

Book Reviews

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

Mauro F. Guillen. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994. 432 pages. \$19.95, paper.

Can the emergence of "management models" such as Scientific Management, Human Relations, and Structural Analysis be accounted for solely by economic and technological factors, or do institutional factors also play a role? And if so, what configurations of institutional factors account for the adoption of these management models by intellectuals and practitioners, and do these configurations vary across countries? In *Models of Management*, Guillen employs an historical cross-national comparative methodology to explore these questions. Furthermore, he argues that each of these management models is characterized by both a coherent ideology and a set of managerial practices, and he studies their adoption in both of these terms. His analysis provides compelling evidence for the importance of institutional factors (i.e., governmental action, worker responses to organizational change, business and cultural elite mentalities, and the influence of professional groups) in the development of management models. The study is clearly in the Weberian tradition of historical-comparative research: The level of analysis is the nation-state, and the goal is to explain organizational change in the broadest historical context. To answer the key questions, Guillen draws on an impressive array of literatures covering every major and minor field of management. In this sense, the book is an academic tour de force.

Models of Management is divided into seven chapters. Chapter 1 outlines the questions described above. In chapters 2-5, Guillen explores how the three management models developed in four countries—the United States, Germany, Spain, and Great Britain—chosen for the diversity of institutional factors that characterized them between 1900 and 1975. For each country, he provides a detailed overview of the development of these paradigms, and the book would be useful for a master's-level organization theory or organizational behavior course based on this content alone. While a detailed summary of the different institutional configurations identified as "causes" for the adoption of each management model in each country is beyond the scope of this review, it is worth noting that Guillen does provide an antidote to deterministic arguments that seek to identify single causes for long-term organizational change. His analysis reveals that the same outcomes—for example, the development of scientific management practices in the U.S. and Germany—can result from markedly different causes. Also, the analysis reveals that a key precondition for the development of new management models is the degree to which structural change (such as increasing size, complexity, or bureaucratization) is present in a country. Where such change is evident, organizational problems arise, and these problems spur both academicians and practitioners to develop or adopt new administrative models. Chapter 6 provides a helpful summary of all of these findings.

319/ASQ, June 1996

The primary data for the country case studies are content analyses of representative academic and practitioner-oriented publications over this time period. Thus, for example, because most articles in the *Harvard Business Review* between 1944 and 1960 focused on human relations (HR) themes (both as an ideology and as a set of management techniques), Guillen concludes that this provides evidence for the dominance of the HR paradigm in the U.S. during this time period. Where possible, he also draws on surveys carried out by governmental or industry trade groups to demonstrate the adoption (or lack thereof) of particular techniques of the three management models. His arguments are bolstered where these multiple sources of data are available, as in the cases of the U.S. and the U.K. While the evidence in these cases is generally persuasive, in the sense that Guillen's interpretations of the content analyses seem to be consistent with the statistics he makes use of, much of the evidence concerning Germany and Spain consists mostly of content analyses, and in all cases his reliance on himself as the sole "rater" of journal-article content raises the issue of reliability—an issue that isn't addressed.

Chapter 7, which attempts to fit the studies' findings into a broader social theory framework, is clearly the weakest part of the book. The author's claims that a "theory of social action has been articulated as part of the study's theoretical framework" (p. 282) is not supported—basically, the study uses the institutional framework associated with DiMaggio and Powell, although using it in a purely historical study is somewhat novel. It also highlights a flaw in the book's central thesis, because few organization theorists these days would argue that the development of management models is determined purely by technological and economic factors—the findings of organizational ecology and institutional researchers are too well known. Thus, the central question outlined at the start of this review and on page 1 of the book assumes a straw-man character.

Also, the chapter discussion builds on one of the conceptual problems with the work: the dualistic distinction between ideologies and techniques that Guillen uses to characterize the management models. Guillen should have addressed the large body of social theory (e.g., Foucault, Elias) and organizational theory (e.g., Clegg, Collinson, Perrow, Nord, Jermier) that provide evidence that managerial ideologies are techniques, and managerial techniques are saturated with ideological content. This dualistic reasoning leads Guillen to make the rather untenable claim that scientific management was never generally successful as a managerial ideology in any of the four countries. Finally, the chapter concludes with a necessarily cursory discussion of how this kind of analysis might be used to understand current managerial paradigms such as total quality management and organizational culture studies. While our understanding of these management models might benefit from this kind of cross-national analysis, Guillen has too little space to do it justice, and the section therefore distracts the reader from the book's key findings.

Book Reviews

Despite these shortcomings, Guillen has provided a well-written and thoroughly researched history of three of the major paradigms in administrative science and does so for four diverse countries. By doing so, he manages to highlight the myopia of much organizational research, which often treats the history of U.S. administrative science as *the* history of administrative science and practice. By highlighting the importance of cross-national influences, he provides an exemplar for the field to follow. I would recommend the book to both academics and practitioners interested in the history of administrative science, as well as to those interested in analyzing future cross-national organizational change.

Stephen J. Jaros

Department of Management
College of Business
Southern University
Baton Rouge, LA 70816

The Employment Relationship: Causes and Consequences of Modern Personnel Administration.

William P. Bridges and Wayne J. Villemez. New York: Plenum, 1994. 241 pp. \$34.50, cloth.

The Employment Relationship reports the results of an ambitious research project begun in the early 1980s, in which some 2,000 randomly sampled Chicago-area employees and their employers were surveyed about employment policies and conditions. The result is the fullest picture to date of how employment practices vary by sector, race, gender, occupation, labor-market characteristics, and a host of other factors. The authors begin by providing an overall picture of the practices organizations use and the practices that go together. They find five sets of practices, with five purposes: due process, bureaucratic work control, market sheltering, mobility assurance, and personnel formalization. Despite some overlap among these groups, Bridges and Villemez show that existing accounts of a singular bureaucratic employment system—often dubbed “internal labor market”—blur important distinctions. Many groups of employees, for instance, work under due-process guarantees without enjoying the market-sheltering and mobility-assurance practices that create internal labor markets.

The study shows the substantial explanatory leverage that can be achieved with data from two levels of analysis. The idea of putting together such a dataset was inspired, and the inspiration has paid off. Bridges and Villemez are able to address many of the looming questions in the field of work and occupations. The book is thick with new results, and the authors are refreshingly even-handed when dealing with diverse theories. The result is an undogmatic catalog of findings that will inform future research.

The most dramatic findings concern the kinds of employment systems men and women, blacks and whites,

321/ASQ, June 1996