enamored with the possibilities and potential of these programs. More recently, the commentary has been more cynical, proposing that although Japanese employees are productive, they suffer from coercion and oppression. This book is one of the few, if not one of the only attempts to untangle systematically and empirically this critical yet complex phenomenon.

This book is based on a study conducted between 1981 and 1983 of 55 American companies in the Indianapolis Metropolitan region and 51 Japanese companies in the Atsugi region of the Kanagawa prefecture. The sampling of organizations was targeted to the following seven industries: transportation equipment, electronics and electronic equipment, chemicals, prefabricated metals, nonelectrical machinery, printing and publishing, and food processing. A stratified sample by size was selected in each industry. Information on the history, operations, market environment, organization, and human resource policies of each company was collected, followed by the administration of a questionnaire to a representative sample of employees. This yielded data on 4,567 employees in the U.S. and 3,735 managers, supervisors, and executives in Japan.

The beginning chapters outline the broad themes of the book and the relevant macro and micro theoretical underpinnings of the central topics—culture, commitment, and control. Next the authors establish that there is a "commitment gap" between the U.S. and Japan. This is not a trivial exercise, given the difficulties in interpreting cross-cultural results of concepts such as satisfaction, commitment, and motivation and the causal reciprocity of these work-attitude constructs and dimensions.

The following several chapters explore possible explanations for this gap. The first of these chapters looks at job-related variables such as organizational position, task characteristics, intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, and informal ties and group cohesion. The findings suggest that job quality, job rewards, and social integration into the workplace through programs such as quality circles are positively related to commitment in both the U.S. and Japan, with the results on satisfaction more mixed. Chapter 5 investigates the relationship in the two countries between work values, such as the importance of good pay, a secure job, getting along with coworkers, whether companies should take care of their employees, employee demographics, and commitment and satisfaction. A number of interesting, albeit subtle differences emerge between U.S. and Japanese employees, although their effects on commitment and satisfaction are not very powerful.

Chapters 6 and 7 turn to predicting and testing differences between the two countries in organizational characteristics such as size, technology, unionization, external dependence, division of labor, hierarchy, decision making, centralization, formalization, organizational structures, practices, and employment systems. The results are fairly consistent with previous studies finding less functional specialization, more diffuse responsibilities, taller hierarchies, more company-sponsored social programs, and more participation in decision making in Japanese firms. Chapter 8 empirically integrates the previous sections by examining the regression effects and correlations of the organizational variables when combined with the job-related and attitude variables.

A theme begun early in the book and woven throughout the chapters is that a blend of practices, which Dore (1973) in his study of British and Japanese factories labeled the "corporatist organization," both evokes higher commitment and

explains the commitment gap between the U.S. and Japan. In corporatist organizations, lifetime employment is common and employees share profits and participate in decision making, although there are few governance guarantees. Jobs and status are highly differentiated, leading to many opportunities for career mobility. Organizational culture, community, and pride are strong and reinforced regularly through symbols and rituals and social, recreational, and welfare programs. Although this framework is not explicitly tested, different pieces of their research tap this notion and offer supporting evidence as the book unfolds.

By the end of the book, the authors conclude that their analysis "provides preliminary support that the welfare corporatist model may be a universally applicable commitment maximizing form " (p. 251). And while they note the role that culture may play in explaining the attitudinal and behavioral differences between U.S. and Japanese employees, they quickly add that they believe that culture does not affect the causal relationships between these variables: It "does not markedly condition the ways employees respond to their jobs or other facets of their employment" (p. 251).

This book makes a number of significant contributions. First, the authors should be commended for creating such a rich and extensive data base, particularly given the constraints and challenges of cross-cultural research. A second strength of this book is the authors' multilevel, multidisciplinary approach to this phenomenon. They are skilled at comprehensive yet rigorous reviews of wide-ranging literatures relevant to organizational research. The book provides a rare opportunity to consider diverse attitude, job, and organizational variables in an international context. Their discussions of findings and their implications are consistently thoughtful and insightful, and they often pursue additional analyses to explore particular findings in more depth.

Although, initially, the issue of construct validity for some of the independent as well as the dependent variables is troubling, the authors do address this topic in a fair and balanced way. While the concern still lingers with some findings, the thoroughness of their discussions and willingness to explore and consider alternative explanations allays many doubts. One wishes, however, that in addition to trying to solve the problem by ferreting out the results empirically, the authors also drew on qualitative data to verify their hunches. For example, perhaps with the assistance of their staff fluent in Japanese they could have asked a subset of the Japanese respondents how they interpreted some concepts and issues in the questionnaire to see if their comments reinforced or challenged the empirical results. Admittedly, the Japanese respondents may be reluctant to share these feelings face to face, but such an approach could uncover some important and relevant issues.

Nonetheless, almost any organizational or international scholar will find the coverage of both historical and current theories informative and insightful and the authors' multilevel, multidisciplinary, multicultural approach to this phenomenon enriching and provocative. Managers or executives

looking for a user-friendly book may be frustrated, but they can find solace in Lincoln's (1989) distilled and accessible summary of the study. This book is a well-executed, systematic, and comprehensive study that offers hope for American managers. It demystifies some of the Japanese manufacturing capabilities that have so perplexed us and suggests that many of these techniques can be effectively applied in our own backyard.

Ellen R. Auster
Visiting Associate Professor
Amos Tuck School of Business Administration
Dartmouth College
Hanover, NH 03755

REFERENCES

Dore, Richard
1973 British Factory–Japanese Factory: The Origins of Diversity in Industrial Relations. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Lincoln, James R.
1989 "Employee work attitudes and management practice in the U.S. and Japan: Evidence from a large comparative study." California Management Review, 32:89–106.

Strategies for Learning: Small-Group Activities in American, Japanese, and Swedish Industry.

Robert E. Cole. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1989. 354 pp. $29.50.

A group is a group is a group. Or is it? According to Robert Cole, who compared small-group activities in the U.S., Japan, and Sweden, the nature of groups varies considerably, and systematically, across national boundaries. Moreover, the spread of small-group activities within nations does not result from stereotypical differences in culture; for example, Cole asserts that the Japanese are not more group-oriented than Americans. On the contrary, such activities spread because there is an infrastructure designed specifically to enhance them. Not surprisingly, the U.S. comes in last in its ability to sustain such an infrastructure and, therefore, to create a small-group movement. Cole analyzes the reasons for this trend and suggests optimistically that we may be able to learn from other nations.

Cole, with his industrial sociological approach, forces the social psychologist to consider the impact of more macro factors on group behavior and survival. Rather than blaming the team or the organization for failed group activities, Cole suggests examining industry's willingness to change, the labor market, embedded relationships between labor and management, and the existence of a national infrastructure to spread innovation. This view is often omitted in the group literature.

Cole is analyzing a very specific kind of small group: factory or office groups that are given greater control over everyday work decisions and encouraged to solve workshop problems. Although Cole often concentrates on quality circles,

Culture, Control, and Commitment: A Study of Work Organization and Work Attitudes in the United States and Japan.

Review Author[s]:
Gary D. Allinson

The Journal of Asian Studies, Vol. 49, No. 4 (Nov., 1990), 937-938.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0021-9118%28199011%2949%3A4%3C937%3ACCACAS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-2

The Journal of Asian Studies is currently published by Association for Asian Studies.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/afas.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org/
Fri Jul 29 14:54:57 2005

complicated by the fact that it is the continental European civil law influences that are still pervasive today in internal Court organization and practice, especially in decision-making and opinion-writing in support of decisions: in particular, as to principles of Collegiality and Anonymity. This makes it especially difficult to discern the dialectical elements in Court decision-making over any period of time: the alternative or conflicting policy positions within the judicial ranks, and the process of reconciliation, or assimilation, or rejection of antithetical positions that are so apparent, for example, within the U.S. Supreme Court, and some other U.S.-influenced constitutional courts with their plethora of specially concurring and dissenting opinions and the frankness with which the individual judicial philosophies are articulated therein.

Professor Itoh, tantalizingly, refers to foreign legal influences within the Japanese Universities—Ihering, Max Weber, the Free-Law movement (presumably Gèny), Ehrlich, Roscoe Pound, Jerome Frank, Goodhart—but he never really follows up with a direct connection to Supreme Court *jurisprudence* which seems to remain, by many Western standards, heavily positivist, and still oriented to a *BegriffsHimmel* in the late nineteenth-century German sense. It may, for these reasons, be somewhat anachronistic to apply to the Supreme Court of Japan contemporary U.S. constitutional law characterizations such as judicial self-restraint and judicial activism, or even the more popular political-legal U.S. antinomy of judicial conservatism/judicial liberalism, if what is involved, really, is the latter-day persistence of German civil law-based insistences upon meeting adjectival law procedural tests as a precondition to any substantive decision-making. Two different universes of legal discourse—German and American, and civil law and constitutional law, at that—still seem to coexist, somewhat uneasily, without, as yet, any full dialectical synthesis in a genuinely autonomous and self-sufficient, intrinsically Japanese body of jurisprudence and legal theory.

EDWARD MCWHINNEY
Simon Fraser University

Culture, Control, and Commitment: A Study of Work Organization and Work Attitudes in the United States and Japan. By JAMES R. LINCOLN and ARNE L. KALLEBERG. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. xii, 291 pp. $44.50.

In the early 1970s the well-known English specialist on Japanese society, Ronald Dore, began advancing a purposefully perverse view of convergence. In contrast with others who had used modernization theory to assert that late-developing countries were becoming more like the U.S. and Great Britain, Dore argued instead that Japan's late-developing status and the institutions to which it gave rise should provide the example for a new pattern of labor organization in the first industrial state. In subsequent publications he not only has continued to promote the political aims implicit in these observations; he also has begun to document how Great Britain has actually come to adopt some Japanese-like features into its economy. Dore characterized the new pattern of labor organization as welfare corporatism, and he endowed the concept with a number of now familiar features: recruitment of workers at entry level, pay according to seniority, promotions based on length of service, a

spirit of moralistic groupishness, generous retirement benefits, and the putative promise of lifetime employment.

Dore's richly documented scholarly studies gradually won attention from businessmen and journalists who have contributed during the past decade to an outpouring of popular writing that heralds the alleged virtues of the Japanese employment system. This book is a by-product of such writing. James Lincoln and Arne Kalleberg are sociologists who offer a sophisticated scholarly endorsement of the virtues of Japanese employment practices. Their purpose in this study, never made fully explicit, is to demonstrate logically and empirically how the components of welfare corporatism operate in Japanese firms in order to advocate its superiority as a model for organizational emulation.

Their book is devoted primarily to a careful explication of the results of a cross-national survey conducted in Japan and the U.S. between 1981 and 1983. They administered questionnaires at forty-six Japanese and fifty-two American factories in seven manufacturing industries. The American survey was completed by 4,567 workers employed in a metropolitan area in south central Indiana around Indianapolis. The Japanese survey was completed by 3,735 workers from the Atsugi region of Kanagawa Prefecture near Yokohama. Response rates were high, running at sixty-five percent in the U.S. and seventy-eight percent in Japan. The authors and their collaborators took the utmost care to insure reliability and comparability of findings.

Lincoln and Kalleberg set out to confirm the now somewhat cautious claim that "the archetypal welfare corporatist form is best approximated in the structures and practices of the modern Japanese firm" (p. 17), and to demonstrate that it is "such structures and practices which are responsible for the extraordinary commitment displayed by Japanese employees toward their companies" (p. 17). They do recognize that culture plays a role. However, they strive to separate what they consider to be acultural organizational imperatives from individuals' prior work values, which in their model are the product of Japanese cultural norms.

The survey responses from Japanese workers do not fully affirm the claim that they are more committed to their organizations than their American counterparts. Nonetheless, after presenting an unconvincing logical and statistical sleight of hand, Lincoln and Kalleberg assert that they are. They also discover, as others have before them, that Japanese workers are less satisfied with their jobs than the American employees. In what is probably their most laudable contribution, they demonstrate how the inter-relationships among structures and practices in Japanese firms do contribute to higher levels of commitment in some ways. Although they unveil few new or startling discoveries, they do provide a rigorous conceptual apparatus that illustrates how job attributes, work values, and organizational modes of control conjoin to elicit worker loyalty.

This is a book for readers who accept the universalizing claims of positive social science, who appreciate the laborious hypothecating style of scientific writing, and who honor the abstract, quantitative results of survey research. Such readers may both like and admire this work. In contrast, humanistic skeptics who prize vivid prose and prefer ideographic discourse will find this book very hard to swallow—in more ways than one. For them a far more illuminating analysis of Japanese workers and their organizations would be Dorrine Kondo's penetrating interpretation of *Crafting Selves* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

GARY D. ALLINSON
University of Virginia

Culture, Control and Commitment: A Study of Work Organization and Work Attitudes in the United States and Japan.

Review Author[s]:
Robert M. Marsh

Social Forces, Vol. 69, No. 2 (Dec., 1990), 650-652.

Stable URL:
http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0037-7732%28199012%2969%3A2%3C650%3ACCACAS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-H

Social Forces is currently published by University of North Carolina Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/uncpress.html.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

http://www.jstor.org/
Fri Jul 29 14:43:55 2005

standard review of the European philosophers who seemingly created this strange thing called postmodern social philosophy — only Murphy's exposition is the one of the clearest and most readable by far. The chapter on postmodern social science takes as its most basic premise the fact that postmodernists disagree with positivism. "Postmodernists contend that truth lurks within meaning and has little to do with facts," Murphy writes. In an effort to prove that a postmodern social science is nonetheless possible, Murphy addresses the symbolic interactionist tradition, hermeneutics, and recent work in linguistics to conclude that, like these distinguished traditions, postmodernists are seeking to revise what is meant by "reality" and how it should be studied.

In chapter 4, Murphy displays great originality in his overall treatment of "postmodern ethics" in relation to the traditional problem of social order. He writes that "justice, therefore, is not an eternal principle that integrates competing claims. According to postmodernists, a society is just if it fosters pluralism." Indeed, until recently, postmodernist philosophy has served as a kind of liberation theology for many concerned with the oppression of women and minorities. This is a result of postmodernism's emphasis on openness, freedom, nonoppression, and giving many "voices" a chance to be heard. Alas, critics contend that the many "voices" become noise, because none of them are permitted to claim absolute, oppressive legitimacy.

In the remainder of the book, Murphy defends many examples of postmodern social movements under the interesting rubric of "order without control." These include community-based mental health treatment, workplace democratization, and community justice. The essence of his argument seems to be that, whereas bureaucracies control individuals, postmodern institutions empower individuals. While one sympathizes with the democratic principles he champions, it is certainly not obvious that individuals are empowered even most of the time in the examples he chooses. Community-based mental health, for example, is regarded by most professionals as a dismal failure, because many former clients are suffering with "their rights on" in the streets.

Is Murphy correct that postmodernism is not only "real" but beneficial to societies because of its efforts to foster demystification, dialogue, self-control, and radical democracy? Or is postmodernism related to old-fashioned anomie, social disorder, and fascism, as many of its critics contend? No one seems really to know the answer. Murphy deserves great credit for championing the benign aspects of a social movement that is beginning to lose steam and that is coming under increasing criticisms from the defenders of Enlightenment narratives. His writing is erudite, logical, and clear — and passionate in its commitment to liberal social philosophy. This is a rare trait in an era that is becoming increasingly conservative. His book deserves serious attention.

Culture, Control and Commitment: A Study of Work Organization and Work Attitudes in the United States and Japan.
By James R. Lincoln and Arne L. Kalleberg. Cambridge University Press, 1990. 291 pp.

Reviewer: ROBERT M. MARSH, *Brown University*

The core proposition of this study is the welfare corporatist thesis pioneered by Ronald Dore and others: "Japanese companies have taken the lead in setting in place a bundle of organizational structures and employment practices which successfully elicit commitment and compliance from a manufacturing workforce." This thesis is connected to the shift in attention in Western organizational theory and research

from job satisfaction and alienation to organizational commitment, defined here as "a social psychological state of deep identification with and dependence on an employing organization." Organizational commitment is seen as a mechanism of organizational control — control through normative rather than primarily coercive or utilitarian means.

The welfare corporatist form of organization comprises permanent employment guarantees, firm internal labor markets, job rotation and enlargement to reduce monotony, at least informal worker participation in decision making, a strong organizational culture, and a broad set of tangible welfare benefits offered by the company. The central questions, then, are: Do Japanese organizations offer a wider implementation of welfare corporatism than do U.S. organizations? If so, and providing that the degree of welfare corporatism has a positive effect on organizational commitment, is there in fact a higher level of commitment among Japanese workers?

To investigate these questions, Lincoln, Kalleberg, and their associates collected organizational data from a sample of manufacturing firms (51 in Kanagawa Prefecture, Japan, and 55 in the Indianapolis SMSA) and individual data from questionnaires filled out by samples of employees in each firm (4,567 in the U.S. and 3,735 in Japan).

The organization of the book follows the multilevel analysis. Successive chapters analyze U.S.-Japanese differences in organizational commitment and job satisfaction, the effect of job attributes on work attitudes, work values and employee background effects, plant-level differences in technology and organizational structure, and work organization and work force commitment.

Welfare corporatist theory is pitted against two alternative theories — cultural contingency theory and bureaucratic alienation theory. Cultural contingency theory explains the alleged higher commitment of Japanese workers by pervasive values and socialization experience in the wider society; it implies that commitment is essentially constant across Japanese firms. This is not true, however: commitment is higher, for example, in large core-sector firms. Cultural contingency theory also fails in that many findings show the same direction of relationships in Japan and the United States. For example, in both countries, regarding work as a central life interest is positively related to both commitment and job satisfaction; and more schooling has the same negative effect on commitment.

Lincoln and Kalleberg also depart from cultural contingency theory by arguing for the universalistic possibilities of welfare corporatism: "corporatist-style organization evokes comparable degrees of commitment from Western and Japanese employees"; the alleged higher level of organizational commitment in Japan "stems from the wider implementation of welfare-corporatist forms in Japanese than in US industry."

Behavioral indicators of organizational commitment — low absenteeism, low turnover, low strike rates and more time working — have long shown the Japanese to have a decided advantage over Americans. But Lincoln and Kalleberg are more interested in *attitudinal* commitment. They want to show that the greater behavioral commitment in Japan does not simply reflect structural arrangements that leave Japanese workers little choice but to comply overtly with work discipline. They want to show that Japan's behavioral commitment flows from procompany attitudes.

Their data, however, are not obliging: "Sharply contrary to our expectations, we have found Japanese workforce members to be no more committed to their employing organizations than US workers and far less satisfied with their jobs." They admit this squares with much previous research. Yet they do not accept the interpretation that the greater behavioral organizational commitment in Japan is rooted not in attitudinal commitment but rather in management, work-group, and

community pressures to exert oneself for the company. To salvage welfare corporatist theory, Lincoln and Kalleberg resort to a far from convincing excursion into response bias arguments and LISREL analysis. They emerge from this with the claim that, after all, Japanese workers have more attitudinal commitment to their firms than do their American counterparts. (One wonders if the authors would have resorted to LISREL had the actual survey responses shown this difference in the first place.) In any case, in the end, this is not altogether convincing, not even to the authors. In the last chapter, the reader learns that "a genuine question can be raised as to whether our survey data have conclusively established that organizational commitment . . . is more pervasive in the Japanese than in the US manufacturing workforce." This is the major weakness of the book.

Space limitations permit only a mention of other serious shortcomings. The authors claim that their two-stage design (a relatively large number of organizations plus representative samples of employees within each organization) gives them a strong basis for causal inferences about the effects of organizations on individual-level work processes and outcomes. Given the cross-sectional nature of their data, this is arguable; longitudinal data would be a better basis for causal inferences.

Another curious limitation is that, although they refer to a causal chain in which corporatist organizational structure influences workplace commitment, which in turn has a positive impact on worker and company *performance*, they present no data on performance. They refer in a general way to Japan's higher corporate performance but never show whether particular social psychological, attitudinal variables have any effect on performance net of organizational structure, technology, etc. Indeed, the only behavioral measure of performance they mention is quits, which are negatively related to commitment in both the U.S. and the Japanese data. But even this is an "ecological correlation" between the plant mean on commitment and the quit rate. Absent is any evidence that, at the individual level, employees with higher commitment scores are less likely *subsequently* to quit the company. Marsh and Mannari (1977) did present such longitudinal data for Japanese employees and found that employees' level of attitudinal company commitment in 1969 had no causal impact whatsoever on whether they had remained in the same firm or had quit by 1973.

Finally, because the overall theory underlying this study is weak, the authors are forced into many *ad hoc*, speculative interpretations of unexpected findings. For example, when Indiana respondents show enthusiastic support for corporate familism, the authors speculate that this is because of the poor economic conditions prevailing in Indiana at the time of the survey. This may well be the case, but, if so, is corporate familism a basic value orientation in a society (as the authors treat it) or a more situationally contingent attitude?

Despite the tremendous effort that went into this volume, I cannot recommend it as an important contribution to our knowledge.

The Reproduction of Social Control: A Study of Prison Workers at San Quentin.
By Barbara A. Owen. Praeger, 1988. 160 pp. $37.95.

Reviewer: GRESHAM M. SYKES, *University of Virginia (Emeritus)*

In this slim book Barbara Owen analyzes the social role of the prison guard, basing her findings on interviews with 35 workers at San Quentin. A brief introduction presents the history of California prisons and the stories of three correctional officers — a middle-aged white man, a young black man, and a young white woman — whose careers, according to the author, illustrate the changes that have taken place