

XX

ECONOMIC SOCIOLOGY

European Electronic Newsletter

Vol. 1, No. 3 (June 2000)

XX

Editor: Richard Swedberg
Managing Editor: Reza Azarian
Distributor: SISWO/Institute for the Social Sciences, Amsterdam

Editorial Committee:
Reza Azarian (Stockholm University, Sweden; razarian@sociology.su.se)
Jens Beckert (Freie Universität, Berlin, Germany; beckert@zedat.fu-berlin.de)
Bert van Hees (SISWO, Amsterdam, the Netherlands; hees@siswo.uva.nl)
Johan Heilbron (Université de Lille 1, France; johan.heilbron@wxs.nl)
Richard Swedberg (Stockholm University, Sweden; swedberg@sociology.su.se)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"A Gendered Division of Labor" by Viviana A. Zelizer 2

"Genetically Modified Food: A Suitable Case for an Economic Sociology Treatment"
by Mark Harvey 6

"Retailing: Production and Consumption's Missing Relation"
by Miriam Glucksmann 12

"Finding New Directions in Economic Anthropology"
by Monica Lindh de Montoya 17

"Economic Sociology in Russia"
by Valery Yakubovich and Sveta Yaroshenko 24

Book Reviews:

 Á. Sverrisson and M. P. Van Dijk (eds.), *Local Economies in Turmoil* 29

 C. Trigilia, *Sociologia economica. Stato, mercato e società nel capitalismo
 moderno* 32

 V. Radaev, *Economicheskaya Sociologiya* 35

Announcements and Reports 38

Back issues of this newsletter are available at <http://www.siswo.uva.nl/ES>
For more information, comments or contributions please contact Arnold Wilts, the Managing Editor, at:
wilts@pscw.uva.nl

A Gendered Division of Labor

by

Viviana A. Zelizer
Princeton University
vzelizer@phoenix.princeton.edu

A funny thing happened to economic sociology on the way to its present success¹. In North America male dominance remains remarkable. If you looked around at the organizational meetings for the proposed American Sociological Association's Economic Sociology section you would have noticed a predominantly male audience. In the section on Organizations, Occupations, and Work, the contrast is striking: a substantial proportion of participants are female. If, in preparation to teach a course, you inspected the ASA economic sociology syllabus set, you would discover the same gendered pattern: only 2 of the 22 syllabi came from women (Green and Myhre 1996). In comparison, of the 10 syllabi included in the newly issued set on Gender and Work, every single one came from a woman (Winfield 1999).

A similar situation prevails in Europe. All authors of articles in the first two issues of this European Electronic Newsletter on economic sociology are male. Another form of evidence comes from scholarly organizations and meetings: for instance, most members and paper givers of the European Sociological Association's economic sociology group are men.

Female voices are similarly absent from the most influential mainstream economic sociology texts. When Richard Swedberg (1990) interviewed 17 leading economists and sociologists about areas of their common concern in the late 1980s, every single respondent was male. That ratio has not changed substantially in the past decade. Some examples:

- ◆ Among the 34 economic sociologists identified by Swedberg's (1997) overview of the field as "key people" only four are women.
- ◆ Of the 45 authors in Neil Smelser and Richard Swedberg's (1994) *Handbook of Economic Sociology*, only nine are women.
- ◆ The field's most prominent reader, *The Sociology of Economic Life* (1992), with 15 selections of what the two editors (Mark Granovetter and Richard Swedberg) define as "the most interesting work done in modern economic sociology and related disciplines", includes only two women.
- ◆ When French economic sociologist Michel Callon (1998) assembled a book of readings on the field, only one of the 12 contributors was a woman.

What's going on here? What explains this pattern of recruitment into the field? Three possible answers come to mind: *first*, that women simply do not study economic processes; *second*, that men have excluded women from this field; and *third* that a fault line has occurred in the gender division of labor. The first explanation is certainly not the case. In fact, women are

¹ Revised version of article prepared for the newsletter, Organizations, Occupations, and Work section, American Sociological Association, Fall 1999.

studying all kinds of economic processes. Nor is there any evidence of the second. Certainly my personal experience is of being welcomed into discussions of economic sociology.

The third explanation, however, seems quite plausible. A boundary has appeared that separates definitions of topics, with economic processes at both sides but only one side defined as economic sociology. To simplify, the fault line results from orientation toward two rather different intellectual agendas. It is as if we had two magnets, one the agenda of mainstream economics, the other the agenda of power and inequality. Of course there is an overlapping field, and we can point to exceptions, but we will find most scholars clustering around one magnet or the other. Calls to unite the two regions usually turn out to involve ceding dominance to one pole or the other.

Economic sociologists have, for the most part, accepted the standard economic agenda, concentrating on firms and markets. On the other side of the boundary researchers have qualified, criticized, modified, or rejected the agenda of mainstream economics. They have sought instead to incorporate studies of power and inequality.

We could explore this surprising division of labor with respect to a wide range of topics, such as consumption, informal economies, households, gift economies, or welfare transfers. However, it appears dramatically in studies of economic processes where differentiation by gender figures significantly. Although gender appears everywhere in economic processes, students of firms and markets in the style of economic sociology ordinarily ignore gender issues.

As Ruth Milkman and Eleanor Townsley (1994:614) observed in their essay on “Gender and the Economy” in the *Handbook of Economic Sociology*:

economic sociology as a field has yet to be truly sensitized to the gender dimension of economic life. The recent flurry of attention to the Polanyian concept of embeddedness, which has striking gender implications, has yet to persuade most sociologists of the economy to seriously integrate gender concerns into their analyses. Gender-centered research, although plentiful, remains essentially ghettoized and ignored by the mainstream.

The result is to treat gender as one more attribute of single decision-making economic actors instead of an organizing principle in economic life. In fact, feminist economists agree with that judgment. Since the late 1980s, a group of critical scholars has been waging a vigorous campaign against gender-biased traditional economic models and methodologies. More forcefully than their sociological counterparts, feminist economists, with their own organization and a special journal (*Feminist Economics*), have boldly criticized economics’ main tenets. As Julie Nelson (1998:36), a leading figure of this movement, states: economists’ “exclusive focus on the individuality, autonomy and agency of the economic actor ignores the social and physical nature and familial upbringing and responsibilities of actual human beings, as it does the possibility of relationships of control and coercion” (For a feminist sociological critique of the economic model, see England 1993).

Let’s be clear about what is going on: plenty of scholars are investigating gender in economic processes. The majority of those scholars are women. The point is that most of them are doing so outside the perimeter of economic sociology as participants currently define the field. As a

consequence, their work has less influence on mainstream economic sociology than it would if scholars would recognize them as engaged in the same enterprise.

Why should we care? Why should gender make a difference for economic sociology?

First, by expanding definitions of economic activity. Most economic sociology follows economics' concentration on production markets, while treating as peripheral a wide range of other economic processes where gender differentiation is obvious and /or where women predominate, most notably non-market economic activity.

Second, attention to gender challenges assumptions of single-utility functions in units, such as households, which are in fact gender-differentiated.

Third, a focus on gender raises more general questions concerning the place of categorical differentiation -- not only gender, but also race and ethnicity -- in economic processes. These form barriers to organizational activities which genderless, efficiency-driven models cannot account for.

Fourth, the presence of gender multiplies the social work going on in ostensibly purely economic transactions. Where economic analysis postulates only the importance of interests and resources, by recognizing gender, we can see instead how people are creating, maintaining and transforming social relations.

It would be a pity if two such talented groups of scholars proceeded to work on economic processes in isolation from each other.

References

- Callon, Michel 1998 "The Embeddedness of Economic Markets in Economics" pp. 1-57 in *The Laws of the Markets*, edited by Michel Callon, Oxford: Blackwell
- DiMaggio, Paul 1994 "Culture and Economy" pp. 27-57 in *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, edited by Neil Smelser and Richard Swedberg, Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press and New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- England, Paula 1993 "The Separative Self: Androcentric Bias in Neoclassical Assumptions" pp. 37-53 in *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*, edited by Marianne A. Ferber and Julie A. Nelson, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Granovetter, Mark and Richard Swedberg 1992 *The Sociology of Economic Life* Boulder: Westview
- Green, Gary P., and David Myhre (eds.) 1996 *Economic Sociology: Syllabi and Instructional Materials* Washington, D. C.: American Sociological Association
- Milkman, Ruth, and Eleanor Townsley 1994 "Gender and the Economy" pp. 600-19 in *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, edited by Neil Smelser and Richard Swedberg, Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press and New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Nelson, Julie A. 1998 "Labour, Gender and the Economic/Social Divide" *International Labour Review* 137: 33-46
- Smelser, Neil and Richard Swedberg (eds.) 1994 *The Handbook of Economic Sociology* New York: Russell Sage Foundation and Princeton: Princeton University Press
- Swedberg, Richard 1990 *Economics and Sociology* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press

-- 1997 "New Economic Sociology: What Has Been Accomplished, What Is Ahead?" *Acta Sociologica* 40:161-82
Winfield, Idee (ed.) 1999 *Gender and Work: Syllabi and Other Instructional Materials*
Washington, D. C. American Sociological Association

Genetically Modified Food: A Suitable Case for an Economic Sociology Treatment

by

Mark Harvey

Senior Research Fellow, ESRC Centre for Research in Innovation and Competition

University of Manchester and UMIST

Msrpsmh@fs1.ec.man.ac.uk

Introduction

There can be little doubt that the unfolding potential of recombinant DNA science and technology on food and agriculture has a revolutionary significance, whose contours are as yet difficult to discern (Rifkin, 1998; Bonanno et al, 1994; Busch et al, 1991; Harvey 1999a, b). Both the nature of the food we eat and agricultural production is open to radical transformation. Food products can be modified in ways heretofore impossible in terms of their nutrient, pharmaceutical, and aesthetic (taste, colour, shape, density) properties. Likewise, modes and locations of cultivation, some of which have endured for centuries, can be fundamentally changed in terms both of the currently dominant agro-chemical practice, and of crops raised.

In the current hysteria, it is important to be clear about the agricultural significance of genetic modification, especially given Greenpeace's website banner headline of 'NO GENETIC MANIPULATION OF NATURE'. First, there has been effectively no 'natural' natural selection involved in agriculture for as long ago as the first domestication of cultivated crops many millennia ago. Genetic modification is succeeding scientific hybridisation, now also using recombinant DNA technology, and not replacing 'natural' species. Second, what is radically new compared with hybridisation is that plant properties can be transformed which allow crops to grow in hitherto hostile climates and soils². Third, it is replacing a dominant agro-chemical based agriculture, with either a more targeted use of pesticides, or potentially pest-resistant strains which promise a high technology route to eco-sustainable agriculture. Again, genetic modification cultivation is not replacing a more 'natural' method of farming. The 'organic' option remains a marginal activity in advanced agricultural economies with consumers who have high levels of disposable income.

The Challenge for Economic Sociology

If we stand at the threshold of a GM revolution in food and agriculture – or even if, as its opponents dream, we witness its suppression – the story so far presents a challenge to social analysis and invites an integrated and synthetic approach afforded by economic sociology. For it is clear that the forces shaping both the development of science and technology, and the markets, firms and products are diverse. Volatile share value fluctuations, a flurry of mergers and acquisitions, the restructuring of many major companies, demonstrate the significance of the economic dimensions. The evolution of often conflicting regulatory frameworks, disputes over market rules on segregation and labelling, skirmishes in the WTO, all manifest the

² The work of the Mexican scientist Luis Estrella has developed plants tolerant to soils with high aluminium content which affect 40% of the cultivated land in the tropics and sub-tropics, and which currently reduce yield by up to 80%.

formal institutional role as a major shaping force. Governmental policy, political alliances, consumer organisations, supermarkets outcompeting each other in claims to being more ‘natural’ than thou, disparate interest groups from Prince Charles to Genetix Snowball, exert ‘political’ influence. Last, but not least, plants themselves have a ‘voice’. The biological has to be a central part of the picture given the way that GM is changing the interface between cultivated and non-cultivated nature. Moreover, GM is modifying plants (and animals), not modifying the laws of nature. Despite the hyperbole of infinite malleability – on either side of the divide over GM – GM products must be biologically viable and in terrestrial environmental conditions. So an adequate explanation of these historic changes has to embrace very diverse shaping forces – economic, institutional, political, and ecological. That is the challenge.

The approach adopted here is that of ‘instituted economic process’ (IEP)³, first enunciated by Polanyi (1957, 1944). Two key components of this type of analysis can serve our purposes here. The first is one of how distinctively *economic* processes become instituted. Perhaps the most important instances of this relevant here are how biological entities, specifically genetically modified ones, become tradable goods; and how ‘economies of knowledge’ are established which distinguish public knowledge from tradable knowledge. How will the divide be made between public or privately owned genomic knowledge? This first aspect thus concerns ‘the study of the shifting place occupied by the economy in society’ (Polanyi, 1957, 250). The second key component is one of how, once instituted as economic, those economic processes and markets for GM crops and foods develop. Here, central issues concern how biotechnology companies have split so separating pharmaceutically-oriented from agricultural- and food-oriented genetic modification economic activity, and how markets and tradable GM goods co-evolve in different ways in different parts of the globe. These two key analytical components of how the economic is institutionally separated from the non-economic, and how processes are instituted within the economic, are quite ‘dialectical’, in the sense that the latter economic processes are clearly affected by how and where the separation between economic and non-economic occurs. Thus, for example, what goes on within the market for tradable GM goods is affected by where the boundary is set for tradable and non-tradable bio-informatics.

It should be noted that this approach facilitates the entry of the biological into the overall analysis, and allows us to operate beyond a simple nature-culture dualism which distorts so much of current debate around GM. Much biological diversity (notably all directly cultivated species) is ‘economically instituted’ bio-diversity. Many species either could not or do not reproduce themselves by ‘natural’ sexual reproduction without human assistance. Most currently cultivated species exist biologically only in relation to the specific products for which they are destined. For example, hybridisation has successively created different varieties of tomato each dedicated for tomato ketchup since the 1870s, the latest being patented by Heinz in 1994, the H9382 ketchup tomato, using recombinant DNA markers⁴. In

³ In Polanyi much was unclear about how this approach of instituted economic process related to the much more commonly referred to concept of embeddedness. In my view, IEP is much the most radical view because it allows all economic processes, capital accumulation, labour, price, supply, demand, markets, etc. to be viewed as instituted, and hence socially and historically variable. This contrasts with an ‘embeddedness’ approach where the social is seen as contextualising (Granovetter, 1985) the economic, or even dissolving the economic (Callon, 1998). An IEP approach takes the economic as economic, but no less instituted for that, even, and indeed especially, when ‘dis-embedded’.

⁴ To avoid confusion, it should be stressed that this is using recombinant DNA technology for hybridisation and *not* genetic modification.

this context, therefore, GM varieties constitute a new range of economically instituted biodiversity.

Genetic Modification as a Bio-socio-economic Process

The analysis below arose out of a case study⁵ of the emergence of a particular GM product, genetically modified tomato purée, and the correlative formation of a distinctive market, followed by the disappearance of that product, and the collapse of a carefully constructed market. Unavoidably, the analysis involved consideration of other, perhaps more typical, broad acre crops, and consequently a central part of the story necessarily has to consider two very different strategies, and their ensuing conflict: Zeneca with its tomato purée and Monsanto with its RoundUp Ready GM soya bean. Here only some of the broad results of the study are summarised in order to illustrate the kind of explanation generated by it.

The Rise of GM Tomato Purée

Let us begin with some simple ‘economic’ facts. In 1996 Sainsbury and Safeway supermarkets began selling, in clearly labelled and advertised cans, genetically modified tomato purée. It can be said to be the world’s first – and as yet only – genetically modified product where the aim of the modification was to improve the final product as well as facilitating food processing, as against modification whose primary aim is directed towards agribusiness and cultivation regimes. Before it was banished from supermarket shelves in 1999, it sold two million cans, at 15% lower price, and was chosen in preference by consumers whose only complaint, according to company commissioned surveys, was that the purée was in cans not tubes.

But the appearance of a standardised can, with clear labelling, under the own label colours of major supermarkets, was the outcome of a highly contingent, complex, and long term process which was initiated over 20 years previously. Here, four major aspects determining this trajectory are noted.

- *Production cultures and plants.* Like Monsanto, Zeneca as a biotechnology company also involved in the production of agrochemicals, spent a lot of capital during the 1980s purchasing seed companies for broad acre crops. But the tomato was already genetically particularly well known from hybridisation experience, and in its developmental pattern peculiarly lent itself to fundamental experimentation. Consequently, Zeneca in 1975 began a collaboration with Don Grierson at Nottingham University, to explore genetically modified tomato. At the same time Calgene (later acquired by Monsanto) in the US was also interested in developing the same technology. The technology involved modifying and slowing the ripening process. In the US, distinctive varieties of tomato had already long been developed for an industry based on mechanical harvesting of semi-ripe fruit. In Northern Europe, tomatoes are grown horticulturally, under glass, and are hand picked when ripe. These can be seen as two quite distinctly instituted production cultures, growing distinctive instituted biological varieties. In 1984, Zeneca and Calgene cut a deal in which Calgene would develop the GM technology for fresh

⁵ The full version can be found in my (1999b). The research involved in-depth interviews with key strategic players, the scientists in universities and companies, the biotechnology companies, supermarkets, and seed companies, as well as food manufacturers and processors. The research on the GM tomato is part of a much bigger project which used the ‘tomato’ as an empirical probe to analyse major transformations of production, distribution, retail and consumption over the past century, and was conducted together with my colleagues Huw Beynon and Steve Quilley (Harvey et al, forthcoming.)

tomatoes (the Flavr Savr) which suited US production culture, and Zeneca would use it for processed tomato. Both plant and production cultures fundamentally affected the economic deal which separated the markets for two distinct GM products.

- *Funding.* The nature and sources of funding of product development and fundamental research in biotechnology is fundamental to the diverse trajectories of GM markets and products. Funding is both critical and a clearly ‘instituted process’ which more or less sharply divides the ‘public’ from the ‘private’ economy. Here a first major point of contrast can be drawn between Zeneca and Monsanto. From the beginning, Zeneca attracted governmental finance, first from the UK and then from the European Commission, and R&D was throughout a process of intense collaboration between public science infrastructure in universities and private research laboratories. Zeneca operated on an ‘open laboratory’ basis with its public sector collaborators. By contrast, Monsanto funded its research exclusively from internally generated profits from its agrochemicals business, and notably from glyphosate, the RoundUp Ready insecticide, which the GM soya bean was designed to tolerate, and whose patent, hence rent generating capacity, is about to expire. In this sense Monsanto’s GM project was much more closely bound up with its agrochemical business. For ‘second generation’ genetic modification, which enhances nutrient or pharmaceutical properties of food (Nutrient Dense Foods), Zeneca acquired European Commission funding, on condition of demonstrable health benefits. It is also worth noting that ‘golden rice’ with enhanced vitamin A was developed by Potrykus with Rockefeller Foundation, EC and Swiss government funding. Thus different trajectories of GM technology can be seen to be affected by the public-private relationship, and related income sources.
- *Regulatory regimes.* The only Californian tomatoes to enter UK supply chains were those grown for Zeneca’s GM purée. One of the major reasons for this was the relative ease, due to lack of complexity as much as to stringency, of the US regulatory system for GM food and cultivation. However, regulatory systems are themselves shifting entities, very much moulded by the economic developments with which they interact. Labelling and segregation of GM food has now become mandatory in UK and other European countries, whereas, for reasons we shall see below, was absent in US food regulation. A further key aspect of regulation has involved differences in patent regimes, where the US have lower levels of prescription in terms of definition of end use of an innovation. This has had fundamental effects in the nature of biotechnology firms and of the goods they trade. The tomato gene construct (for polygalacturanase) was patented without definition of end use in 1987 in the US, and companies hence trade in licenses for its use.
- *Inter-sectoral power relations.* One of the starkest differences between Monsanto and Zeneca is that the latter was engaged with retail supermarkets four years prior to launching their GM product, in a co-operative exercise to construct the rules of the new consumer market, including labelling and segregation of GM material. It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that Monsanto did not even consider consumer markets, but was exclusively oriented to agribusiness. This reflects deep seated, ‘instituted’ differences in power relations between agribusiness, manufacturing,

and food retailing in the US and UK. In the UK, especially in the last 30 years, supermarket retailers have exercised unprecedented power over supply chains. In these circumstances, it is significant but unsurprising that the first GM products appeared in Sainsbury and Safeway livery.

The Fall

If the co-evolution of GM product and markets was a result of a complex interaction between plants and production cultures, revenue flows, regulatory regimes, and sectoral power relations, the disappearance of those markets is equally complex. Again four major heterogeneous aspects can be discerned.

- *Food scares and science.* In the UK, the experience of a succession of food scares, salmonella, lysteria, e-coli, and above all BSE created a climate of suspicion. Industrial food systems in which technology seemed to become increasingly 'un-natural', especially making cows into cannibals, provoked a reaction. Conflicting and contradictory scientific advice from various sources fed into a more widespread growth of scepticism towards science, which was easily mobilised by anti-GM propaganda.
- *Political configurations.* Strange alliances emerged between radical eco-warriors, Greenpeace, Prince Charles, the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, the Church (which holds a lot of land) and the Soil Association. A new form of 'nature fundamentalism' arose which constructed a contingent linkage between defence of nature against human interference and the organic farming lobby. Opportunistically, the power of the supermarkets was reversed from promotion to rejection of GM almost too quickly for them to clear their shelves. Once one supermarket led the stampede, all others had to occupy the same nature-moralistic high ground, coincidentally expanding their organic range of food at much higher profit margins.
- *The clash of regulatory regimes.* Zeneca had decided early on that bringing produce from one regulatory regime into another was likely to be unsustainable. But the clash between regulatory regimes over segregation and labelling created enormous market turbulence. A more profound clash of production cultures, between an agribusiness-oriented Monsanto and a more consumer-oriented Zeneca, however, contributed significantly to the at least temporary destruction of the market for GM produce in the UK.
- *Capital markets and biotechnology companies.* The impact of this multifaceted market disturbance took on its own logic within capital markets, especially when the world's largest bank, Deutsche Bank, advised dis-investment from the biotechnology companies involved in GM, and declared 'GMOs are dead' (August 1999). The consequences for the future of recombinant DNA science and technology have been profound. Pharmaceuticals have been detached from agribusiness and GM foods, and genomics likewise has split into a distinct trading area. Sector restructuring and firm organisation has been fundamentally altered so that these different developments of the same underlying science are now economically instituted in a new corporate division of labour.

Conclusion

The dramatic rise and fall of GM markets in Europe can be seen as a complex and contingent process which involves the interaction of many different causal domains: biology, economics, law, regulation, politics. Complexity and contingency, however, should not stifle the search

for adequate explanation. An IEP approach has been suggested as a way in which the properly economic can be analysed in its interactions with other causal domains, on condition that the economic itself is seen to be variously instituted and as a separate domain with shifting boundaries. Turbulence in Europe and advanced economies may well presage a fundamental shift in the centre of gravity for this biotechnology revolution to China, India, and South America.

References

- Bonanno, A., Busch, L., Friedland, W. H., Gouveia, L. and Mingione, E. 1994 *From Columbus to Conagra. The Globalisation of Agriculture and Food* University Press of Kansas
- Busch, L., Lacy, W. B., Burkhardt, J., and Lacy, L. R. 1991 *Plants, Power and Profit. Social, Economic and Ethical Consequences of the New Biotechnologies* Oxford: Blackwell
- Callon, M. 1998 "An Essay on Framing and Overflowing: Economic Externalities Revisited by Sociology" pp. 244-269 in *The Laws of the Markets* edited by M. Callon Oxford: Blackwell
- Granovetter, M. 1985 'Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness' *The American Journal of Sociology* 91:3:481-510
- Harvey, M. 1999a "Cultivation and Comprehension: How Genetic Modification Irreversibly Alters the Human Engagement with Nature" in *Sociology Research OnLine* October, Rapid Response Issue
- 1999b "Genetic Modification as a Bio-socio-economic Process: One Case of Tomato Purée" ESRC Centre for Research in Innovation and Competition Working Paper No 31. <http://les.man.ac.uk/cric>
- Harvey, M., Beynon, H., and Quilley, S. (forthcoming) *The Human Tomato*
- Mayer, S. and Rutovitz, J. 1996 "Trojan Tomatoes: Genetically Engineered for Delayed Softening or Ripening" Greenpeace draft report, unpublished
- Polanyi, K. 1944 *The Great Transformation. The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* Boston: Beacon
- 1957 "The Economy as Instituted Process" pp. 243-270 in *Trade and Market in the Early Empires. Economies in History and Theory* edited by Polanyi, K., Arensberg, C. M., and Pearson, H. W., New York: Free Press
- Rifkin, J. 1998 "Apocalypse When?" *New Scientist*, 31 October, pp. 34-37

Retailing: Production and Consumption's Missing Relation

by

Miriam Glucksmann
University of Essex
glucm@essex.ac.uk

Embarking recently on a project researching changes in the retail sector and their effects for shopworkers led me to reflect on the production/consumption paradigm, and especially on its inadequacies for this purpose. During the 1990s many writers did critique this paradigm, largely on the grounds that it had prioritised production over consumption, and the material over the cultural. In drawing attention to the circuit linking production with consumption, a space was created for focusing on the many phases and activities that intervene between the production of a good and its eventual consumption: packaging, transport, marketing, advertising, selling and so on. Over-compensating for a previous productionist bias, the emphasis of much of the new work has been on consumption (particularly on individuals and their buying and using of goods and services), rather than on the many and varied aspects of 'distribution'. However, if we are to do justice to the contemporary retail sector, a far more radical break with the production/consumption dualism is required and for two principal reasons. First, because retail remains a black box within this paradigm, an epiphenomenon of the two terms between which it mediates, but with no significance of its own other than as a 'site' for the exchange of goods and services. Second, because analysis of contemporary developments is held back by a way of thinking that posits two terms, distinct and in opposition. This not only prevents a focus on the actual connections linking production and consumption, but it is also too rigid in its assumptions about what constitutes consumption and production and its neglect of the blurry boundaries between these activities.

A broad, relational perspective is required if we are to analyse the overall circuit linking production, distribution and consumption. This focuses on connections and linkages between the various phases and parts of what is an integral, if not always integrated, process. It enables analysis of the overall articulation of the circuit by demonstrating how, at a given historical time, the operation of any one part of the process and the labour that is undertaken in it connects with the operation of any of the other parts and the labour that is undertaken in them. Production, distribution and consumption articulate with each other but in varying ways that are subject to historical change. Taking the manner of articulation as the central object of investigation means recognising the variability and multiplicity of linkages and connections. And viewing what goes on in consumption and production as subject to change overcomes an essentialism with regard to these categories that is often implicit in the debates that treat them as oppositions. A relational perspective, which looks at the overall articulation of a number of interconnected spheres, as well as the dynamics of each in its own right, opens up, rather than forecloses, analysis.

The following discussion draws on the conceptual framework of the 'total social organisation of labour' (TSOL), which I have elaborated elsewhere (Glucksmann 1990, 1995, 2000), to sketch the beginnings of just such an analysis. By directing attention to how the labour undertaken in one sector or institution connects with that undertaken in another, the TSOL framework permits a view on the overall articulation of interconnecting sectors. The most obvious example is the connection between paid employment and unpaid domestic labour:

labour undertaken in the household economy articulates with the labour undertaken in the formal market economy in the sense that what goes on in one affects and interlocks with what goes on in the other. For a long historical epoch this was a highly gendered division and articulation, men's paid work in the formal economy presupposing women in the household performing unpaid domestic labour. At a later stage, with the expansion of married women's employment, and of mass production, a different kind of connection was established, for instance between the work of (some) women working in factories producing ready-made food or clothing or electrical appliances and the work that (these and other) women did in the home, heating up, washing or using these goods. But which tasks are conducted in which sector is variable as are the socio-economic relations under which they are undertaken.

In what follows I attempt to make a case for the value of a relational perspective capable of focusing on the interlocking series of changes and connections between sectors basing the argument on a number of examples: the orchestrating role of retail and its associated industries; the strategic power of large retailers in relation to producers; the impossibility of drawing strict demarcation lines between activities and tasks that are productive, distributive or consumption-side; links between the expansion of women's employment, and changes in production, retail and consumption.

- The Orchestrating Role of Retail and Its Associated Industries

Retail represents the necessary link articulating production with consumption. The point of sale in a shop is nowadays only the end point of a whole series of processes that have grown up around selling, and which are all oriented to this final exchange. The advertising and marketing sectors, powerful industries in their own right, come under this heading. So do new 'knowledges' and experts, such as retail psychologists and lifestyle designers, and the whole panoply of educational institutions and courses that train recruits in retail marketing, management, design and so on. None of these are directly involved in the act of selling, but this is what they are all ultimately geared to. Similarly, goods have to be transported to their destination, packaged, and displayed. As the scale of commodities for sale has increased from local to national to global operations these functions have expanded in size and importance and also become specialist fields of expertise and employment. In a highly competitive retail market leading companies invest heavily in them. Thus, much activity is required for goods to reach the point of sale. And no understanding of how products get to the point of being consumed is possible without recognition of the orchestrating role of the retail sector understood in the widest terms to include all its associated 'industries'.

- The Strategic Power of Large Retailers in Relation to Producers

The shifting power position of different players in the overall circuit can also be confronted from a perspective that focuses on their connectedness. Britain, for example, has experienced a transition from producer hegemony in the 1960s and 1970s through supposed consumer sovereignty in the 1980s to retailer power in the 1990s. Large retailers have gained pre-eminence over producers, certainly over the companies supplying their goods. Grocery multiples such as Tesco and Sainsbury are the prime example, exercising control not only over the selling of food but increasingly also over the producers whose goods they stock, which now extend beyond foodstuffs to clothing, toiletries, and even banking and finance. Manufacturers of designer underwear, sports shoes and perfume (e. g. Calvin Klein, Levi, Armani) fought a losing battle to prevent their products being mass marketed at discount prices in high street supermarkets (The Guardian 27.3.98). The increasing size, concentration and monopolisation of retail businesses in the UK have led to a situation where a small number of very large companies now virtually dominate their respective markets. Shops are

also employers of a sizeable proportion of the total labour force: over two million people in Britain work in shops, and they account for nine per cent of the total workforce (1991 Census of Great Britain; Economic Activity, Table A: 598-624).

Shops are emerging as dominant economic institutions. And in so doing retail ceases to be the 'poor relation' to production or simply a vector for the transmission of goods to the consumer. On the contrary, retail now occupies a central strategic position, orchestrating relations both upstream to manufacturers and producers and also downstream to consumers (Wrigley and Lowe 1996). Tesco and Sainsbury dictate to producers on prices and quality, multi-source virtually everything they stock, produce their own brands to compete with erstwhile better known brands, adopt all manner of sales techniques, displays, layout and discounts to lure purchasers to buy more, and tie consumers to them with loyalty cards. And they employ well over one hundred thousand people each (The Times 1000, 1998).

•From Taxonomy to Relationality

Far from being eternally fixed as either production, or distribution, or consumption, many activities are sometimes one and sometimes another, and the line distinguishing between them is blurry rather than rigid. Where a dualistic paradigm cannot entertain this ambiguity or flexibility, no such problem hampers a relational approach. A few examples will illustrate the general point. In past decades bread used to be both produced and sold in bread shops, while today most sell bread that is factory-produced. The bread shop, in other words, is now a retail outlet where it used previously to be also a productive unit. The (re)appearance of the in-store bakery, as a distinct complement to the shelves of pre-packaged loaves, serves to emphasise the supplementary and mimicking function of this segment of the bread market within the superstore.

Or take packaging: is this production or distribution? Many goods arrive at their destination from the factory or warehouse already packaged but many also do not, and large supermarkets now offer the same goods for sale either already packaged or to be weighed and wrapped in the shop on meat or deli counters. Until the 1970s a large proportion of foodstuffs was stocked loose and packaged only at the point of sale, as it is now in many alternative or eco-shops. Thus, an overly taxonomic approach to classifying as *either* a productive *or* a retail function obscures rather than clarifies the relation between activities. Sometimes it is one and sometimes it is the other; there is no rigid cut off point between the two. The development of pre-packaging and self-service went hand in hand (Malcolm 1976), a change in production and distribution also involving a change in consumption, at least in the first, shopping, phase of the process of consumption. So, this example is also indicative of the interlocking set of changes affecting the whole circuit rather than just one phase of it.

And what exactly do we mean by consumption? Buying something, making use of it, or literally consuming it so that it gets used up? Writers differ widely in their deployment of this term, reflecting the impossibility of a hard and fast definition. From the productionist perspective, shopping was conventionally seen as consumption. Yet, many products bought in shops are used as raw materials for further production in the home (knitting wool, flour, DIY goods) and those doing the further production (clothing, meals, car maintenance) would probably not class the work this involves as consumption. Moreover, shopping, in the form of the weekly or routine family shop, has long been re-interpreted, particularly in feminist literature (Cowan 1983, Game and Pringle 1982) as work rather than as consumption or leisure. A relational perspective implies that there can be no intrinsic definition of

consumption. Whether or not activities count as consumption depends on their relational position in the circuit.

Similar observations apply at other points in the circuit. In a service and consumer oriented market, where part of what is bought is the actual service relationship itself (Urry 1990, Hochschild 1983, Adkins 1995) retail and consumption become indistinguishable. When customers base their choice on whether to buy package holidays, air tickets, insurance, from one company rather than another, on the basis of efficiency, helpfulness, the friendly face or voice (Lash and Urry 1994:201), then part of what they are paying for is the retail relationship.

A classificatory attitude is unhelpful to the analysis of activities which are unfixed or shift between production, distribution and consumption. The problem is not one of drawing a new demarcating line between manufacture and service. To do so would perpetuate the analytical opposition between production, consumption and other sectors and divert attention from the characteristic relational nature of the overall circuit.

- Links between the Expansion of Women's Employment, and Changes in Production, Retail and Consumption.

The expansion of women's employment, another development correlative with the consolidation of mass consumption, provides a final example of the integrated changes occurring through the circuit of production, distribution and consumption as a whole. The process of goods and services being increasingly produced and sold as commodities has gone hand in hand with the entry of millions of women to the paid labour force across the industrialised world, and the lengthening of their lifetime period of paid employment. The trend has been for goods formerly produced in the home to be increasingly made by women working in factories and sold by women working in shops (the vast majority of sales workers and shop assistants are women). So a multiple, rather than dual, series of changes interlock with each other, the expansion of women employed in production and distribution (amongst many other activities) connecting with the increasing consumption of goods and services that might earlier have been both produced and consumed within the household. The proliferation of upmarket mail order clothes catalogues targeted at the professional woman provides a contemporary example. Too busy to go shopping for clothes, the journalist, city analyst, doctor, barrister, or teacher finds telephone or internet ordering more convenient and less time-consuming. And in so doing she contributes both to the consolidation of an emerging field of retail, telesales, and to the expansion of a new and distinctive form of employment in call centres, which is also highly feminised.

I hope to have made a compelling case for a relational perspective capable of focusing on the interlocking series of changes and connections between sectors. All the examples are intended to highlight both the centrality and significance of retail to the overall circuit of production and consumption and the ability of a relational framework to come to terms with a huge realm of activity whose existence a production versus consumption dualism cannot even recognise.

Bibliography

- Adkins, L. 1995 *Gendered Work: Sexuality, Family and the Labour Market* Buckingham: Open University Press
Cowan, R. S. 1983 *More Work for Mother* New York: Basic Books
Game, A. and Pringle, R. 1982 *Gender at Work* London: Pluto Press

- Glucksmann, M. 1990 *Women Assemble: Women Workers and the 'New Industries' in Inter-war Britain* London: Routledge
- Glucksmann, M. 1995 "Why Work? Gender and the 'Total Social Organisation of Labour'" *Gender, Work and Organisation* 2, 2, April: 63-75.
- Glucksmann, M. 2000 *Cottons and Casuals: The Gendered Organisation of Labour in Time and Space* York: Sociology Press
- Hochschild, A. R. 1983 *The Managed Heart: Commercialisation of Human Feeling* Berkeley: University of California Press
- Lash, S. and Urry, J. 1994 *Economies of Signs and Space* London: Sage
- Malcolm, B. 1976 *The Structure of the Retail Grocery Trade* Watford: Institute of Grocery Distribution
- Urry, J. 1990 *The Tourist Gaze* London: Sage
- Wrigley, N. and Lowe, M. (eds.) 1996 *Retailing, Consumption and Capital: Towards a New Retail Geography* Harlow: Longman

Finding New Directions in Economic Anthropology

by

Monica Lindh de Montoya
Department of Social Anthropology, Stockholm University
monica-lindhde.montoya@socant.su.se

Economic sociology and economic anthropology are close relatives, but the communication between the two fields could be much better. In what follows I survey some old and new developments in economic anthropology, with the hope of encouraging economic sociologists to examine studies in economic anthropology, some of which can be relevant for their work - be it on markets, production or consumption.

As anthropologists began to conduct fieldwork and gather ethnographic material in different societies around the world, they encountered economies very different from their own. In his work on the Kula trade of the Trobriand Islands, Malinowski (1922, 1935) was one of the first to discuss a non-Western economy in depth, and noted that the productive aspects of Trobrianders' lives were tightly interwoven with kinship responsibilities and political and religious considerations, and that the important Kula trade had little significance for provisioning society, or in a monetary sense. Subsequent research (Bohannan and Dalton 1962, Godelier 1977, Meseilloux 1981, Sahlins 1974) continued to challenge categories important in economic theory and thought, and the belief that non-Western economies were primitive or underdeveloped, and would eventually evolve to become like those of the developed countries. Ethnography from non-industrialized societies indicated that production could be organized in many ways, under the auspices of a wide variety of 'non-economic' bonds and relationships. Additionally, material goods were frequently invested with immaterial qualities which transformed them, and gave value to social relations. The circumstances under which goods were exchanged affected, and could be affected by, the different social relationships which united exchange partners. Gift exchange, reciprocity, labor arrangements, long term-trading relationships and innovation are, then, some early interests of economic anthropologists, and although early work was undertaken in Melanesia and in Africa, ethnography from peasant societies of Latin America grew in importance from the 1970's onward (Johnson 1971, Gudeman 1978, Barlett 1980).

As ethnographic material accumulated, the debate between the formalists, who believed that non-western economies were in essence little different from modern ones, and could be analyzed with the same instruments, and the substantivists, who, following Polanyi (1944, 1957), conceived of economies as unique, deeply embedded within particular societies, and comprehensible only on their own terms. The formalist-substantivist debate -- inconclusive, and ultimately grounded in individual anthropologists' ways of perceiving the world -- dominated economic anthropology as the discipline was developing, waning only as academic ammunition and patience was depleted. Unfortunately it may have discouraged potential contributors to what was perceived as a conflictive and polemical field.

Meanwhile, economic anthropology was making progress on another front. The work of Eric Wolf (1957, 1969, 1982) inspired anthropologists to make use of historic material in analyzing the cultures of different societies, and the theoretical contributions of Frank (1967) and Wallerstein (1974) were a further stimulus in this direction. Some excellent monographs undertaken within this perspective, which analyzes cultures by focusing on political and

economic processes, are Roseberry (1983), Schneider and Schneider (1976) and Verdery (1983). Integration is frequently a major concern for these authors, and generally speaking, a large part of the work in economic anthropology during the last two decades deals with the transformation of non-capitalist or marginal societies as they meet the modern market.

An important way in which this meeting has always taken place is through markets, and an vital branch of economic anthropology studies markets and marketing. Here, most work has been undertaken in Latin America; much in Mexico, for example by Beals (1975) and Cook and Diskin (1976). Carol Smith's work, especially her edited volume on regional analysis (1976), shows how history and geographers' models of ideal market distribution can be used to decipher the economic structure of a region. Plattner has also made interesting contributions to the field (1982, 1983, 1985). An innovative work less concerned with circulation in the marketplace, and more with cultural transactions, is Geertz' essay on a Moroccan *suq* (1979). Finally Larson, Harris and Tandeter (1995) have recently edited a volume with a historical perspective on markets in the Andes.

In this very brief introduction, I have touched on a number of the main interests and theoretical orientations that have formed economic anthropology, and named a few of its contributors. Anthropologists have studied production (innovation, risk-taking, labor arrangements, entrepreneurship) and circulation (markets, exchange relationships, labor migration, economic integration) and more recently, have also turned their attention to consumption (Appadurai 1986, Miller 1995). The focus has been on small-scale non-Western economies: tribes, peasant communities, or urban enclaves with well-delimited borders. Scant attention has been paid to mainstream economic activities in the developed countries.

The last few years, however, have given indication that anthropologists are beginning to turn their attention to new fields closer to home, examining economic action in modern societies. James Carrier, a prolific economic anthropologist (1995, 1997a-d), has compiled an edited volume (1997d) that demonstrates some of the kinds of contemporary economic themes which can be illuminated from an anthropological perspective. In his preface to the volume, Carrier points out its difference in respect to other fairly recent collections of articles on markets and market systems (Dilley 1992, Friedland and Robertson 1990, Plattner 1985). The Friedland and Robertson, and Plattner volumes approach the market as an empirical entity to be described, rather than regarding it and its processes as conceptual categories to be analyzed. While Friedland and Robertson turn their attention to how social, political and economic forces interact in modern society, the Plattner volume addresses similar themes, but primarily outside the modern West. Dilley's volume also discusses societies that are more marginal to the global economy, with interest in seeing how their economic discourses interact with dominant Western ones, but he emphasizes the economy as a cultural entity, examining how people beyond or on the edge of the modern West conceive of economic activity, and how their constructions interact with Western constructions. Gudeman (1986), Gudeman and Rivera (1990) and Taussig (1980) are other economic anthropologists named by Carrier as long concerned with peoples' cultural models of economic activities although, as Dilley's contributors, they focus on non-Western economies. Parry and Bloch (1989) is an interesting collection discussing non-Western reaction to, and adaptation of, modern economies that might well be added to the list.

Carrier's collection, then, aims at discussing the modern economy as a cultural entity, and attempts to break new ground. In an ample and thought-provoking introduction, Carrier discusses the meaning the model of the "free market" has in modern society, examining its

underlying assumptions, and suggests that rather than judging its empirical accuracy against a certain set of standards, it may be more useful to think of it as a *lingua franca*, a “communicative analogy” used in public discourse by people of different social groups, which, once established, is maintained by the power of fashion and repute. The contributions to the volume are more concerned with examining the meanings people connect with the idea of the free market, than with the market’s actual functioning.

Yet considering the dearth of anthropological studies concerning aspects modern economies, a good deal of work needs to be done and there is ample room for analyses both of the “modern economy as entity” and the “modern economy as cultural construction,” as well as those which emphasize historical processes. In the last few years of the 1900’s a handful of such studies have emerged, and research groups that are currently forming indicate that modern economies are at last providing a fertile area for anthropological inquiry.

The work of Eric Wolf continues to be important for those interested in a political economy approach to modern market processes. Reyna Rapp and Jane Schneider have recently edited a volume (1995) which collects a number of studies on contemporary market processes. Gracia Clark, the author of a work on market women in Ghana (1994), is now examining the effects of structural adjustment programs on the economies of households in Ghana, a subject on which she has presented papers at the annual conference of the Society for Economic Anthropology (1999) and the American Anthropological Association (1999).

In the field of markets and marketing, Dannhaueser, interested in how the circulation of goods in patterns of commerce affects commercial opportunity and market structures, has written an interesting article on the circulation of import goods in Asia (1989) and a monograph on commerce in Germany. Plattner has discussed the structure of an art market (1997) and Lien (1997) has produced an interesting work on the professional marketing of a new food product in Norway.

Stock markets, and the modern world of finance in general, is also stimulating interest among anthropologist. Abolafia’s (1997) pathbreaking work on bond traders on Wall Street is an inspiration here, as well as Hertz’(1998) work on popular participation and the role of the state in the early days of the Shanghai stock exchange. While these two monographs are mainly descriptive – economy as entity – Lindquist, an ethnologist, has taken a look at Swedes’ increasing participation in the financial market (1999) and discusses changing conceptions of the act of saving. Other names to watch for future work are Annelise Riles, a legal anthropologist who is researching the activities of Japanese options traders, and Gustav Peebles, who is working on alternative currencies in Scandinavia.

The awakening interest in analyzing modern market processes is also giving rise to research groups and networks. At Stockholm University, I am currently participating in one such group, working on a project “Cultural models of the market: Trust, risk and social change.” My research concerns small investors in the Stockholm stock exchange and their conceptions of the financial market (Lindh de Montoya, forthcoming). Within the same group, Miguel Montoya (forthcoming) is researching local investors in emerging markets, Anna Hasselström is focusing on the information networks of currency traders, and Christina Garsten is discussing the ethical investments made by multinational companies. Other groups which are now forming include anthropologists headed by Richard Rottenburg at the Institute of Comparative Cultural and Social Anthropology at the European University Viadrina in

Frankfurt (Oder), and as we saw in the Economic Sociology Newsletter No. 2, a group of French social scientists have recently formed a Social Studies of Finance Network in Paris.

It is interesting to note that the anthropology of the modern economy promises to be interdisciplinary in character, drawing more from related disciplines than has previously been common. An obvious reason for this is that as anthropologists begin to explore complex economic processes in industrialized societies, they encounter and make use of concepts already long discussed by, for example, economists, sociologists and social philosophers, finding their work useful in developing their own perspective on these phenomena. The scope of anthropology is in general much broader today, and advances in related fields help widen the bases needed to examine modern societies. While themes such as risk, trust, identity, and ideas of community have been much apparent in economic anthropology, the recent discussion within sociology can fresh provide insights. The work of sociologists such as Granovetter on the embeddedness of economic action (1992), Swedberg on markets (1994), as well as the theoretical contributions of Beck (1992), Giddens (1989) and Lash and Urry (1994) on modern societies serve as points of departure for anthropological studies of modern market processes, as can Saskia Sassen's (1996, 1998) work on global economic processes. Baudrillard (1981) and Bourdieu (1986,1990) provide perspectives that anthropologists have long found useful and are very relevant for the study of modern markets. In the field of economics, the new institutional economics also provides points of departure. Acheson's edited volume (1994) is an example of recent interest in examining the differences and convergences between institutional economics and social anthropological approaches to economic behavior. Chapman and Buckley's article in *Carrier* (1997d) is an interesting reflection on the shortcomings of transaction-cost theory seen from an anthropological perspective.

To sum up, anthropologists are just beginning to turn their attention to the complexities of the modern market, and to carry out fieldwork on economic processes of industrialized countries, examining for example, commercial structures, marketing and consumption, financial markets, and the viability of development strategies. This new orientation promises a wealth of new ethnography and productive links with theory in neighboring disciplines. Perhaps most of all, it will be interesting to see how these anthropologists meet the challenge of linking their work with the long anthropological discussion on such central concepts within the discipline as those mentioned earlier - exchange, reciprocity, trading relationships, and innovation.

References

- Abolafia, Mitchell 1997 *Making Markets: Opportunism and Restraint on Wall Street* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press
- Acheson, James M., (ed.) 1994 *Anthropology and Institutional Economics* Monographs in Economic Anthropology, No. 12 Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America
- Appadurai, Arjun, (ed.) 1986 *The Social Life of Things* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Barlett, Peggy 1980 *Agricultural Decision-Making: Anthropological Contributions to Rural Development* London: Academic Press
- 1982 *Agricultural Choice and Change: Decision-Making in a Costa Rican Community* New Jersey: Rutgers University Press

- Baudrillard, Jean 1981 *For a Critique of the Political Economy of the Sign*. St. Louis: Telos Press
- Beals, Ralph 1975 *The Peasant Marketing System of Oaxaca, Mexico*, Los Angeles: University of California Press
- Beck, Ulrich 1992 *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity* London: Sage
- Bohannan, Paul and George Dalton, (eds.) 1962 *Markets in Africa* Evanston: Northwestern University African Studies Series
- Bourdieu, Pierre 1986 "The Forms of Capital" in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, J. B. Richardson (ed.) New York: Greenwood Press
- 1990 *The Logic of Practice* Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Carrier, James 1995 *Gifts & Commodities: Exchange and Western Capitalism Since 1700* London: Routledge
- 1997a "Preface" in *Meanings of the Market: The Free Market in Western Culture*, James Carrier (ed.) Oxford: Berg
- 1997b "Introduction" in *Meanings of the Market: The Free Market in Western Culture*, James Carrier (ed.) Oxford: Berg
- 1997c "Mr. Smith, Meet Mr. Hawken" in *Meanings of the Market: The Free Market in Western Culture* Oxford: Berg
- Carrier, James (ed.) 1997d *Meanings of the Market: The Free Market in Western Culture*. Oxford: Berg
- Chapman, Malcolm and Peter J. Buckley 1997 "Markets, Transactions Costs, Economists and Social Anthropologists" in *Meanings of the Market: The Free Market in Western Culture*, James Carrier (ed.) Oxford: Berg
- Clark, Gracia 1994 *Onions Are My Husband: Survival and Accumulation by West African Market Women* Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Cook, Scott and Martin Diskin (eds.) 1976 *Markets in Oaxaca* Austin: University of Texas Press
- Dannhauser, Norbert 1989 "Marketing in Developing Urban Areas" in *Economic Anthropology*, Stuart Plattner (ed.) Stanford: Stanford University Press
- 1996 *Two Towns in Germany: Commerce and the Urban Transformation* Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
- Dilley, Roy (ed.) 1992 *Contesting Markets: Analyses of Ideology, Discourse and Practice* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press
- Frank, André Gunder 1967 *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* New York: Monthly Review Press
- Friedland, Roger, and A. F. Robertson (eds.) 1990 *Beyond the Marketplace: Rethinking Economy and Society* New York: Aldine de Gruyter
- Geertz, Clifford 1979 "Suq: The Bazaar Economy in Sefrou" in *Meaning and Order in Moroccan Society*, Clifford Geertz, Hilda Geertz and Clifford Rosen (eds.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Giddens, Anthony 1989 *The Consequences of Modernity* Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Godelier, Maurice 1977 *Perspectives in Marxist Anthropology* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Granovetter, Mark 1992 "Economic Action and Social Structure. The Problem of Embeddedness" in *The Sociology of Economic Life* M. Granovetter and R. Swedberg (eds.) Boulder: Westview Press
- Gudeman, Stephen 1978 *The Demise of a Rural Economy: From Subsistence to Capitalism in a Latin American Village* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- 1986 *Economics as Culture: Models and Metaphors of Livelihood* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

- Gudeman, Stephen and Alberto Rivera 1990 *Conversations in Colombia: The Domestic Economy in Life and Text* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hertz, Ellen 1998 *The Trading Crowd: An Ethnography of the Shanghai Stock Market* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Johnson, Allen 1971 *Sharecroppers of the Sertão: Economics and Dependence on a Brazilian Plantation* Stanford: Stanford University Press
- Larson, Brooke, and Olivia Harris with Enrique Tandeter (eds.) 1995 *Ethnicity, Markets and Migration in the Andes: At the Crossroads of History and Anthropology* Duke University Press
- Lash, Scott and John Urry 1994 *Economies of Signs and Space*. London: Sage
- Lien, Marianne 1997 *Marketing and Modernity: An Ethnography of Marketing Practice* London: Berg
- Lindh de Montoya, Monica (forthcoming) "Looking Into the Future: Anthropology and Financial Markets" in *Development Beyond the 20th Century: A Critical Discussion in Economic Anthropology*, Jeffery Cohen and Norbert Dannhaueser (eds.) Lanham: University Press of America
- Lindqvist, Mats 1999 "Igår var vi slösare. Idag är vi sparare. Etnologiska reflektioner kring en privatekonomisk mäsas" [Yesterday Squanderer, Today Saver] *Kulturella Perspektiv* 1999:1:25-38
- Malinowski, Bronislaw 1922 *Argonauts of the Western Pacific: An Account of Native Enterprise and Adventure in the Archipelagoes of Melanesian New Guinea* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- 1935 [1978] *Coral Gardens and their Magic* New York: Dover
- Meseilloux, Claude 1981 *Maidens, Meal and Money: Capitalism and Domestic Community* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Miller, Daniel (ed.) 1995 *Acknowledging Consumption: A Review of New Studies* London: Routledge
- Montoya, Miguel (forthcoming) "Emerging Markets, States, and the Global Economy: The Case of Venezuela" in *Development Beyond the 20th Century: A Critical Discussion in Economic Anthropology*, Jeffery Cohen and Norbert Dannhaueser (eds.) Lanham: University Press of America
- Parry, Jonathan and Maurice Bloch (eds.) 1989 *Money and the Morality of Exchange* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Plattner, Stuart 1982 Economic Custom in a Public Marketplace *American Ethnologist* pp. 399-420
- 1983 "Economic Custom in a Competitive Marketplace" *American Anthropologist* 85:848-58
- 1985 *Markets and Marketing. Monographs in Economic Anthropology, No. 4* Lanham: University Press of America
- 1997 *High Art down Home: An Economic Ethnography of a Local Art Market* Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Polanyi, Karl 1944 *The Great Transformation* New York: Farrar & Rinehar
- 1957 *Trade and Market in the Early Empires: Economies in History and Theory* New York: Free Press
- Rapp, Reyna and Jane Schneider (eds.) 1995 *Articulating Hidden Histories: Exploring the Influence of Eric R. Wolf*. Berkeley: University of California Press
- Roseberry, William 1983 *Coffee and Capitalism in the Venezuelan Andes* Austin: University of Texas Press
- Sahlins, Marshall 1974 *Stone Age Economics* London: Tavistock

- Sassen, Saskia 1996 *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization* New York: Columbia University Press
- 1998 *Globalization and its Discontents: Essays on the New Mobility of People and Money* New York: The New Press
- Schneider, Peter and Jane Schneider 1976 *Culture and Political Economy in Western Sicily* New York: Academic Press
- Smith, Carol (ed.) 1976 *Regional Analysis, Volume 1: Economic Systems* New York: Academic Press
- Swedberg, Richard 1994 "Markets as Social Structures" in *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, Neil J. Smelser and Richard Swedberg (eds.) Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press
- Taussig, Michael 1980 *The Devil and Commodity Fetishism in South America* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press
- Verdery, Katherine 1983 *Transylvanian Villagers: Three Centuries of Political, Economic and Ethnic Change* Berkeley: University of California Press
- Wallerstein, Immanuel 1974 *The Modern World-System* New York: Academic Press
- Wolf, Eric R. 1957 "Closed Corporate Peasant Communities in Mexico and Central Java" *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 13:1-18
- 1969 *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century* New York: Harper and Row
- 1982 *Europe and the People Without History* Berkeley: University of California Press

Economic Sociology in Russia

by

Valery Yakubovich
Stanford University
and

the Institute for Comparative Labor Relations Research (ISITO), Russia
valery@stanford.edu

and

Sveta Yaroshenko
The Institute for Social and Economic Problems of the North
Russian Academy of Sciences
and
Stanford University
sveta@stanford.edu

The origins of Economic Sociology in Russia can be traced back to the 1960s-70s when Russian sociologists actively explored economic themes within the fields of industrial sociology and sociology of labor and economists routinely involved sociological arguments in their research. Nobody thought about a distinctive identity as economic sociologists until the early 1980s. At that time, sociologists from the Novosibirsk Institute for Economics and Organization of Industrial Production faced the issue while searching for the title for a new undergraduate course. They articulated the subject matter and drew the boundaries of the discipline as well as named it, apparently, independently of Western colleagues (Zaslavskaya and Kalugina 1999). Thus, the formation of the field, which we refer to below as Old Economic Sociology, preceded the collapse of state socialism by a decade. However, it was only on the wave of the social and economic upheavals of the early 1990s that the development of Economic Sociology went beyond the establishment of relatively isolated regional and local research centers. New academic departments, textbooks, courses, degrees, and conferences entitled Economic Sociology mushroomed across the country. These organizational processes parallel substantial changes in the content of the discipline which receives crucial input from its Western counterpart and, to a lesser degree, from the rich inheritance of the pre-revolutionary Russian sociology. To analytically distinguish the new intellectual trend, we call it New Economic Sociology. In practice, the old and new traditions are closely intertwined and are often pursued by the same scholars. We see their interaction and the resulting change as a path dependent re-institutionalization of Economic Sociology in Russia shaped by the theoretical and empirical opportunities and challenges of the uncertain Russian transition from state socialism to market and by the increasing openness of the Russian sociological community to the world.

In this essay, we highlight the basic intellectual trends emerging from the processes mentioned above. Because the topic is broad, space is limited, and the boundaries of our discipline, particularly its Russian version, are still emerging, our review will unavoidably be subjective and incomplete.

The Evolution of Old Economic Sociology

The fact that the new field was set up within the Novosibirsk Institute for Economics and Organization of Industrial Production, an economic institution, highlights the trend revealed in the early 60s. Thoughtful economists saw the gaping difference between the Marxist-Leninist theory of socialism, with its picture of dynamic economic development on the basis of state property and central planning, and the reality they saw around them in which plans often remained on paper, technological innovation chronically failed, and state property was subverted for personal gain. These observations switched their attention to ordinary economic agents who stubbornly refused to behave as submissive cogs in the state machine. Zaslavskaya and her colleagues concluded that a person's structural position in the process of production and cultural traits influence her economic behavior. Therefore, social stratification and economic culture should be the primary focus of analysis in Economic Sociology (Zaslavskaya and Ryvkina 1991). Differences in economic behavior can be explained by the differentiation of actors according to economic branch, region, gender, age, ethnicity, family status, education and qualification, work experience etc. Unlike its Western counterpart, Russian Economic Sociology initially was more positional rather than relational, and focused primarily on the micro- and meso- levels of analysis largely avoiding the scrutiny of the economic role of societal institutions such as the Communist Party and socialist state.

This research tradition did not disappear in the 1990s; analysis of individuals and groups as both subjects and objects of the socio-economic reforms still relies heavily on the conceptual and methodological tools and vocabulary of the early Novosibirsk school. In this fashion, Ryvkina (1998) attempts to identify concrete economic agents whose joint actions led to the most famous chronic failures of the Russian reforms such as wage arrears, falling living standards, and criminalization of the economy and society. Her explanation refers to the corruption of the political structure which acted in the interests of various cliques rather than society as a whole. More generally, the author believes that the Soviet and Post-Soviet political elites did not have skills and intellectual resources to creatively embed new economic policies into the historically formed cultural environment of Russian society. In a substantial departure from tradition, Ryvkina scrutinizes the economic role of the Russian state and concludes that it is primarily responsible for the failure of the market reforms.

Bessonova (1997) suggests that this failure itself should be considered from a historical perspective. She argues that the Russian economy has been a distributive (*razdatochnaya*) economy over the course of its eleven centuries history. Such an economy is defined by following criteria: (1) property is granted under the condition of certain obligatory services and can be confiscated by the principal if the rules of its use are violated or the services are unsatisfactory; (2) material resources necessary for rendering services are delivered through institutions of distribution (*rasdach*); (3) the accumulation of the public wealth takes place through institutions of delivery (*sdach*); (4) a system of administrative complaints represents a feedback mechanism which transmits the reaction of servants to the patron; and (5) a system of governance and financial institutions coordinate delivery and distribution.

The institutional concept presented here resembles closely Polanyi's (1957) notion of redistributive economy. The only difference is the primacy of distribution vis-a-vis delivery in Bessonova's argument; Polanyi treats these two sides of the redistributive mechanism as equally important. It is interesting to note that the treatment of the Russian economic organization as stable over centuries runs against Szelenyi's (1978) reformulation of Polanyi's argument which distinguishes between traditional redistribution in feudal societies and rational redistribution under state socialism.

The Emergence of New Economic Sociology

Two schools of thought, the new institutionalism of Coase, North, and Williamson and the embeddedness approach of Granovetter, Polanyi, and White, dominate the intellectual scene of New Economic Sociology in Russia. Vadim Radaev is particularly vocal in promoting these and other key ideas of Western Economic Sociology in his teaching, research, and writing. His research on stratification, entrepreneurship, household and informal economies addresses the most crucial aspects of the Russian economic reality from a multi-theoretical perspective. The new institutionalism provides a framework for the problems of high transaction costs and low contractual discipline which are indeed salient during the Russian transition. The embeddedness approach highlights the deeply-rooted informality and personification of economic relations in Russia.

Radaev's (1998) study of entrepreneurship debunks the myth of Russian business practices as completely unethical, corrupt, and coercive. He does find that the state is weak and ineffective in enforcing contractual discipline, which is why, it is always supplemented or substituted by informal mechanisms. However, such mechanisms are not necessarily violent and criminal; they also include stable business networks in which trust, reciprocity and loyalty play a pivotal role. The most fascinating issue for future research with broad policy implications is under what conditions one or the other type of horizontal mechanisms proliferates. As the first step in this direction, one would like to know the size and density of networks which nurture trust and reciprocity.

The authors of this essay had an opportunity to explore similar issues in empirical research on labor markets and poverty. A number of studies convincingly shows that the role of personal contacts in the Russian labor market does not diminish but increases in comparison with the pre-reform period (Clarke 1999, Gimpelson and Magun 1994, Kozina 1997). A more detailed survey of the labor market in one Russian city suggests that hiring often takes place within small and dense networks which, on one hand, limit the scope of job opportunities and, on the other, transform hiring into the reciprocal exchange of favors. One can argue that the logic of reciprocity supercedes the logic of exchange (Yakubovich 2000).

The phenomenon of poverty presents a good illustration of the dramatic simultaneous failures of many institutional mechanisms. Traditional Russian enterprises and organizations, where the majority of the population is still employed, pay minimal wages and even those are often delayed. The impoverished state cannot sustain even a minimalist welfare system and therefore provides support to a small group of households singled out according to their registered income which, as a rule, grossly underestimates their actual well-being. Thus, the criterion justifies assistance to households which are not worse-off than many of those left out. Finally, the most economically disadvantaged are involved in informal exchanges primarily with each other and therefore cannot improve their economic standing that way either (Yaroshenko 1998).

New Economic Sociology in Russia is still in its infancy. After years of insulation from the Western tradition which is difficult to overcome even now due to the language barrier, it is in a desperate need of good translations and interpretations of the best work by Western scholars. Books by Veselov (1995), Ilyin (2000), and in particular Radaev (1997) partly fill the gap, although much more still needs to be done. It is also crucial to quickly absorb the state-of-the-art research methods. We do not mean that these methods are perfect and that no improvements and breakthroughs are possible. However, it is very unlikely that they can be

made from scratch without learning from the body of knowledge and skills already accumulated. In this regard, one can particularly appreciate an effort of American sociologist Michael Swafford and his Russian colleagues Polina Kozireva and Mikhail Kosolapov. This team carefully designed and has been carrying out for almost ten years the Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey (RLMS) which is the only nationally representative multi-purpose study of the Russian population open to the whole scientific community. The project satisfies high standards of quantitative social studies and thereby helps establish them in Russia.

A very short period of free development partly explains the discipline's theoretical eclecticism, descriptiveness, and the polarization between the metaphorical and unconditional acceptance of Western approaches and their equally metaphorical and unconditional rejection and ignorance. In reality, our intellectual inheritance already contains the most fundamental propositions of Economic Sociology. In a book written in one of Stalin's prisons in 1930-32 and first published in 1991, world-renown economist Kondratyev discusses the Russian word *khozyaystvo* whose English analogue, according to him, does not exist. Kondratyev defines *khozyaystvo* as a system of relationships within a real group of people which emerges from and is reproduced by their activities directed toward the provision of the means to satisfy their needs (Kondratyev 1991:110-113) and designates it as the subject of economics. In the current Russian literature, the words *khozyaystvo* and *economy* are used interchangeably. On the contrary, Kondratyev's insight suggests that *khozyaystvo* captures Polanyi's substantive meaning of economic activities while *economy* refers to the formal one (cf. Polanyi 1957). Moreover, Kondratyev pointedly entitles the chapter where these ideas are presented *Society and Khozyaystvo*, thereby postulating the primacy of society in economic affairs, and insists on moving beyond the formal cost-benefit analysis of economic activities. Kondratyev's ideas, which anticipated some major developments in our discipline by a couple of decades, make us to believe that economic sociology in Russia has a potential to overcome initial difficulties and establish a mutually beneficial dialogue with its Western counterpart.

References

- Bessonova, O. E. 1997 *Институты раздаточной экономики России: Ретроспективный анализ* (The Institutions of Russian Handout Economy: A Retrospective Analysis) Новосибирск: ИЭиОПП СО РАН
- Clarke, Simon 1999 *The Formation of a Labour Market in Russia* Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar
- Gimpelson, V. E. and V. S. Magun 1994 "Uvolennye na rynke truda: novaya rabota i sotsialnaya mobilnost'" (Russian: The Laid-off in a Labor Market: A New Job and Social Mobility). *Sotsiologicheskii zhurnal* 1:134-149
- Плутин, Владимир 2000 *Поведение потребителей: Краткий курс* (Consumers' Behavior: A Short Course) С.-Петербург
- Kondratyev, Nikolay D. 1991 *Основные проблемы экономической статики и динамики* (Basic Problems of Economic Static and Dynamics) Москва: Наука
- Kozina, Irina 1997 "Povedenie na rynke truda: analiz trudovykh biografii" (Russian: Behavior in a Labor Market: An Analysis of Work Histories). *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya* 24(4):55-64
- Polanyi, Karl 1957 "The Economy as Instituted Process" in *Trade Market in the Early Empires*, by Karl Polanyi, Conrad M. Arensberg, Harry W. Pearson (eds.) The Free Press

- Radaev, Vadim V. 1997 *Экономическая социология: курс лекций* (Economic Sociology: A Lecture Course) Москва: Аспект Пресс
- Radaev, Vadim V. 1998 *Формирование новых российских рынков: транзакционные издержки, формы контроля и деловая этика* (Formation of New Russian Markets: Transaction Costs, Forms of Control and Business Ethics) Москва: Центр политических технологий
- Ryvkina, R. V. 1998 *Экономическая социология переходной России* (Economic Sociology of Transitional Russia) Москва: Дело
- Szelenyi, Ivan 1978 "Social Inequalities in State Socialist Redistributive Economies" *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 19:63-87
- Veselov, Yuriy V. 1995 *Экономическая социология: История идей* (Economic Sociology: A History of Thought) С.-Петербург: С.-Петербургский Университет
- Yakubovich, Valery 2000 "Institutions, Social Networks, and Market Exchange: Matching Workers and Jobs in Russia" Paper presented at the International Conference "Economic Sociology at the Edge of the Third Millennium," Moscow, Russia
- Yaroshenko, Svetlana 1998 Бедные в социальной стратификации постсоветской России (The Poor in the Social Stratification of the Post-Soviet Russia). *Рубеж* 12
- Zaslavskaya T. I. and Z. I. Kalugina (eds.) 1999 *Социальная траектория реформируемой России. Исследования Новосибирской экономико-социологической школы* (Social Trajectory of Russia's Reformation. Studies of the Novosibirsk School of Economic Sociology) Новосибирск: Наука
- Zaslavskaya, T. I. and R. V. Ryvkina 1991 *Социология экономической жизни* (Sociology of Economic Life). Новосибирск: Наука

Árni Sveinsson and Meine Pieter Van Dijk (eds.), *Local Economies in Turmoil – The Effects of Deregulation and Globalization*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd, 2000, 192 pp.

Since the beginning of the 90s there has been a tremendous change in the economic and political landscape in both third world and former communist countries. This is sometimes referred to as the process of *globalization* and is a process which has taken place on many levels. On the international level there is pressure from international economic organizations and large companies, which encourages deregulation, market reforms and open borders. On a national level there are the so called *structural adjustment policies* which implement these free market reforms. The effects of these economic policies have given rise to a number of studies, either showing the positive impact of the market reforms or their negative consequences. In the present work the ambition is to give a more nuanced picture of these effects for some countries in Africa, Southeast Asia and South America. Also an example from Eastern Europe is presented. The main theme is that some *local economies* in these countries have developed somewhat similar strategies to handle these structural adjustment policies. The keyword is *clustering* or *networking*. This means that in many local economies small businesses and entrepreneurs have merged into more or less organized “groups” or “clusters” where they try to help each other, or at least take advantage of factors such as collective information and services, to withstand and/or take advantage of the new economic order. The effectiveness of these cooperative measures differs thus, sometimes clustering is an effective measure, sometimes not.

In the first part of the book there are three chapters which try to analyze the effects of globalization or structural adjustment policies from the viewpoint of the small business or entrepreneur, i. e. a microperspective. In Chapter 2, *Adjusting to an Opening Economy: Three Industrial Clusters in Brazil*, Jörg Meyer-Stamer compares three different local business clusters in Brazil. He shows that clustering both encourages and hinders economic development for small and medium sized firms. An important finding which explains why clustering sometimes is not an effective strategy is that small firms in a cluster, instead of introducing new techniques and organize activities according to new demands, continue to pursue their traditional patterns to make business. Here the concept “path-dependency” is used. In Chapter 3, *Social Embeddedness: Families and Firms in Tanzania* by Per Trullsson, the language of economic sociology is explicitly used. According to Trullsson, (extended) family- and kinship relations are crucial for both success and failure in business. Tanzania is referred to as ‘an economy of affection’ which means that personal relationships are very important for business activities. Concepts such as “social embeddedness” and “trust” are used in the analysis. Sometimes strong family ties give economic benefits to the small businessmen. The family can contribute with “reliable” workers and colleagues. But the fact that economic relationships often are embedded in larger “social” relationships can also be an obstacle to economic development. Two important consequences of this are that economically successful members of an (extended) family often feel obligated to support and take care of not so successful family members. Another consequence is the fact that companies and small businesses have not created production networks which could be important in adjusting to structural adjustment policies. There is a tendency towards vertical integration, which means that all steps of the production process remain within the separate enterprise. To be able to build up strong production networks entrepreneurs must seek partners and relationships outside the extended family. In Chapter 4, *Financing Small- and Medium-sized Enterprises in Eastern Europe*, Debora Revoltella discusses the effects of economic transition in Eastern Europe for small and medium sized business financing opportunities. One reason why it is sometimes difficult for this type of businesses to get access to financial capital is that the

“institutional” or legal framework is underdeveloped. The system also favors the old and large companies from the communist era.

The second part of the book focuses on the meso-perspective, which means the cluster or network-level. In Chapter 5, *Structural Adjustment and Cluster Advantages: A Case from Peru*, Evert-Jan Visser discusses in what way *spatial clustering* advances business success among small- and medium sized enterprises. Visser criticizes the idea from the “industrial districts” literature that spatial or geographical closeness *in itself* has a positive impact on business development. From the data of his study he concludes that geographical closeness is not enough. When new economic circumstances have created new demands it is not just possible to rely on geographical closeness; “active forms of collective efficiency” or networking are also needed by the companies in the same geographical location. In Chapter 6, *Innovation in Roof Tile and Copper Craft Clusters in Indonesia*, Henry Sandee and Piet Rietveld show that active participation in networks is of decisive importance for a cluster of small firms to adapt to new circumstances. In this case, it is argued that technological change depends on active collaboration through networks. Even the role of *brokerage* is emphasized. This means that intermediates play a key role in connecting different enterprises into a cluster, and thereby initiate technological and economic development. In Chapter 7, *Light Engineering Networks and Structural Adjustment in Zimbabwe* by Charles M. Halimana and Árni Sverrisson, the effects of Zimbabwe’s structural adjustment policies on the light engineering sector are discussed. It is here shown that there exist two kinds of networks that must be taken into consideration in order to understand how the relationships between companies should be analyzed. The first one is the technological or production network, and it shows how the different steps in production are organized between enterprises (See also Chapter 10). The other kind of network is referred to as the social network, and it shows how enterprises are linked to each other “commercially” and “socially”. The strategies vary between companies, but it seems that the light engineering companies that have adjusted the best to the effects of structural adjustment policies are the ones which have been able to reorganize and strengthen their production networks.

In part 3 the political and economic environment of the enterprises and clusters is discussed, i. e. the focus is on the macro level. In Chapter 8, *A Macro-perspective on Small Enterprise Growth in Southern Africa*, Poul Ove Pedersen focuses on the small enterprise sector as a whole especially in Zimbabwe, but also in Kenya and Botswana. One finding of importance is that many small enterprises in these countries are relatively well developed in comparison to the agricultural sector. In Chapter 9, *Good Governance and Small Enterprises in Zimbabwe*, Meine Pieter van Dijk analyzes state policies regarding small business development. Some interesting information is given why institutional constraints on small economic development, in spite of “good government” ambitions, still remain. In the chapter called *Economic Cultures and Industrial Development in the South* by Árni Sverrisson (Chapter 10), the themes of the book are put in an theoretical context. Sverrisson emphasizes the distinction between *global* and *local production cultures*. He draws on two traditions in sociology when he analyses the consequences of this “bifurcation” in two different economic cultures, namely economic sociology and the social studies of technology. What he especially makes use of is the different “network conceptions” in the respective traditions, i.e. social networks and socio/technical networks. I have already discussed these two above but must emphasize that also the “technological” network is in essence a “social” network. According to Sverrisson also “technological artefacts” should be analyzed as “essentially equivalent” to human actors in this kind of networks. How the “production technology” is organized is of great importance for understanding strategies and outcomes for companies in local economies. Sverrisson

argues among other things that a precondition for local economic development is precisely that local production networks are able to “connect” and incorporate the “artefacts” of the global production culture. He is thus “pessimistic”, and the reason for this is that these connections are still few and far between.

Local Economies in Turmoil is an important contribution to the growing literature on globalization. For me as an economic sociologist it was especially interesting to read the chapters by Trullsson and Sverrisson. They both make use of the analytical apparatus from economic sociology, and do so very well. Core concepts such as “trust”, “social networks”, “social embeddedness” and “strong” and “weak ties” are, I think, very fruitful in analyzing development problems in third world countries. I especially found Sverrisson’s ambition to integrate economic sociology and the social studies of technology fruitful for a deeper understanding of economic processes in developing countries.

Erik Ljungar
Stockholm University
eljungar@sociology.su.se

Carlo Trigilia, *Economic Sociology. State, Market and Society in Modern Capitalism (Sociologia economica. Stato, mercato e società nel capitalismo moderno)*. Bologna: Il Mulino, 1998, 488 pp.

The main merit of Trigilia's textbook is that it succeeds in presenting the historical development of economic sociology and, at the same time, to discuss its major analytic contributions. To find the correct balance between these two aspects – the historical and the analytical - is essential, both for the didactic purpose of Trigilia and for the scientific value of his book. The choice to adopt a historical presentation of economic sociology is due to two reasons: the desire to show that economic sociology has a long tradition, and the author's own take on what kinds of explanatory models are needed in economic sociology. Economic sociology operates with historical models, according to Trigilia, which have definite coordinates in space and time; and the author's way to proceed is to link the analytic contributions of economic sociology to different aspects of modern capitalism.

The book is divided into three parts. In the first of these the focus is on the origins of economic sociology and its separation from economics. The second part presents the "classics" of economic sociology and their legacy, with an emphasis on the origins and social consequences of modern capitalism. The third part, finally, deals with the emergence of "New Economic Sociology" and "New Comparative Political Economy". In the last section the main topics are as follows: the rise and the subsequent crisis of the Keynesian welfare state, the economic development of backward areas, globalization and the varieties of capitalism, the crisis of fordism and new flexible models of economic organization. Before I say something more about each of these parts, a few general remarks are needed. Trigilia has a very broad view of economic sociology; and by focussing on "modern capitalism", he is able to show the usefulness of the different approaches to the understanding of "economy and society". Depending on the question you are interested in, you can use a "Political Economy"-approach or a "New Economic Sociology"-approach. Secondly, Trigilia's own choice is to pay special attention to the empirical findings of the various schools, rather than to look at various theoretical positions. This way, the strength of a discipline depends more on the robustness of its empirical findings, than on its degree of sophistication in theoretical debates.

In the first part of his book Trigilia argues that economic sociology emerged as an empirically-grounded and historically oriented discipline, which focusses on cultural and institutional factors which regulate the economy. Why this is the case has much to do with the fact that economic sociology, on the one hand, has defined itself against neo-classical economics, which is ahistorical and deductive in nature, and, on the other hand, that it refuses to engage in the descriptive and anti-theoretical approach of the German Historical School. In the first part of the book the author also discusses the interesting intellectual path which has led - from Adam Smith to David Ricardo and the emergence of neoclassical economics - to a separation of economic analysis from the study of institutions. This separation was criticized both by Marx and the German Historical School, but these failed to create a well-defined economic sociology. Sombart and Weber, on the other hand, were able to incorporate the study of institutions into a precise theoretical framework.

In the second part Trigilia argues that the classics of economic sociology - Simmel, Sombart, Weber, Durkheim, Veblen, Polany and Schumpeter - were all interested in the origins as well as the social consequences of capitalism. Simmel, Sombart and Weber were very much concerned with the institutional factors which influenced the emergence of capitalism, while the others were more interested in trying to understand the emergence of organized forms of

capitalism. The first and second parts of the book delineate the main subject of classical economic sociology, namely the origins and consequences of modern capitalism. Trigilia's take on all of this is very interesting, and that is that the classical authors of economic sociology all have a different cultural background, ranging from the "methodological individualism" of Weber and Schumpeter to the "institutionalism" of Polany, Durkheim and Veblen. Nonetheless, these differences should not be exaggerated; and from a theoretical point of view their positions have much in common, such as the view of economic action as a form of social action, that institutions play a crucial role in the shaping of economic life, and that institutions can be seen as a form of "social construction". Moreover, the classics were all interested in different aspects of the same phenomenon. Sombart and Weber, for example, discussed the cultural and institutional framework which allowed for the rise of Western capitalism; Durkheim and Veblen made important contributions to the understanding of the destabilising effects of liberal capitalism; and Polany and Schumpeter analyzed the emergence of a more organized form of capitalism.

In the third part Trigilia presents the themes and ideas of contemporary economic sociology. In the 1940s the last two works of classical economic sociology were published: Polany's *The Great Transformation* and Schumpeter's *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. Then there was a decline in economic sociology, mainly due to two factors: the Keynesian Revolution, which was to stabilize the capitalist economy for some thirty years, and the moving away from economic topics by sociologists. This second trend, according to Trigilia, was legitimized through Parsons. As a result, economic sociology was fragmented in the 1950s and the 1960s into a number of different subfields. At the macrolevel, attention was mainly paid to the study of backward areas, and at the microlevel there was a division of labor between such fields as industrial relations, labour sociology and the sociology of organizations. During this period two major topics dominated the intellectual debate: the origins and characteristics of the Keynesian welfare state and the fordist organization of production. Following Trigilia's schema, both of these discourses entered a crisis in the 1970s, and this led to the reemergence of the institutional study of the economy. At the macrolevel, this took place through the political economy—analysis of inflation and of neo-corporatism. At the microlevel, two important trends can be discerned. The first was empirically driven and focussed on the institutional analysis of the "new and flexible mode of productions". The economic success of certain regions - such as the Third Italy, Baden-Wurtemberg, Silicon Valley - can best be explained through the existence of institutions, which helped supply cognitive and normative resources to the economic actors. The second trend, Trigilia argues, was more theoretically oriented and can be described as a reaction against the efforts of New Institutional Economics (Williamson). According to Trigilia, this second development has two parts to it: a more structural one (Granovetter, Coleman, Burt) and a more cultural one (Powell and DiMaggio). Both of these share a view of economic action which emphasizes the autonomous role of social variables in shaping economic outcomes.

In the last chapter of the book Trigilia broaches a much debated topic: globalization and the varieties of capitalism. According to the author, the perspectives of Political Economy and New Economic Sociology both agree on the need for a better understanding of modern capitalism and globalization. Political Economy looks at the role of institutions in regulating the national or supra-national level, while New Economic Sociology stresses the importance of institutional factors at a local level. Globalization, Trigilia argues, is not a standardizing process which cancels out all existing differences and leads to deregulation. I would

summarize Trigilia's message as follows: where economists only see deregulation, economic sociologists see something different (e.g. different forms of regulation).

All in all, Trigilia's work has the following great merit: it gives meaning and coherence to a very complex and sometimes contradictory field. This textbook is a perfect tool for teaching economic sociology, both at a graduate and a post-graduate level; and it definitely deserves to be translated into English.

Filippo Barbera
Turin University
filippo.barbera@libero.it

Vadim Radaev, *Economicheskaya Sociologiya: Kurs Lektsiy (Economic Sociology: A Lecture Course)*. Moscow: Aspekt Press, 1998, 367 pp.

This is one of the first attempts in post-communist Russia at a systematic conceptualization of the field of economic sociology. The author reverses a common approach among economic sociologists of exposing the non-economic nature of central economic phenomena, such as the market, money or production. He, instead, imports a system of sociological concepts (stratification, ideology and social relations) into the sphere of economic life. The unifying theme is human action. The discussion progresses from the micro foundations of behavior -- actors' motivations and roles -- to macro sociological concerns, such as the evolution of the forms of economic life and the formation of economic ideologies.

Although this monograph has been primarily written *for* a Russian audience, it is hardly *about* Russia: only one and a half out of ten chapters are dedicated to Russia's contemporary issues, while references throughout the book to Soviet or Russian empirical and theoretical sources are sparse. Instead, the book mostly relies on North American and British traditions of economic and industrial sociology, as well as classical sociological literature and a history of economic sociology.

As its title indicates, this volume is intended to provide lecture material for economic sociology courses, and is catered to advanced undergraduate and graduate students and to lecturers in economic sociology. It consists of 22 lectures organized into 10 chapters. The first chapter, *Two Approaches to the Individual in Social Theory*, lays the foundations for the rest of the book by defining the methodological boundaries that divide economic theory and economic sociology. It provides a systematic (if somewhat brief) account of a historical evolution of the *homo economicus* and *homo sociologicus* models, starting with the classical works in each of the fields and ending with the recent tendencies of economic and sociological "imperialism." It is argued, for example, that economic theory evolved from a theory of material well being in to a theory of the distribution of limited resources, and is now claiming to be a theory of rational decision making. The latter trend divorces economic theory from the doings of the economy per se and also makes possible its expansion into neighboring disciplines. The chapter concludes by offering a history of the complex and often conflicting relations between economics and economic sociology, and defines the subject of economic sociology as a discipline that "studies economic action as a form of social action" (p. 53).

The second chapter, *Social Foundations of Economic Action*, introduces the issues of economic motivations and rationality. The author argues that motivations for economic behavior cannot be reduced to economic interests alone. In addition to interests, such motivations originate in social norms and/or coercion. Thus, rationality is understood in a much wider sense than the one utilized by economic theory. Following Weber, rationality is seen as a variable (instead of a constant) that does not have a universal meaning but is context-bound. The chapter concludes by developing an argument about the embeddedness of economic action in culture and power relations.

In the third chapter, *The Individual as an Entrepreneur*, the author defines entrepreneurship, analyzes the historical development of the entrepreneurial spirit (especially in its American type, linked to the "frontier" mentality), and discusses systems of ideology and social relations, from which entrepreneurship emerges. Radaev supports the theory that entrepreneurship flourishes in periods of economic crises, as more people are then "forced" to become entrepreneurs as a result of previous workplace dissatisfaction (including the

overcrowding of certain labor market segments). In periods of economic growth innovations are less important, and the same people are gladly filling the ranks of bureaucrats and administrators. One is left to wonder whether a recent growth of dot-com startups in an overall growing economy points in the opposite direction.

Chapter four, *The Individual in an Economic Organization*, defines the notions and general features of “firms” and “organizations,” and briefly recalls Weberian theory of bureaucratic organization. The discussion proceeds to offer various classifications of organizational types (by their place in historical development, by principles of internal organizational order, by kinds of relationships between the superiors and the subordinates, etc.). The author concludes that unlike economic theory and business administration, which build universal organizational models and prescribe most efficient behavior, economic sociology sees as its task to describe the multiplicity of existing organizational forms.

The main goal of the fifth chapter, *The Individual in Labor Relations*, is to analyze how control over the labor process is exercised. The author presents various managerial strategies, from Taylorism to the recent trends in management philosophy, followed by a discussion of the labor force and its means to exercise control over the labor process, including labor conflicts (strikes and sabotage), and resistance (absenteeism, pilfering or overall restrictions on productivity).

The issue of labor relations continues in the next chapter, *The Individual in Labor Markets*, which discusses economic and sociological approaches to the supply and demand side of labor. The author offers a sociological analysis of segmented labor markets and their impact on the fairness of labor participation and compensation. As opposed to economic theory, which explains labor market differentiation solely by the individual properties of the workers (i.e. their human capital), economic sociology recognizes the role of numerous other factors, namely job seekers’ different positioning in the systems of social connections and reciprocity, information channels, power and status hierarchies. The chapter concludes with a discussion of household labor.

Chapter seven, *The Individual in the Social Hierarchy*, discusses theories of social and economic stratification. The author offers several classificatory systems (approaches to stratification, ways to define and delineate middle class, patterns of inequality distribution in a society), followed by a thorough analysis of three classical stratification theories: Marxism, functionalism and Weberian theory.

In the eighth chapter, *The Individual in the Economic World*, the reader is introduced to various theories of economic and historical development. The discussion starts with a description of linear developmental models, followed by models of parallel and cyclical development. The author clearly favors the two latter models as they de-emphasize the centrality of the West and the economic sphere, and allow for the multiplicity of developmental paths. This chapter and the last part of Chapter Seven (on classical stratification theories) are, probably, the most successful parts of the book due to their systematic approach, analytical depth and overall logic and organization of material.

Chapter Nine, *The Individual and Economic Ideologies*, raises the issue of economic ideology formation on three levels: ideological systems, economic programs and mass consciousness. The author offers a comparative analysis of four types of ideologies (liberalism, democratism, socialism and conservatism), and illustrates a process of ideological transformation by

referring to the case of Russia, where ideology shifted from socialist to democratic in the mid-to-late 80s, to liberal in the early 90s, and, finally, to conservative in the mid 90s.

Finally, the last chapter is dedicated to Russia's economic system, both in the Soviet and post-Soviet periods. Students of Russia will find this chapter especially useful as it offers them an accessible overview of the Soviet and Russian economic systems, including individual economic motivations and life styles, labor relations and economic ideologies. The chapter concludes with a discussion of Russia's several future alternative paths of development. With a few exceptions, and unlike the rest of the book, the discussion is almost exclusively based on Soviet and Russian bibliography.

In the *Conclusion*, Radaev returns to the problem of interdisciplinary relations between economic theory and economic sociology, arguing for a professional dialogue and a bridging of the two, while maintaining their disciplinary definitions and methodological distinctions.

The volume contains a useful appendix in which the content of each of the lectures is briefly recounted, followed by required and additional readings. Full citations to original sources are included in footnotes throughout the text, but there is also a special bibliography. One problem, however, is that the citations in the footnotes and the bibliography only partially overlap. The author could perhaps have used partial citations throughout the text, while supplying a comprehensive bibliography at the end. As a suggestion for subsequent editions, a subject index could also be added to the Appendix, to make this work more user friendly. I also suggest to include authors' names in their original language, as Russian transcriptions of foreign names can be misleading.

The material in this volume is somewhat dense for a relatively short (less than 350 page of text) book, but this is simultaneously its asset and liability. This density ensures that the reader is introduced to a wide variety of issues relevant to the field of economic sociology; yet, the breadth is sometimes achieved at the expense of depth and clarity. Perhaps, numerous classifications and abstract discussions (especially in Chapter Four) could be supplemented by appropriate examples.

All in all, the author has been very successful in presenting the readers with the main themes, traditions and debates in the field. I have no doubt that this volume will serve as a valuable guide to both students and teachers of economic sociology in Russia.

Announcements and Reports:

New Co-chairs of the ESA's Research Network Economic Sociology

Dear members of the ESA's Research Network Economic Sociology,
The final result of the ballot has led to the election of a new set of co-chairs for the Research Network Economic Sociology. The new co-chairs are Patrik Aspers (Stockholm University, Sweden), Sokratis Koniordos (University of Crete, Greece) and Janos Istvan Toth (Research Institute of Economics, Hungary), who will be in charge of organising the Economic Sociology sessions at the fifth ESA conference in Helsinki, Finland, next year. We hereby would like to thank the former co-chairs, Soeren Jagd, Vadim Radaev and Zoltan Szanto, and wish the new ones the best in their future work.

The new Co-chairs can be reached at:
Patrik Aspers (aspers@sociology.su.se)
Sokratis Koniordos (skoni@social.soc.uoc.gr)
Janos Istvan Toth (tothij@econ.core.hu).

Special Issue on the Euro

The Center for for Society & Economy at the University of Michigan has devoted the inaugural issue of its Policy Newsletter to the topic of the introduction of the single European currency, Euro. The Newsletter is edited by Wayne Baker and among the contributors are Mabel Berezin (*The Euro Is More Than Money*), Nigel Dodd (*Convergence in Euroland*), Neil Fligstein and Kathleen R. McNamara (*The Promise of the EMU and the Problem of Legitimacy*), and Wayne Baker (*The Widening Cultural Divide*). For the Newsletter see: <http://www.bus.umich.edu/eintro.html>.

Call for Papers

Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy is seeking papers for a special issue on Feminist Philosophies of Love and Work to be guest edited by Paula England and Julie A. Nelson. Contributions from all disciplinary backgrounds, including linguistics, theology, and the social sciences as well as philosophy, are invited. Submissions must be received by September 1, 2000. For more information please contact the editors at: (pengland@postoffice.pop.upenn.edu).

Workshop on New Economic Sociology in Europe 2000

For two days, June 2-3, Stockholm hosted a workshop on New Economic Sociology in Europe 2000, organised by Richard Swedberg and Jens Beckert, with Patrik Aspers' assistance. In the first session, which was chaired by Richard Swedberg, two papers were presented: *Global Microstructures: The Interaction Practices of Financial Markets* by Urs Bruegger and Karin Knorr Cetina, and *Reliability at Risk: Financial Models' Supervision as a Test for Reflexive Sociology* by Javier Izquierdo. The papers presented and discussed at the second session, chaired by Jens Beckert, were Carlo Trigilia's *Social Capital and Local Development: The Perspective of Economic Sociology* and Patrik Aspers' *A Market in Vouge: A Study of Fashion Photography*.

Later during the day, in a session chaired by Johan Heilbron, two other papers were presented for discussion: *Organized Complexity: Conventions of Coordination and the Composition of Economic Arrangements* by Laurent Thévenot, and *Economic Action and Embeddedness: The Problem of the Structure of Action* by Jens Beckert. At the end of the day Frédéric Lebaron's paper *Economists and the Economic Order: The Field of Economists and the Field of Power in France*, and Philippe Steiner's paper *The Sociology of Economic Knowledge* were presented and discussed in a session chaired by Patrik Aspers.

The papers from the second day were *Economic Sociology in France* by Johan Heilbron, *Game Theory and Sociology -Landmarks in Game Theory from a Sociological Perspective* by Mie Augier and Richard Swedberg, *Reinventing Money in Europe: A Sociological Analysis of the Euro* by Nigel Dodd, and *Capitalism as a Religion? An Unorthodox View* by Christoph Deutschmann.

On the whole, the workshop showed that there exists a rather strong interest in money and finance among European economic sociologists. Moreover, as demonstrated by several papers presented at the workshop, a phenomenological emphasis on the impact of intersubjective perceptions and joint meaning constructions on economic actions and processes seems to be receiving more attention among economic sociologists. The workshop ended with a session of general discussion in which many ideas were put forth on how to proceed in order to promote New Economic Sociology in Europe and make it more viable as well as visible. (The papers can be obtained from Patrik Aspers at: aspers@sociology.su.se).

Second Annual Conference on Economic Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania

In recent years, economic sociology has become one of the more exciting areas in sociology. Although it was one of the key thrusts behind the discipline's inception at the turn of the century, the study of how social structure affects economic processes and outcomes has only regained its prominence over the last decade or so. In December 1998, the Sociology Department and the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania co-sponsored a conference on economic sociology focusing on the status of the field, the role of networks and social capital, and the transition from state planning to the market in formerly Communist nations. Ten speakers from throughout the United States presented papers in three panels.

Based on the success of this first conference, a second conference took place at Penn in March 2000. Sponsored by the Russell Sage Foundation, the Second Annual Conference revisited the main issues facing the field of economic sociology in a broad stock-taking theoretical panel (see program below). Further, two topical subsequent panels explored the challenge that gender poses for economic sociology as well as explored the sociological aspects of the process of globalization. Close to 100 scholars and graduate students from around the United States as well as abroad were in attendance. Given the strong interest in economic sociology and the evident vitality of the field, it is hoped that this conference will become an annual event at the University of Pennsylvania.

Selected papers presented at the first and second annual conferences will become part of an edited volume to appear in 2001. For additional information on Penn's Economic Sociology initiatives and future conferences, please visit the following website:

<http://pesos.wharton.upenn.edu>

Program Overview

Panel 1: What is Economic Sociology? Do We Have an Emerging Theory?

Chair and Discussant: Randall Collins (University of Pennsylvania)

Presenters and Papers:

Paul J. DiMaggio (Princeton University) *The Future of the Firm*; Mark Granovetter (Stanford University) *Economic Sociology at the Crossroads*; Harrison White (Columbia University) *Markets in Networks*.

Panel 2: Globalization, Entrepreneurship, and the State

Chair and Discussant: Marshall Meyer (University of Pennsylvania)

Presenters and Papers: Susan Eckstein (Boston University) *Globalization and Mobilization: Third World Social Movements at the Dawn of the New Millennium*; Alejandro Portes (Princeton University) *The Role of Social Capital and Embeddedness in Economic Development: Some Theoretical Reflections*; Charles Sabel (Columbia University) *Formal and Informal Organization in the Age of Globalization*.

Panel 3: Gender, Organizations and Economic Sociology

Chairs and Discussants: Paula England and Jerry Jacobs (University of Pennsylvania)

Presenters and Papers: James Baron and Michael Hannan (Stanford University) *Determinants of Gender Composition in New High-tech Firms*; Denise Bielby and William Bielby (University of California, Santa Barbara) *Who Works Hard for the Money? A Comparison of Theories about Work Effort and Organizational Commitment*; Barbara Reskin (Harvard University) *A Multilevel Theory of Employment Discrimination*.

Jonathan Mote
University of Pennsylvania
jmote@sas.upenn.edu

Economic Sociology Section at ASA

We are pleased to announce that the number of members of the Economic Sociology Section-in-Formation at the American Sociological Association (ASA) has passed the critical mark of 300 which is the minimum needed to become a full-fledged Section. The next task for the Organizing Committee for the Section-in-Formation is to write the by-laws of the Section which are to be approved by the ASA.

Correction about the Moscow Conference

Regretfully we have been notified that the website address to proceedings of the conference "Economic Sociology at the Edge of the Third Millennium", January 14-15, 2000 in Moscow, was printed incompletely in the last issue of the Newsletter. We hereby apologize for the inconvenience that this error might have caused our readers. The complete address is:
[http:// www.msses.co.ru/english/interc/rnet](http://www.msses.co.ru/english/interc/rnet).

A Final Note

Dear Reader,

Almost a year has passed since the idea of having an electronic newsletter on economic sociology in Europe took form at the ESA's 4th conference in Amsterdam. After having been in charge of the first three issues of the Newsletter it is now time for us to pass over the editorship to Johan Heilbron and his Managing Editor Arnold Wilts. We wish them the best.

Richard