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Abstract

[Excerpt] John Turner and Noriyasu Watanabe have written numerous articles and books on pensions and employee benefits. In this collaborative effort, they synthesize a great deal of institutional and analytical material on a wide range of countries, including those typically regarded as industrialized (most of the OECD countries are the subjects of case studies and illustrations) and those that would probably be happy to learn that they now fall into that category (in particular, Chile and Argentina). The book is both accessible (there are no equations in sight) and analytical.
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trial relations, than what was sufficient for standar-
dized mass production. According to this perspec-
tive, as a country becomes more eco-
nomically advanced and as capital-, technology-, and knowledge-intensive industrial sectors take the place of labor-intensive manufacturing, there should be a transition to mutual commit-
tment HRM policies and cooperative industrial relations institutions. Nobody should be sur-
pised that the material presented in the book does tend to show more progressive industrial relations norms in more advanced nations and firms. It appears that the predominant form of work organization and the level of competence and commitment required from employees rises progressively as we turn from Thailand to Mal-
aysia, and then to Korea and Singapore. Simi-
larly, we find significant advances in work orga-
nization and HRM policies when we turn from light manufacturing to automobile production in Thailand, or from garment-making to tex-
tiles in Hong Kong.

On the other hand, a more careful look at the information makes that simple point less obvi-
ous. Deyo tells us that some Japanese-owned auto assemblers in Thailand have been able to achieve international competitiveness by intro-
ducing key elements of flexible production sys-
tems supported by many of the HRM policies advocated in the lean production literature—
even though Thailand remains at a low level of economic development, the Thai labor move-
ment is almost nonexistent, and even the excep-
tional high performance firms continue to give priority to cost-cutting tactics in many of their policy choices. At the opposite extreme, Begin tells us that employers in Singapore’s much more advanced economy enjoy a high degree of financial and numerical flexibility (the ability to easily adjust wage levels and head count). On the other hand, Singaporean blue-collar work-
ers are usually not as skilled as their counter-
parts in the most successful advanced nations, work is organized into narrow routine jobs, there is a low degree of employee commitment, and operations are poorly integrated. Simi-
larly, Kim’s study of large Korean manufactur-
ing firms shows that even the internationally competitive firms in relatively advanced indus-
trial sectors generally fail to effectively use and build upon the human resource potential of their highly educated employees, or to adopt flexible integrated operating systems.

The chapters dealing with the affiliates of American and Japanese multinationals in Ma-
aysia and Taiwan also suggest that industrial relations institutions, and the level of economic
development at the national level, may have only a limited impact on HRM policies or per-
formance outcomes. Kuruvilla’s article shows how Malaysia’s industrialization strategy, with its emphasis on attracting foreign investors through the availability of disciplined, low-cost labor, has rendered Malaysian labor unions weak and ineffective. Nonetheless, the studies of subsidiaries of American and Japanese multi-
nationals show that the HRM policies, work organization, and performance outcomes in the Malaysian subsidiaries differ only slightly from those in the subsidiaries in Taiwan’s more advanced economic and political envi-
ronment.

Though this book does not provide a good basis for making comparisons across countries, it does support the general conclusion that tensions remain, regardless of the level of eco-

omic or technological development, between policies designed to minimize labor costs and policies designed to cultivate competent and committed employees whose input can be used for mutual gains. In addition, many of the articles provide valuable insights into the process of change within firms, industrial sectors, and nations. The book does not provide defini-
tive answers, but the material it provides on non-Western countries makes a vital contribu-
tion to the literature on industrial relations and international competitiveness.

Ronald A. Rodgers
Lecturer
National University of Singapore
Department of Organisational Behaviour
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John Turner and Noriyasu Watanabe have written numerous articles and books on pen-
sions and employee benefits. In this collabora-
tive effort, they synthesize a great deal of insti-
tutional and analytical material on a wide range of countries, including those typically regarded as industrialized (most of the OECD countries are the subjects of case studies and illustrations) and those that would probably be happy to learn that they now fall into that category (in particular, Chile and Argentina). The book is
both accessible (there are no equations in sight) and analytical.

The authors take an issue-based as opposed to a country-based approach. Because of an exceptionally comprehensive index, which is organized not only by subject but also by country, this approach works quite well. For instance, the reader interested in Japan will find more than 40 index entries on various aspects of that country's pension system. This makes for a bit of page-flipping, but that inconvenience is unavoidable in a broad-based comparative analysis.

The book considers eleven principal issues: To what extent should retirement income be privatized? Should the private pension system be voluntary or mandatory? If private pension plans are voluntary, should the government encourage them or simply permit them? Who is best able to bear the inherent financial risks in pension plans? Should there be mandatory insurance for pension benefits? Who should pay for pension plans? Should benefits be funded in advance? To what extent should pension portfolios be regulated? What types of organizations should be allowed to sponsor pension plans? Should individual plans be allowed? What types of institutions should be allowed to manage pension funds? Readers looking for answers to these questions will be disappointed, because the authors do not give them. They do, however, present an appropriately broad range of possible institutional arrangements and public policy approaches, from which readers can draw their own conclusions.

Certain parts of this book are likely to be particularly informative and interesting to readers of this journal. These include case studies in Chapter 3 of privatization of pensions in Chile, the United Kingdom, and Japan; an analysis of various sources of pension risk in Chapter 5; and a consideration of labor market issues such as pension coverage, portability of pension benefits, and effects of pensions on retirement ages in Chapter 7.

However, the book is not without its lapses. One is the consideration of adverse selection based on age but not on income. Another is the treatment of adequacy in most countries in terms of pension benefit amount but not in terms of pension coverage. (This is corrected, though, in a particularly illuminating discussion of these issues in the United States.) And then there is this statement about contracting out (that is, allowing firms to voluntarily privatize part of the social security system by paying a reduced contribution to social security when they provide a replacement private pension plan of sufficient generosity): “Attractive features of contracting out include reduced reliance on the government and greater reliance on the private sector.” Beauty is in the eyes of the beholder, but I wonder how many beholders living beyond Hyde Park see much attractiveness here.

We at Cornell have already adopted sections of this book in our required Economic Security course. For policy makers, policy advisors, and ordinary citizens considering reforms of existing pension systems or designs of new ones, this is a “must” read.

Gary S. Fields
New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations Cornell University

Historical Studies


This extraordinary study of the formative period of the British working class will jolt many historians with its challenge to the central premises of E. P. Thompson’s 1968 analysis, which profoundly influenced Anglo-American labor historiography. By closely studying the interplay between men and women during the process of class formation, Anna Clark brilliantly illuminates the reasons for what she terms the tragic loss of a genuine radical politics for British workers. Following up on the distinguished work of Barbara Taylor, Dorothy Thompson, Joan Scott, Sally Alexander, Deborah Valenze, Sonya Rose, Leonora Davidoff, Catherine Hall, Carol Morgan, Ellen Ross, and others, Clark explodes Thompson’s version of male artisans as the radical vanguard in the making of the working class. Gender analysis reveals these skilled workers to have been fundamentally and consistently conservative, manipulative, masculinist, exclusive, misogynistic, violent, and stubborn. Far from challenging the power of early nineteenth-century industrial capitalism, they thus continually undermined the potential for such a challenge.

Clark examines three regions of early industrialization: London, Lancashire, and Scotland.