

ability of noncitizen Arabs to penetrate the occupational structure in Israel. Next is the Lieberson index of net differences to establish whether differences in occupational distribution between noncitizen Arabs and other groups in Israel are systematically related to status ranks. Then the authors examine the determinants of differential participation using cross-product odds ratios. The results of all these analyses show a uniformly low and worsening position for noncitizen Arabs. At this point, the authors find it essential to estimate the net effect of each of four variables on the rate of participation of noncitizen Arabs in the labor market: ethnic composition, unemployment rate, percentage of salaried workers, and average age of workers in an occupation. The central politicomilitary fact that shapes the condition of Palestinians from the occupied territories in Israel is simply not considered. The chapter continues to subject the available evidence to more and increasingly elaborate statistical procedures. And this is only one chapter. The other three chapters that form the core of the book follow a similar logic of explanation.

The book provides us with a first-rate illustration of various sociological models and statistical procedures that can be used to understand the incorporation of ethnic minorities in a labor market and their chances for occupational mobility. Some of these models are indeed powerful tools that would allow one to disentangle differences between such groups as Italian and Polish workers in Chicago or Colombian and Mexican immigrants in the United States. But the choice of population limits the explanatory power of these methods and models. It becomes a way of trivializing both the condition of the workers and such sociological models. The methods and procedures used basically pivot on issues of socioeconomic status and rank and are intended to capture detailed variation. But there is not much variation in the status and rank of noncitizen Palestinians employed in Israel: they are segregated and concentrated in low-income occupations, and their absence from high-status occupations is absolute. All the results confirm what the authors had presented in the first 15 pages of the book with evidence from Israeli government statistics.

Work and Industry: Structures, Markets, and Processes. By Arne L. Kalleberg and Ivar Berg. New York: Plenum Press, 1987. Pp. 244. \$24.95.

Randy Hodson
Indiana University

Work and Industry seeks to integrate recent research in the United States on the sociology of work. The goal is to provide both a scholarly integration and a teaching tool for graduate courses on the sociology of work.

The authors' primary conceptual contribution is the development of a matrix of six work "structures" cross-classified by six types of markets. The six work structures, or factors that influence the nature of work, are the state, classes, occupations, industries, business organizations, and unions. The six types of markets are product markets, capital markets, resource markets, demand for labor, labor supply, and political markets. The literatures that Arne Kalleberg and Ivar Berg argue can be organized within this matrix include organizational and labor-market analysis, stratification research, industrial sociology, and occupational sociology, not to mention economics, history, political science, industrial relations, and social psychology.

Kalleberg and Berg argue that previous studies of work are flawed if they do not include a consideration of all of these factors. Thus, they criticize studies that consider only one factor and commend those that consider several factors. Any given study of work would not have to include all these factors, but it should at least be organized so that comparisons across the various dimensions are possible.

The purpose of the matrix is to guide researchers in situating their studies and encourage them to consider as many factors as possible in their research designs. This is to be done either by including measures of the factors or by selecting cases that allow for comparisons across dimensions that do not vary within a single study. Such integration is an admirable goal advanced by the book.

Another stated purpose of the book is to encourage greater attention to the connections among different structures and the examination of how these structures influence one another. This is most convincingly argued for the effects of the state on various aspects of work such as benefits, safety and health, and corporate regulation; less so for other connections. However, the invitation to give greater attention to these interconnections is well taken.

The most fundamental limitation of the book is that a 36-cell matrix is no substitute for an integrative theory of how these structures are inter-related. The authors make no attempt to outline such a theory, and without a theory of how these structures are related, the matrix provides a way to label and categorize research articles but little more. I am not sure what such a theory would look like, but one might try to develop a theory of work based on *power*, in contrast to Oliver Williamson's market efficiency model of organizations. The work involved in developing such a theory would be immense. Providing a matrix of factors can perhaps be seen as a preliminary step in developing such a theory. But without some beginning statement of that theory, how are we to know whether these are the correct factors to consider?

The matrix can also be criticized on more specific grounds. Kalleberg and Berg's model of work structures and markets is ahistorical. Rapid changes are occurring in the nature of work that, at a minimum, involve technological advances based on the widespread application of micropro-

cessors, shifts in the world economy, and changes in the nature of women's involvement in paid labor. The matrix of work structures and markets described here is limited in its ability to help us in our efforts to come to theoretical terms with how these important changes are shaping the nature of work.

In addition, each "structure" is itself made up of a complex set of dimensions that are not independent of one another. Organizations and unions, for example, cannot be "added" to class or even "interacted with" class. The identification of these other structures as significant factors involves theories of social organization that take many of the same factors used by class theorists and array them in different ways with different claims about causal priority. Similarly, other aspects of work are not well conceptualized as "correlates" of these six work structures. The components of any one theoretically identified structure are to a significant extent shared by other theories; they are just integrated differently. This complexity is not well captured by the language and conceptualization of a "multivariate" regression model that assumes independence among causes.

In spite of these criticisms, the book might be used in a graduate course on the sociology of work. The coverage is extremely wide, and this might serve as a useful organizing framework for students. The book was written with teaching uses in mind and contains a number of pedagogical devices, such as lead questions, that begin each section.

The endeavor of classifying the growing body of research on work is an important one, and Kalleberg and Berg have made a worthy effort in this regard. They apologize in their preface and at several places in the book for not having a theory to integrate their conceptual model. I wish they had at least begun the work of developing such a theory. Their efforts may, however, encourage greater attention to the connections among the many influences on the nature of work. Their efforts may also encourage the theoretical work needed to conceptualize work adequately and to understand contemporary changes in the nature of work.

The Mobility of Capital and Labor: A Study in International Investment and Labor Flow. By Saskia Sassen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. Pp. xi + 224. \$34.50.

John Walton
University of California, Davis

Any author aspiring to say something new on the subject of migration faces great competition. Classic studies by Max Weber and W. I. Thomas have plowed this furrow. Social scientists from around the world have had a go at it. In the past decade or so, new theories have come in rapid succession, supplanting rude notions of push and pull with heady anal-



Multifarious Work Structures

Joe L. Spaeth

Contemporary Sociology, Vol. 17, No. 5 (Sep., 1988), 611-613.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0094-3061%28198809%2917%3A5%3C611%3AMWS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-L>

Contemporary Sociology is currently published by American Sociological Association.

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/asa.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.

suggestions will doubtlessly be called idealistic, utopian, and lacking in concrete plans. The labels are undeserved, for any approach concerned with practice must confront the heart of an oppressive structure. Traditional approaches have a way of glossing that.

This book has a variety of excellent classroom applications. It is well written, lively, accessible, and appropriate for audiences with various levels of knowledge about Central America. Barry's discussion of solutions makes an excellent point of departure for discussion of theories of Third World development. Social problems courses concerned with hunger, poverty, or war would benefit from the book, as would courses concerned with social change and revolution, stratification, politics and the state, and health and society.

Revolution Through Reform: A Comparison of Sarvodaya and Conscientization, by MATHEW ZACHARIAH. New York: Praeger, 1986. 147 pp. \$30.95 cloth.

EDWARD G. SINGER
Northwest Technical College

In an uncommon comparative work, Zachariah summarizes critiques of the present society and visions of a new society that have been produced within Indian culture (the Sarvodaya movement) and Brazilian culture (the Conscientization movement) while both of these societies have been progressively subordinated to the demands of industrial capital. The noted differences are meant to confirm the opening claim that the struggles for social change in the developing world are not merely simple capitalism versus communism conflicts, but culturally derived responses to widespread injustices.

Zachariah examines the philosophies of each movement according to religious influences, views on the nature and role of technology, education as a revolutionary tool, and implicit strategies. Despite noteworthy differences, both movements eschew violence in the pursuit of revolutionary change. The author argues that when such pursuits rest on attempts to change people's attitudes through education and through direct appeals to an individual's compassion, the results are at best a greater sense of dignity for oppressed

people and at worst the eventual cooptation by elites.

Notwithstanding the important issues raised, some shortcomings make these 147 pages (with a thirty-dollar price tag) more expensive than they already are. At times the different views are presented so sketchily and without nuance that nothing new or interesting is offered. Frequent references to "proponents of conscientization" fail to provide names or document sources. The author's insistence on a theoretical comparison to show the importance of sociocultural influences is puzzling, if not self-defeating. In short, this book is a satisfactory introduction to the ideas of two important Third World social movements. Readers searching for rigorous answers being developed by these movements to the questions of the viability of active nonviolence and the role of the state in revolutionary social change, however, must look elsewhere.

Organizations, Occupations, and Markets

Multifarious Work Structures

Work and Industry: Structures, Markets, and Processes, by ARNE L. KALLEBERG and IVAR BERG. New York: Plenum Press, 1987. 244 pp. \$24.95 cloth.

JOE L. SPAETH
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

The primary message of this book is that most sociological research on work focuses too narrowly on one or a few of the possible myriad structures that influence the organization of work. The authors argue that opportunities for theoretical synthesis are ignored and that empirical research is not as rich as it could be. They concentrate on six basic structures that influence work—nation-states, industries, business organizations, occupations, classes, and unions—and on four basic types of markets—product, capital, resource, and labor. Much of the book deals with the relationships of each structural type to the other types and to markets, which are seen as fundamental structures, as "uncaused causes."

This book is both an outgrowth of the new structuralism and a criticism of it: an

outgrowth because it pays systematic attention to each of the different kinds of structures to which the new structuralists have paid separate attention; and criticism because it stresses the importance of examining the interrelationships of these structures instead of treating them singly.

The rhetoric in which much of this criticism is couched is rather curious. The authors' central criticism is that too many investigators rely on a master concept or structure instead of taking into account how different structures interact. Examples are the Marxist reliance on class, especially that of Wright, the focus of status attainment investigators on occupation, and the focus of others on organization or industry. Each of these limited approaches is characterized as "univariate," with preferable alternatives being "multivariate." But classes, occupations, organizations, and industries are not variables; they are structures.

For example, the authors treat Wright as having adopted a "univariate class approach." Wright clearly treats class as a master concept and tends to ignore other structural aspects such as market segmentation. Nevertheless, his class typologies are not univariate or even unidimensional. One typology takes account of ownership of an enterprise, managerial and supervisory authority, and autonomy; the other includes ownership and the exploitation of organizational position and credentialing. Both are multidimensional. It is at this level that variables and dimensions are appropriate. Perhaps Kalleberg and Berg should have coined the word "multistructural" to express their concerns.

The curious rhetoric extends to discussions of the characteristics of the various types of structures, which are treated under the rubric "correlates" of structures. "Correlates" of nation-states include democratization and planning; of class, authority and control over money; of occupation, status and power; of organization, size and market power; and of industry, concentration and technology. Any of these variables could be correlated with any other. Can the structures themselves be "correlated" with their own characteristics?

Despite these problems, the book is useful for the breadth of its coverage. It shows clearly that the social world is more complex than any of us has been able to capture in our research, and offers clues for broadening the scope of our work.

Since the book is only 244 pages long, its breadth of coverage has been achieved at the expense of depth. For example, Kalleberg and Berg examine the relationships of formal organizations to other kinds of work structures, but ignore the characteristics of formal organizations and the literature on organizations and environments. Consider how the population ecology concept of niche could have enriched the treatment of organization and industry. They treat the relationship between the two structural forms from a conventional point of view, in which industries are treated as homogeneous aggregates of the organizations within them. Yet the fifth largest firm in an industry in which the top four control eighty percent of the sales is in a very different position from the largest. Although the smaller firm would ordinarily be treated as part of a powerful industry, having to survive in an environment of powerful organizations may mean that the target organization is itself quite weak. On the other hand, it could be doing rather well because it specialized in the products it offered. The authors do not consider possibilities of this kind.

Similarly, work itself receives surprisingly little explicit attention. Occupations are treated as organized nodes of power largely devoted to advancing their members' interests. Jobs are defined as "specific tasks within particular organizations" (p. 38), and they vary according to their skills, substantive complexity, and autonomy. Authority is not considered as a characteristic of organizational positions or of the work that people in certain organizational positions do.

A related conceptual gap is equally unfortunate. In a variety of ways, sociologists have been concerned with the manifestation of power in the relationships between persons and the organizations for which they work, and in the relationships of organizations with each other and their environments. These relationships include the market power of firms, the power of firms with regard to each other as manifested, for example, in directorate interlocks, and the authority of job incumbents. Kalleberg and Berg could have used power as a major unifying theme in discussing the relationships within and between the structural forms, but they do not.

A perhaps unanticipated consequence of the wide-ranging approach is the support it

gives to currently unfashionable views. The picture of American society presented here gives considerable cumulative support to a pluralist rather than, say, a Marxist point of view. At one point, U.S. society is described as a "socioeconomic salmagundi" (p. 194). Intra-class conflict, including that between corporate managements and raiders or skilled and less skilled labor, is seen as at least as bitter as interclass conflict. As evidenced by "the large number of roles in which even working class Americans find themselves" and "the limited value of class analysis" (p. 189), the importance of class in U.S. society is declining. Industry too is becoming less useful as a structural concept, because conglomerates operate in many industries and the boundaries between industries have thereby grown increasingly fuzzy.

With industry losing its importance and with very little treatment of work as such in the book, the title of the book is something of a misnomer. This may be partly a consequence of the evenhanded treatment of structures and markets. Consider an alternative approach: In work organizations, most people spend most of their time doing their jobs. Jobs are clusters of specific tasks; occupations are clusters of jobs. The structure most immediately influencing the task composition of jobs and the way jobs are aggregated into a division of labor is the organization within which work takes place. Therefore the basic structure is the organization. The structural forms considered by Kalleberg and Berg are also important, but they influence the organization of work primarily by influencing the structure of the organization. If one were to adopt an approach of this kind, it might provide guidelines that could point to the ramifications of specific structures for specific problems dealing with the organization of work.

Although *Work and Industry* provides little specific guidance for future research, it shows the ways in which much current research fails to encompass the great variety of work structures and their interrelationships. It is a systematic treatment of the contexts within which work is organized. One way of understanding the niche that this book fills is to compare it with articles in the *Annual Review*. Concentrating as they do on recent developments, these articles often ignore the contexts of their subject. *Work and Industry*

fills this gap very nicely, and I intend to use it for this purpose in a course on social organization for beginning graduate students.

All Organizations are Public: Bridging Public and Private Organizational Theories, by BARRY BOZEMAN. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987. 184 pp. \$21.95 cloth.

LAWTON R. BURNS
University of Arizona

This book attempts to redress two shortcomings of organization theory. First, it seeks to demonstrate that the public context of organizations does matter, and that "public" should not be equated with government. Second, it seeks to demonstrate that public and private organizations share some common characteristics, and that organization theory has some utility for public management.

The thesis of this book is evident from its title: all organizations are affected by political authority to varying degrees. A corollary thesis, implicit throughout the book but stated only once (chapter 6), is that all organizations are private as well, i.e., affected by economic authority to varying degrees. The book's arguments rest on the assumptions that all organizations are based on two sources of authority (political and economic), and that these two types of authority are continuous dimensions rather than binary variables.

Starting from these assumptions, Bozeman develops a multidimensional theory of the "publicness" of organizations (chapter 6). According to this theory, the impact of publicness on organizational behavior is a function of the mix of the two sources of authority constraining the organization, the intensity of the authority brought to bear on the organization, the organization's ability to buffer itself from these external constraints, and the mix of the two types of authority exerted by the organization. Such a theoretical formulation marks a significant advance over traditional approaches to understanding the differences between public and private.

Bozeman's analysis focuses primarily on the dual authority relations constraining the organization; this is both a strength and a limitation of his argument. On the one hand, he makes a concerted effort to conceptualize and measure the political/economic authority



Work and Industry: Structures, Markets, and Processes.

Review Author[s]:
Oliver E. Williamson

Industrial and Labor Relations Review, Vol. 41, No. 4 (Jul., 1988), 646-647.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0019-7939%28198807%2941%3A4%3C646%3AWAISMA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-M>

Industrial and Labor Relations Review is currently published by Cornell University, School of Industrial & Labor Relations.

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/cschooll.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.

This book is an exemplary empirical investigation of working-class stratification by one of America's foremost industrial sociologists. Form's comparative analysis of France and the United States, in particular, provides a model of the kind of cross-national analyses that are needed to further our understanding of systems of economic and social stratification. Because of the clarity of his writing and argumentation, combined with controversial arguments such as his thesis that industrialization increases working-class heterogeneity, the book will inevitably stimulate debate. One might question, for example, his including self-employed persons in the working class, and his excluding white-collar employees from this group. If disagreements over such matters spark empirical research, Form will have achieved a key goal stated in this book: to launch quantitative studies of working-class stratification.

Arne L. Kalleberg

Professor of Sociology
University of North Carolina
Chapel Hill

Work and Industry: Structures, Markets, and Processes. By Arne L. Kalleberg and Ivar Berg. New York: Plenum, 1987. xviii, 244 pp. \$24.95 U.S. and Canada, \$29.95 other.

The past decade has witnessed growing research interest in the organization of work and of industry. Although increases in international trade and competition have had something to do with this research trend, a more important factor has been the emergence of new conceptual apparatuses. Much of the recent research works out of a more microanalytic, comparative institutional, and interdisciplinary orientation than was previously employed. Both sociologists and economists have contributed to this development.

Work and Industry serves notice of the changes to which I refer and helps further to transform the dialogue. The authors survey and critically assess an enormous literature. Although the sociology literature is understandably featured, Kalleberg and Berg draw also on the relevant studies in economics and political science, and introduce observations both from the law and from research on comparative

systems. The result is an important book with lasting significance.

The authors' approach to the study of work organization rests on the assumption that "the ultimate causes of work structures are the various *markets* within which exchanges take place and the political processes that determine the mix of market and nonmarket initiatives in a society" (p. 4). They further observe that previous studies of these matters have "been conducted at many different levels and units of analysis" (p. 4). Following a critical examination of these piecemeal studies, they propose a synthesis.

Rather than assume that work structures are given or are the product of univariate logics (of which class, occupation, organization, and industry are candidates), Kalleberg and Berg favor a multivariate approach. Specifically, they urge that work organization be examined with reference to six key work structures—nation-states, industries, business organizations, occupations, classes, and unions—and argue that these work structures derive from four types of markets—capital, product, labor, and resource. Implementing this model requires a microanalytic point of view: "It is necessary to specify in detail the attributes of work structures and thus the dimensions along which they differ" (p. 63). They also argue that "future research on work and industry [needs] to be more explicitly comparative" and that researchers should make greater allowance for the "growing importance of political markets and interest groups" (p. 221).

Among the comparative observations of special interest regarding nation-states are the differences between the United States and Europe with regard to class consciousness and aristocracy (pp. 75–77) and the ramifications these differences have had for labor organization (p. 122). Also notable are the comments on Japanese labor organization, which the authors examine in a more skeptical way than has recently been customary (pp. 116, 166).

This is an ambitious book. The authors succeed better, I think, in providing an informed resource regarding labor organization and in critiquing the literature than they do in developing the synthesis to which they aspire. Although I am persuaded that a comparative, microanalytic approach to labor organization is needed, I do not think that our current understanding of the issues is sufficient to support a synthesis in which six key structures and four markets are joined in an interactive way. This is not to say that a synthesis is not needed or that the factors Kalleberg and Berg propose to join are not

germane. Rather, an attempt at synthesis at this juncture is simply premature.

Inasmuch as Kalleberg and Berg indicate that their book would have read differently had they had access to my recent book, *The Economic Institution of Capitalism*, I will use this opportunity to sketch what I regard as the key features of the transaction cost economics approach to the study of labor organization. These are: (1) economizing, in the sense expressed by Frank Knight, is held to be the "main case" (to which alternative main case orientations—class, monopoly power, and so on—should be compared); (2) a viewpoint that can help to inform all approaches to the study of economic organization is that of "incomplete contracting in its entirety"; and (3) economic organization is always and everywhere beset by intertemporal process features, which must be included in the analysis.

Whereas economists and sociologists were once studying very different phenomena, transaction cost economics now has them operating on some of the very same terrain. So as better to appreciate the strengths and weaknesses of alternative approaches, I suggest that each main case candidate—economizing, class, monopoly power, and so on—be asked to show its hand. What distinctive predictions does each make? What do the data reveal? To be sure, each main case theory is necessarily embedded in a socio-economic context, the influence of which is responsible for added predictive content. I would treat these contextual features as qualifications to and refinements of each main case hypothesis.

An advantage that is sometimes ascribed to economics in relation to the other social sciences is that it works out of a more fully developed systems orientation. This orientation is what I refer to in the phrase "contracting in its entirety." But inasmuch as economics is sometimes given to excesses of hyperrationality in working out of this framework, I use the prefix "incomplete" to restore perspectives.

Incomplete contracting in its entirety may appear to be a contradiction in terms. It is not. The first part (*incomplete contracting*) follows immediately upon supplanting hyperrationality by bounded rationality. Although this concession to the limits of cognitive competence vitiates the mechanism design and related complete contracting setups favored by many economists, transaction cost economics accommodates the incompleteness of contract by expressly dealing with *ex post* governance. This consideration brings me to the second part. What *contracting in its entirety* means is that parties to a contract will be cognizant of

prospective distortions and of the needs to (1) realign incentives and (2) craft governance structures that fill gaps, correct errors, and adapt more effectively to disturbances. Prospective incentive and governance needs *will thus be anticipated* and thereafter "folded in."

The need to make allowance for process effects is where sociology has the most to offer to the contractual approach sketched above. Process analysis introduces intertemporal features of an unanticipated (and often dysfunctional) kind. These features are frequently very subtle and require "antennae" that are distinctively associated with training in sociology. The analysis of process (history, embeddedness, networks, and the like) is crucial to an accurate assessment of the comparative strengths and weaknesses of alternative forms of work organization. Economists have much to learn from sociologists on such matters.

Oliver E. Williamson

Visiting Professor of Economics
Transamerica Professor of
Business Administration
University of California—Berkeley

The Responsive Workplace: Employers and a Changing Labor Force. By Sheila B. Kaman and Alfred J. Kahn. New York: Columbia University Press, 1987. xi, 329 pp. \$35.00 cloth.

As the authors of this book point out in their preface, "society has changed, work has changed, families have changed, and the work force has changed." In support of their conclusion that "therefore, the workplace should change, too," they provide a great deal of documentation. Though they recognize that government needs to play some role in bringing about change, their primary emphasis throughout the book is on what *business* can and should do in order to be responsive to personal and family needs, how little it is doing, and how it could be induced to do more.

The stated goals of the book are, first, to describe existing problems, who is covered by programs that help to mitigate those problems, and how adequate coverage is; and, second, to evaluate the pros and cons of the wide variety of programs that have been employed in this country and elsewhere. Both these aims are carried out with competence and great thoroughness. What is missing is a careful examination of economic factors that help to determine