Models of Management: Work, Authority, and Organization in a Comparative Perspective.

Review Author[s]:
Frank Dobbin

American Journal of Sociology, Volume 101, Issue 1 (Jul., 1995), 244-246.

Your use of the JSTOR database indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use. A copy of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use is available at http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html, by contacting JSTOR at jstor-info@umich.edu, or by calling JSTOR at (888)388-3574, (734)998-9101 or (FAX) (734)998-9113. No part of a JSTOR transmission may be copied, downloaded, stored, further transmitted, transferred, distributed, altered, or otherwise used, in any form or by any means, except: (1) one stored electronic and one paper copy of any article solely for your personal, non-commercial use, or (2) with prior written permission of JSTOR and the publisher of the article or other text.

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.

American Journal of Sociology is published by University of Chicago Press. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/journals/ucpress.html.

American Journal of Sociology
01995 University of Chicago Press

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

02001 JSTOR

http://www.jstor.org/
Fri Jan 12 14:49:43 2001

and justified comparable worth claims by measuring the wage gap, redefining discrimination, etc.) and second-generation sociological case studies of local and state efforts.

Although it is impressive, I have a general reservation about McCann's approach. There is less feel in the text for concrete political processes than the model's name implies, perhaps because of the very aggregation of cases. Despite bows to the importance of "context-specific, microlevel experiential factors" (pp. 92–93n.1) and the stated skepticism toward "law-like" models (p. 15), the textual presentation (or representation of the research) at times detracts, particularly from the examination of how the crucial yet fragile alliances across class, gender, and race lines were strengthened, or in other cases weakened, by demands for comparable worth reforms. McCann seems, respectfully if somewhat uncomfortably, to straddle epistemological divides currently structuring knowledge hierarchies in the social sciences.

Finally, however, McCann offers an excellent discussion of social movement reliance on legal norms and practices and an insightful argument about the complexities of legal consciousness among subordinate group members in democratic societies. Rights at Work should be widely read by those with interests in gender issues, the sociology of law, and the study of social movements.

Models of Management: Work, Authority, and Organization in a Comparative Perspective. By Mauro F. Guillén. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994. Pp. xiii+424. $18.95.

Frank Dobbin
Princeton University

In this rich history of management ideology and practice, Mauro Guillén charts the diffusion of scientific management, human relations, and "structural analysis" in the United States, Germany, Spain, and Great Britain during the 20th century. Guillén seeks to establish the success of each paradigm in each country and to explain the variance with reference to myriad ideological and institutional factors.

Guillén begins with the premise that the adoption of a management paradigm hinges on institutional context and not alone on the scientific quality or economic utility of the paradigm. He defines institutional context broadly to include structural change (e.g., organizational size and technical complexity), international pressures, labor unrest, elite *mentalité* (in French *Annales* terms), activities of professional groups (especially engineers), state support, and worker response. The first three factors stimulate managers to seek new techniques, and the last four condition adoption of particular paradigms. Guillén draws on neoinstitutional theory to define management paradigms as comprising both practices and underlying ideologies of efficiency. But the causal imagery here

connects with a long sociological tradition of institutional analysis, in which ideological institutions frame interest group struggle. Here, nations' ideological orientations — modernist-technocratic versus liberal-humanist and Catholic versus Protestant — explain much of the variance in labor-business conflict and hence paradigm success.

The central negative lesson is that economic determinist arguments do not explain the success of management paradigms. The positive story is very much a theoretical mosaic. It boils down to this: structural change in industry stimulates efforts to bring in new management techniques — it is a necessary condition. This much even economic determinists will swallow, although readers from the Garbage Can school may wonder whether these structural changes were real, imagined at the time, or constructed post hoc. Of the four conditioning factors, state support and worker cooperation often follow structural crises, and together they may suffice to put a new paradigm into place. Professional groups can advance a new paradigm single-handedly, in the presence of all three stimuli—structural change, international pressures, and labor unrest. Elite *mentalité* matters most where labor unrest is a stimulus, because it shapes how nations conceive labor-management relations.

Guillén clearly has a lot of explaining to do. The task of gauging the outcomes alone — with three paradigms by two realms (management ideology and shop-floor practice) by four countries — is considerable. Historical content analysis of management journals gives us a handle on the success of these schools in national management ideology. Getting a handle on their success on the shop floor is trickier, given the scarcity of historical surveys of management practice, but Guillén does a creditable job of piecing together evidence from surveys and from important firms.

Guillén counters efficiency arguments by using J. S. Mills's method of difference, selecting cases that hold constant level of development, technology, and such but that differ in terms of both institutional factors (causes) and paradigm success (outcomes). Spain is the odd man out, for economic factors are not held constant, but the contrasts among the United States, Germany, and Britain are dramatic, especially given the fervor with which followers of each paradigm believed that they had the one best way.

This book, more than most, should be read backward. Guillén saves the punch line for the last two chapters. In the four core empirical chapters, organized by country, he reviews the secondary literature on each country's management paradigm (e.g., structural analysis in Germany), treating diverse institutional causes evenhandedly. In these chapters, a central goal is to establish the face validity of existing arguments. Guillén finds evidence, for instance, that scientific management was inhibited in Spain by industrial backwardness, international isolation, labor opposition, scarcity of engineers, antimodernist mentality, and lack of state support. This review is a great strength of the book, for the chapters comprise an encyclopedic survey of management history sources, accompanied by a wonderful 90-page bibliography. Being driven by the second-

ary literature, these chapters cover "structural analysis" in short order, because it is not generally recognized as a single paradigm. It is only in the two concluding chapters, and in a Boolean appendix inspired by Charles Ragin, that Guillén makes the analytic comparisons that help us to discern which factors were decisive.

Mauro Guillén's ambitious new book carries forward the problematic of Reinhard Bendix's *Work and Authority in Industry* (New York: Wiley, 1956). Its value lies as much in its cross-national map of the terrain of management theory and practice as in its rich explanatory framework. At a time when the world is rethinking economic determinist theories of organizing, *Models of Management* provides striking evidence of just how important national and historical context are. This is a book one should keep within reach as a ready reference.

Family, Dependence, and the Origins of the Welfare State: Britain and France, 1914–1945. By Susan Pedersen. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Pp. xv+478.

Ann Orloff
University of Wisconsin — Madison

Susan Pedersen's ambitious book illustrates the promise of work that is simultaneously historical and comparative. Comparing the development of core welfare state programs in Britain and France in the years between the two world wars, she argues convincingly that differences in the structures of industrial and political mediation and in the discursive constructions of family problems and policies can explain the very different logics that continue to mark the social policies of these two countries. Moreover, this work makes a significant contribution to analyses of the welfare state—all studies of the welfare state, not just feminist ones—by demonstrating the centrality of gender relations and families to explanations of social policy outcomes and by presenting an analysis that fully integrates gender and families with class and markets and states.

British social policy is characterized by a "male breadwinner logic" centered on the needs of male breadwinners. The labor market is organized around a male family wage, and social programs ensure workers' "right" to maintain wives and families even when employment is interrupted or workers retire. The needs of children and their mothers are to be met through men's family wages or through survivors' or dependents' benefits from men's social insurance. In contrast, French welfare efforts are characterized as following a "parental logic"—they assist parents in meeting the costs of raising children, conceived as a national collective good, and redistribute resources from the childless to families with children. Rather than underwriting men's "right to maintain," policies were to combat *denatalité* and build the French nation, which faced continuing military and economic competition from more populous Germany.