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Abstract

The goal of this paper is to reconsider institutional labor economics and make a renewed case for it. Two recent developments motivate this effort: the rise of New Personnel Economics (NPE) as a significant subfield of labor economics and the very substantial shifts in work organization that have taken place in recent years. Understanding how and why firms have reorganized work opens the door for a renewed interest in institutional approaches.

The focus is upon how organizations structure their internal labor market (ILM) rules. The argument is that these rules emerge from the interplay of competing groups and competing views of legitimate objectives. As such the role of power and influence in establishing work rules is central although more conventional NPE considerations also remain important.

The paper illustrates the utility of institutional labor economics by reviewing evidence regarding features of ILMs and how they are changing. The empirical material includes the emergence of ILMs, patterns of diffusion of high performance work organization, variation across firms in obtaining effort and commitment from their workforce, the use of contingent labor, the increased diversity of ILM patterns, and the rise of rise of equal employment opportunity and due process functions. The paper then concludes by addressing a possible response to the argument developed here: that deviations from standard theory are merely transitory and will be eliminated by market discipline. The final section draws together the argument and its implications and discusses limitations and possible next steps.
A chestnut in any course on Industrial Relations is a review of old debates between the so-called institutionalists and more mainstream labor economists. Lester (1946) and Machlup (1946) debated the role of equilibrium and marginal analysis in labor economics while Lampman (representing what he termed the “empiricists”) and Rottenberg (representing mainstream theory) argued about realism and the standards against which theory should be judged (Lampman and Rottenberg, 1956). The local labor market studies of Reynolds (1951), Myers and Shultz (1951), and others critiqued the standard assumptions of mobility and perfect information and these scholars believed that “where frictions, imperfections, and the ‘human element’ in labor markets bulk larger…the competitive…model frequently gives answers that are incorrect, misleading, or unduly narrow and simplistic.” (Kaufman, 2008, p. 287)

By the mid-1960s these disputes seemed to have been settled with the rise of human capital theory and the elaboration of search and information models which accounted for many of the institutionalists’ observations regarding the operation of labor markets. The institutionalists were not eliminated but they retreated into schools of Industrial Relations and, less commonly, into business schools. This outcome notwithstanding, the goal of this paper is to reconsider institutional labor economics and make a renewed case for it.

One stronghold of institutional thinking has been researching and explaining the personnel practices of firms and, in particular, how they organize the rules of their internal labor markets (ILMs). Understanding ILMs is an important arena for institutional theory because, at least as a first approximation, the very existence of
administered employment rules seems to point to a different understanding of labor markets than that which emerges from invisible hand models of supply and demand.

However, in a replay of the old pattern, in recent years New Personnel Economics (NPE) has emerged as a significant subfield of labor economics. This line of research seeks to explain the personnel and internal labor market practices of organizations from an optimization perspective. For example, NPE has addressed the general question of why internal labor markets exist, has studied optimal compensation and promotion practices, retirement policies, and many other human resource topics. Because NPE is congruent with most of standard economic theory it has gone unchallenged yet the older tradition of institutional labor economics appropriately updated takes a different perspective, has a great deal to say on the same topics, and is worth a serious reconsideration. This is particularly true because somewhat below the radar screen more institutionally oriented scholars, many of whom are sociologists but some of whom are more direct descendants of the older institutionalists, have enlarged and deepened their own analysis of organizations. Hence the substance of institutional economics is deeper and more vital than has been understood.

The second justification for reconsidering institutional labor economics is that the current period is witnessing a remarkable number of changes in how firms organize work. Understanding what is driving these transformations is central to the intellectual agenda of the field and this project poses a substantial number of puzzles that are difficult to understand simply from the perspective of NPE. The impulse to restructure ILMs is certainly linked to competitive pressure as well as new technologies which enable new organizational forms (Roberts, 2004) but how this is played out and what new
arrangements actually emerge cannot be understood without reference to institutional considerations.

It is the contention of this paper that to understand these changing patterns of modern ILMs the static optimizing approach of mainstream New Personnel Economics is inadequate and a more complex institutional model is more appropriate. To address this question this paper joins other recent contributions that have sought to elaborate the meaning of institutional labor economics and to create space for this school of thought (Jacoby, 1990, Kaufman, 1994, Kaufman, 2004, Marsden, 1999). This paper aims to build on that literature and add to it a varied range of contemporary theory and empirical research.

In the next section of the paper I describe the approach that I will take to this topic and the boundaries and limits of my argument. Subsequent sections of the paper illustrate the utility of institutional economics by reviewing evidence regarding features of Internal Labor Markets and how these ILMs are changing in the current environment. I then turn to a possible NPE response to the argument developed here: that deviations from standard theory are merely transitory and will be eliminated by market discipline. To address this objection I draw on a substantial literature that casts doubt on the efficacy of the market in pushing organizations toward a single optimum solution. The final section draws together the argument and its implications and discusses its limitations and possible next steps.

The Argument and Its Terrain
For both institutionalists and practitioners of NPE there are three logical steps in the research program. The first is to ask whether in fact organizations have rules that at least nominally shape employment practices and outcomes. The second step is to ask whether these rules are binding in the sense that they lead to outcomes that are different than those predicted by standard supply and demand models. Assuming that the answers to the first two steps are positive the third step is to explain the origins of those rules and why they persist.

The simple existence of ILM rules is well accepted by scholars of all persuasions and has been so at least since the publication of Doeringer and Piore (1972). The second step in the chain of logic is more difficult because of the challenge of establishing the counterfactual (that is, what the results in a more standard labor market would look like) and testing against it. Firm level data are required because national datasets lack detail on the specific personnel practices that shape outcomes for the individuals who are surveyed. As a result the research that addresses this question typically studies individual firms although in some instances the form in which the data comes is descriptive or ethnographic accounts and in other cases econometric analysis of personnel records. The sophisticated econometrics should not, however, obscure the fact that essentially each study deals with a sample of one firm. In this literature NPE researchers have played a very important role by providing more clarity about where observed patterns diverge from those predicted by traditional labor economics (see for example Baker, Gibbs, and Holmstrom, 1994, Gibbs and Hendricks, 2004, Gibbons and Waldman, 2006). In general a fair conclusion is that scholars of all camps accept the
view that ILM rules do in fact shape outcomes in ways that differ from those predicted by models that ignore the administrative rules of the firm.

The NPE Perspective

The debate arises regarding the third question, the origins and persistence of these ILM rules. New Personnel Economics (NPE), as summarized in a recent review by Edward Lazear and Katherine Shaw “is aimed at modeling firms’ use of optimal management practices. (Lazear and Shaw, 2007, p. 92).” The prototypical research strategy in the NPE is to identify a personnel practice that is empirically prevalent and develop a model in which the practice in question emerges as the most efficient solution to the problem posed in the model. In other words, practices are seen as flowing from the firm’s effort to maximize efficiency. As a second step, NPE adopts the standard economics equilibrium assumption that if organizations err and adopt sub-optimal practices they will lose out in the competitive market. As a result natural selection will enforce the diffusion and dominance of practices that flow from the optimizing models.

In developing these models NPE, according to a recent review (Gibbons and Waldman, 1999), draws on four building block theories: human capital theory, optimal job assignment models, incentive contracting, and tournaments. The central ideas of each of these theoretical streams are well known. Human capital theory addresses the acquisition of skill and, in the context of a firm the determination and consequences of learning trajectories. Assignment models ask about how organizations can best match skills and job requirements. Incentive contracting concerns solutions to the well known agent-principal problem while tournament models focus on the use of promotions to provide incentives and to sort employees by quality.
I present the alternative institutional approach below and critique NPE. However, in making my argument it is also important to be clear that the claim is not that mainstream labor economics does not pay attention to institutions. Whatever the merit of this claim might have been in the past when the dominate research stream was human capital theory and earnings regressions it is certainly no longer true. There is a rich “standard” literature that examines the impact of minimum wages, unions, employment security legislation, temporary help agencies, and a variety of other labor market institutions. However, in this literature institutions such as those listed above are viewed as external constraints on the firm and the model of firm behavior, the model exemplified by NPE, remains one of optimizing a well defined objective function subject to external constraints be they supply and demand or institutions. The argument developed here challenges this perspective.

The Institutional Perspective

The central theoretical idea that I wish to develop is an alternate perspective on how firms make decisions regarding how to organize work. Within organizations there are competing objectives, of which efficiency as conventionally understood is certainly one but not the only one, and the economic outcomes that we that we observe and seek to explain are the result of a political and social process that blends these. The core ideas are the importance of groups inside of organizations, the persistence of conflict of interest among these groups, and the role played by power and politics in working through these conflicts. In this view the outcomes we observe are the result of a political process and although it is may often be tautologically true that there is a decision maker the reality is that the outcome reflects the political process and not that decision maker’s
optimization. It is this group level process that is the distinguishing feature of the institutional approach that I develop here.

This focus on group conflict over goals and rules is consistent with the work of many scholars who have recognized that firms contain multiple groups with quite different perspectives on the legitimate objectives of the organization. Nearly a century ago John Commons wrote that “…economic conflicts are not merely conflicts between individuals…but are conflicts between classifications or even classes of individuals…” In his description of a French bureaucratic organization Crozier wrote of “opposing forms of rationality” (p. 298) and went on to observe a “complex equilibrium affecting the patterns of action, the power relationships, and the basic personality traits characteristic of the cultural and the institutional systems of a given society” (p. 294).

The importance of organized work groups, in both union and non-union settings, is very well demonstrated in a very large and diverse ethnographic literature on workplaces. Furthermore this literature establishes that these groups act collectively, again in non-union as well as union settings, to pressure management to modify practices and policies. In the words of one review of this ethnographic literature (a review that contains numerous citations) “Workers’ goals can include oppositional elements that focus on resistance to management practices…. (Hodson, 1977, p. 426). Another review of this literature summarized it as finding that “managers and workers jointly negotiate the trade-offs among management control, worker consent, and labor effort. (Choi, Leiter, and Tomaskovic-Devey, 2008, p. 423). Again, it is important to understand that by “negotiate” the authors refer to informal interaction, pressure, and accommodation and not to formal union-management collective bargaining. It follows from the nature of
these implicit negotiations and political struggles that the outcomes that we observe cannot be presumed to result from optimal decision making. It is not the case that the competing perspectives described above can simply be modeled as additional constraints to be considered by an optimizing leader.²

An extended illustration of this point is found in Gouldner’s classic book *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy* (1954). In a case study he analyzed the origins and implementation of bureaucratic rules regarding issues such as attendance, safety, bidding for jobs, and effort. In modern language he explored how the firm created the rules of its internal labor market. He described how each rule came into being and argued that they were not based on a universal functional rationality but rather the result of competing interests. For example, he showed how the world view and interests of several distinct groups of employees as well as both incumbent managers and newly hired outside managers all differed from each other and how these differences varied depending on the topic at hand. The point was not just that they had different self interests but also that they had different views about the underlying rationale of the organization and about what was appropriate and inappropriate behavior. As a result the firm’s personnel practices, its ILM, reflected a political and social process that resolved these conflicts. Gouldner wore that “Rather than assuming that bureaucracy possesses a Gibraltar-like stability, the perspective directs attention into the tensions and problems evoked by bureaucratization” (p. 11).³

In short, the institutional perspective offered here challenges the view that ILM rules emerge from an optimization calculation. The interpretation of institutional thinking developed here is that within organizations the urge towards optimization and
efficiency competes with other objectives held by powerful constituencies. The form that ILMs take, the nature of the personnel rules, can only be understood as flowing from a complex interaction of these objectives and interests. This competition for policy includes an important role for group level factors such as norms and customs, social structure, competing interests, search for legitimization, and power. Rather than the perspective of agency theory, which implicitly assumes that there is a decision maker with power to impose an optimal set of rules given the constraints, in fact decisions in organizations are the outcome of a political bargaining process among the groups as described above. Of course, there is always a “decision maker” at the top of an organization chart but, as in politics in the public arena, that person often is one of many players and in the end the “decision” that he or she makes is a ratification of the outcome of bargaining among constituencies and not the limited version of “politics” recognized by NPE. ⁴.

**Relationship of the Debate To The Literature**

The argument developed here differs from other lines of criticism of NPE. The New Personnel Economics assumptions regarding the optimizing behavior of the firm insists that organizations adhere to what March and Simon called the “machine model” of behavior (March and Simon, 1958, p. 37). This is the view that organizations can been seen as an algorithm that take inputs, e.g. data on prices and production processes, and spit out the optimal response which they then execute. This view assumes an organizational computational capacity doubts about which have long formed the basis of
critiques (Nelson and Winter, 1982, Cyert and March, 1963). Setting aside this particular doubt, one general criticism of this machine model of organizational behavior which is relevant to the proposed paper is that it is excessively functional.

Functionalism in social science is the tendency to confound the functions that an institution performs with an explanation for why it came into existence, i.e. the argument that “Institution X does so and so and therefore it was created in order to accomplish just that.” As Jacoby notes in his critique of standard theory, “There is a tendency to rationalize employment practices in functional or efficiency terms without regard to their historical-causal (how did the practice arise) complexities (Jacoby, 1990, p. 317).” A similar comment, directed to economic modeling more generally, was made by Granovetter:

“…the main thrust … is to deflect the analysis of institutions from sociological, historical, and legal argumentation and show instead that they arise as the efficient solution to economic problems. This mission and pervasive functionalism it implies discourages detailed analysis of social structure that I argue here is the key to understanding how existing institutions arrived at their present state” (Granovetter, 1985 p. 505)

Indeed, there is a long tradition in political science and sociology of criticizing this style of argument but, because of the power of the modeling tradition in standard economics and the tendency to ignore history as a source of data, functionalism has persisted.

Related to the overly functional approach is the observation that NPE models are essentially not subject to dis-confirmation. As Baker and Holmstrom note in their review of the NPE literature on Internal Labor Markets “At this point there is hardly any feature of internal labor markets that cannot be given some logical explanation using the right
combination of uncertainty, asymmetric information, and opportunism.” (Baker and Holmstrom, 1995, p. 255). If a particular set of empirical facts appear inconsistent then the model can simply be tweaked in the manner suggested by the quote.

These complaints aside, the NPE approach has not gone unchallenged on theoretical grounds and it is important to understand the perspective taken here differs from other critiques and in particular from those based on social-psychological arguments and the variety of capitalism literature.

The NPE model typically sees economic actors as atomistic and selfish utility maximizers whereas social-psychologists emphasize interpersonal comparisons of utility and alternative sources of motivation such as gift-exchange. Several recent reviews of the literature (Pfeffer 2007; Baron and Kreps, forthcoming) provide well developed expressions of this perspective and by now it is easy to show that the behavioral assumptions inherent in NPE models are incomplete and lead to misunderstandings about how people actually behave at work and about what motivates them.

As useful as is this socio-psychological viewpoint it is also important to see that the discussion and examples used to support the argument center on such individual level behaviors as role of intrinsic motivation, the importance of reciprocity and gift-exchange, status inconsistency, the anchoring of expectations, and interpersonal comparisons of utility. By contrast the perspective developed here emphasizes group norms, conflict, and negotiation.5

At the other extreme from individual behavioral foundations is a critique at the level of markets and society. The argument is that the labor market (and other markets)
are embedded in larger cultural, legal, and institutional systems. This perspective is exemplified in the substantial political science literature on “varieties of capitalism” and this research makes the fundamental point that alternative equilibriums are possible and that there is no single “most efficient” outcome (Hall and Soskice, 2001; Katz and Darbishire, 1999, Thelen, 2004). For example, Japan, Germany, and the United States are all successful market systems but they show considerable variation in how they have responded to economic shocks and the impact technological change has had on the wage distribution. This stands in contrast not just with standard theory but also the older institutional view that industrial societies were converging towards a single model (Kerr et.al., 1960). One review of the varieties of capitalism literature concludes that the consensus among scholars that there is a persistent diversity across nations in how capitalism is organized is “truly striking.” (Thelen, 2004, p. 1).

From the perspective of the argument developed in this paper national effects are important because, in addition to having a direct impact upon ILM practices, they also affect the relative power and resources of different groups within firms. However, although in one sense national effects are a challenge to NPE—because their existence demonstrates that context matters and that ILM practices cannot be explained via timeless and spaceless optimization models—a more sophisticated version of NPE can deal with national effects by simply treating them as an additional constraint on firm decision making. From the NPE perspective firms choose their ILM practices in order to optimize efficiency subject to the constraints they face and some of those constraints may be national effects. It is also worth noting that a weakness in the national effects literature is its tendency to view nations as internally homogeneous in their practices but
the reality, as I will show below, is that there is substantial within country diversity regarding ILM rules. It is this diversity that I seek to better understand.

Evidence

The institutional argument I make in this paper is focused on Internal Labor Markets. The paper is limited to this theme and does not attempt to develop a more general argument regarding the role of institutions in economic activity nor in all of Industrial Relations. The focus of the paper is on the nature of ILMs and I argue that the independent variables emphasized by institutional theory are essential for understanding this dependent variable. The empirical material is examples and cases drawing from the literature on the origins and operations of ILMs.

The paper does not deny that NPE considerations are relevant and the most obvious of the NPE factors is that as competitive pressures on firms have ratcheted up many older ILM practices increasing looked costly and hence the pressure to change them have grown. In addition NPE scholars might also plausibly argue that underlying technologies have shifted in ways that affect optimal retention policies (for example in the direction of more general skills. See, for example Gould (2002)).

All of the above is certainly supportive of the idea that some of what we observe today as ILMs are transformed can be understood via standard models as shifting constraints that lead firms to implement new ideas about organizations, what Cappelli (1999) has characterized as “market-in,” such as new uses of on-site suppliers,
increased utilization of contractors and out-sourcers, and innovations in pay-for-performance. However if analysis is limited to this mode of thinking our understanding will be both theoretically and empirically incomplete. The particular ways in which the economic pressures are refracted through institutional considerations is essential for a full understanding of current developments. As the examples below will demonstrate, groups within organizations seek to redirect the pressures for change to their own liking and the actual ILMs rules which emerge reflect this institutional fact of life. In the sections that follow this point will be illustrated by six examples: the historical emergence of ILMs and present day political struggles over occupational boundaries, the slow diffusion of High Performance Work Systems, the strategies of firms to obtained increased levels of effort and commitment from their workforce, the use of contingent employees, the growing diversity of ILM systems, and the spread of new promotion rules in response to equal employment opportunity pressures.

Job Ladders And ILMs

ILMs emerged gradually among American firms from roughly the beginning of the twentieth century until the beginning of the Depression and then accelerated in their diffusion and took on a somewhat different form with the arrival of the New Deal and the rapid growth of union power (Jacoby, 2004, Kaufman, 2008). Underlying the NPE story is the effort by firms to find more efficient ways to manage increasingly large organizations as well as the need, which varied over the cycle, to limit the costs of turnover. Turnover is costly because it entails a waste of human capital and because in a high turnover organization provision and investment in on-the-job training is
problematic. In order to reduce turnover compensation is back loaded and this leads to a system in which people spend long periods of time with the same employer. This effect is intensified by the nature of human capital acquisition. The early investments in training need to be rewarded over time, from both the perspective of the employees and the firm, and again this implies long careers. In some versions of the human capital story there is also a process by which firms need time to learn about the abilities of their employees and this implies firm based careers (e.g. Farber and Gibbons, 1996). The incentive interpretation is somewhat different in that it is less about skills and more about behavior. In this line of thought ILMs help resolve agent-principal problems by creating long-term employment settings. In such settings opportunism can be minimized because there is always another round in the game (Williamson, 1975).

The institutional argument regarding the rise of ILMs takes two tacks. The first is to point to the role of unions in pressing firms to rationalize their employment practices in general as well as to adopt specific practices such as seniority based promotion. The second thread of the institutional story is the role of personnel profession in acting in their own self-interest by encouraging the diffusion of formal employment practices which then required a personnel staff to administer.

The evidence is that both the NPE and the institutional stories were important over the course of the twentieth century. At the turn century American firms, even large ones, did not have well developed internal labor markets. Instead, they managed their workforce via the so-called “drive system” in which substantial discretionary (often arbitrary) power was put in the hands of the foreman (Jacoby, 2004). Turnover was high and was problematic during periods of growth and labor shortage and this led to efforts to
stabilize the workforce via creation of job ladders personnel systems. In his history of the rise of Human Resource Management Kaufman argues that while in the pre-New Deal period “HRM also moved up and down in response to the threat exerted by unions and government (Kaufman, 2008, p. 295)” he nonetheless places more explanatory weight on the problems posed by managing large organizations (Kaufman, 2008, p. 300). Jacoby writes that “employers now found personnel management an attractive alternative, one that promised to simultaneously relieve labor shortages, improve productivity, and promote labor peace,” (Jacoby, 2004, p. 102). Furthermore, Jacoby relates the ebb and flow of adoption to shifting pressures of supply and demand in the external labor market (Jacoby, 2004, p. 129). Other correlates included firm size and stability of their product demand (Jacoby, 2004, p. 143).

With the onset of the Depression the relative importance of the different considerations shifts. In sectors that were unionized internal political pressures led firms to establish the formal job ladders and seniority systems that characterize industrial ILMs. Non-union firms then imitated these systems in order to avoid unionization. In addition, personnel specialists within firms were very active in pushing for the formalization of employment practices, a point of view that was clearly in their self-interest. Indeed, during the Depression and the World War II periods there was very little correlation between the standard optimizing correlates of ILMs—firms size and turnover rates—and the adoption of specific formal personnel practices. (Baron, Dobbin, and Jennings, 1986).

The core conclusion from this material is that when it comes to understanding how the prototypical ILM of the post-war period emerged the story is considerably more
complex than that implied in NPE models and the complexity is consistent with the institutional perspective developed above. There was certainly considerable room for the play of market forces and efficiency maximizing considerations but to these were joined the actions of two important interest groups within firms, unions and personnel professionals, as well as the actions of an external institution, the government. Internal Labor Markets can only be understood as resulting from the interaction of these actors as they used their resources to pressure organizations in the directions that they preferred.

The role of internal political struggles over the shape of ILMs is an on-going story, not limited to a particular historical episode. A powerful illustration of this point is the extensive literature on the determination of boundaries among occupations. The struggle over these boundaries is essentially a struggle over the definition of jobs and the steps in the ladder of an ILM.

At the core of this struggle, and central to the literature, is a rejection of the idea that there is some natural order regarding which tasks are assigned to which professions or occupations (Abbott, 1988). Rather, the creation of boundaries and steps in the job ladder is the result of political conflict, some of which is carried out in the public arena via professional societies and licensing authorities, but some of which takes place within the firm. A classic example is the struggle in the medical field between doctors, nurses, and medical technicians over who could do what for a patient (Freidson, 1970), a contest which is on-going and fueled by changes in technology and external shifts in funding. Even among doctors there are internal political struggles, for example between internists and specialists over who can treat which conditions. Abbot (1988) provides a wide range of examples of struggles of this kind in fields such as information technology,
law, medicine, engineering, and construction. Furthermore, the literature on how self-conscious groups engage in political struggles within organizations to define the scope of their tasks and to protect themselves against competing groups is not limited to a few highly educated elite occupations. Barley (1986) and Nelson and Barley (1997) provide a wide range of evidence of similar processes in a range of “lower level” technical occupations.

The point for our purposes is the ample evidence of self-conscious groups engaged in a power struggle over the shape of job ladders within an organization. It would be hard to understand the resulting ILM as simply the result of an optimizing process by managers who survey the technology and tasks and decide upon the most efficient way to structure work.

The Slow Diffusion of High Performance Work Systems

High Performance Work Systems, which involve the use of teams and various forms of quality programs, have been implemented in a range of firms (Osterman, 1994 Osterman, 2000; Handel and Gittleman, 2004) because there is considerable evidence that they lead to higher levels of quality and productivity (Pfeffer, 2007, MacDuffie, 1995, Ichniowski, Shaw, and Prennushi, 1997, Kochan and Osterman, 1994). Yet despite this evidence adoption has been slow which implies, as Pfeffer has observed, that money has been left on the table. Even when adopted the final form that the work organization takes is often not in line with the initial expectations of management.
The role of internal political struggles between groups of employees and management is apparent in accounts of adoption or the lack thereof. In a case study of non-union and white collar Hewlett-Packard Michael Beer and Mark Cannon examined why an effort to implement pay-for-performance compensation failed. They found that teams of employees resisted because of fears of unexpected changes in their compensation levels and that their resistance took the form of refusing new job assignments and refusing to admit new members to their teams. Beer and Cannon conclude that the process was one of “implicit negotiation” and that “high commitment [work systems] can only be created if employees…feel fairly treated and this in turn is a function of how much voice they have. (p. 14, 17).” Other non-union examples include the observation that first line supervisors resist HPWO because they feel threatened by the role of self-managed teams in taking over some of their functions (Coyle-Shapiro, 1999).

Case studies in unionized settings reach the same conclusion. The poster-child is the automobile industry in which tensions between local unions and management often delayed or reshaped the implementation of high performance work systems (Kochan, Lansbury, and MacDuffie, Landsbury, 1997). More broadly the literature reports similar issues. Unions can be oppositional when their adversary function is threatened by the more cooperative nature of HPWO systems (Walton, McKersie, and Cutcher-Gershenfeld, 1994) and management resists giving up its power to groups of employees (a useful review of failed HPWO partnerships in unionized settings is provided in Chapter 2 of Kochan, Eaton, McKersie, and Adler, 2009).
The case study research is supported by survey methods although the surveys cannot by their very nature provide as textured a picture. In their survey of the adoption of HPWO practices across a sample of automobile firms Pil and MacDuffie (1996) find that variables capturing the presence or absence of internal organizational barriers and resistance perform better than simple measures of economic performance. In a cross-national survey, Bloom and Van Reenen (2007) show that ownership patterns play an important role in explaining differences in adoption of modern managerial practices, a finding that is consistent with explanations that emphasize balance of power considerations within firms. In short, both surveys and case studies support the view that adoption of HPWO systems is strongly affected by group pressures and politics within organizations. As the Hewlett-Packard case makes clear, this pattern extends well beyond the unionized sector of the job market. It is clear that whether and how a firm adopts these practices is due to much more than simply an optimizing decision by senior managers.

Effort and Commitment

Obtaining higher levels of employee commitment has emerged as important in markets where quality and customer satisfaction are key to competitive success. As a consequence another recent development is new strategies by firms aimed at addressing this need.

The New Personnel Economics addresses employee effort and commitment from the perspective of efficiency wages and incentive compensation models that are
grounded in principal-agent theory. These perspectives are somewhat different in that efficiency wage/shirking models are about level of effort whereas in principal-agent models the worry is that the effort may be in the wrong direction, i.e. for the self-interest of the agent rather than the principal. However, what both flavors of standard theory have in common is the view that effort is largely decided at the level of the individual and that the key to any solution is to get that individual’s incentives correct.

An empirical illustration of this perspective, and evidence that it has power, is Lazear’s research on Safelite glass (Lazear, 2000). This paper, which is prominently cited in the literature, discusses the consequence of introducing piecework pay systems for auto-glass installers. The research showed that the installers responded to these incentives and that there was a selection process in which the less able employees quit the organization. The point then is that people do indeed respond as predicted to financial incentives but it is also important to remember that the circumstances of Safelite were special. Output was easily measured and monitored and employees worked individually, not in teams or groups. Nonetheless, one can take the point that incentives are important.

Although it is clear that incentives as conventionally understood play a role in eliciting effort it is easy to show that the NPE perspective is strikingly incomplete. At the core of the critique is the idea that the level of effort delivered by the workforce is at least partially determined at the group level and by considerations other than incentive schemes. Consider Toyota or Southwest Airlines, both of whom are probably taught in Human Resource courses even more frequently than Safelite. These firms are tremendously successful in their industries and both are widely known for obtaining high
levels of effort from their workforce. They are also successful in obtaining
organizational commitment, an idea that is basically foreign to New Personnel
Economics thinking (Lincoln and Kalleberg, 1990). But, in contrast to NPE
expectations, both are quite conventional in their incentive systems (and this is as true of
Toyota of America as it is of Toyota of Japan) and in both organizations seniority
(frequently seen in the NPE literature as the enemy of meritocracy) is important. Why
is it that these organizations are able to obtain exceptional individual effort and
organizational commitment while other firms with essentially the same compensation
arrangements are not? The answer lies in factors that institutionalists emphasize: group
norms and culture.

In thinking about this it is important to recognize that norms and culture are
group phenomena and not examples of the kind of individual level social-psychological
exchange discussed earlier. It is also important to contrast this perspective with the
individualist viewpoint typical in the NPE literature. Consider, for example, the
comment made by John Roberts in his widely cited book on the internal economics of
organizations: “While motivation problems can be manifested at the group level, we
focus our discussion on the problems of motivating individuals because these are
logically prior and because most of the arguments are more directly made in this context”
(Roberts, 2004, p. 177). This perspective misses the fundamental point that group
behavior and group objectives are not simply the aggregation of the behavior and
objectives of individual actors.

There is a long tradition in institutional research of recognizing that group culture
and norms are important. Seashore (1954) showed that norms operate at the group level,
Dunlop (1957, p. 130) emphasized the importance of custom in both the short and long-run process of wage determination, and Roy (1959) described how group processes lead to withholding of effort. In its more modern form organizational culture is a rapidly growing research field (Barley, Meyer, and Gash, 1988; Martin, 1992).

In both Southwest Airlines and Toyota the employees have developed strong group commitments to the success of the organization (Womack, Jones, and Roos, 1997; Pfeffer, 1998; Gittell, 2003; Rubinstein and Kochan, 2001). It is important to avoid romanticism in that Southwest has had labor trouble on occasion with its pilots and Toyota has worked very hard to keep out the United Automobile Workers. Nonetheless it is clear to observers (see the citations above) that at the level of the workgroup each organization has succeeded in obtaining effort via broadly shared norms and not simply via individual incentives or individual gift-exchange.

There is a very large ethnographic literature that generalizes the point of the Southwest and Toyota examples and suggests that the reality is that the workforce essentially engages in a bargaining process with management over effort, a negotiation that can be informal and is not linked to formal collective bargaining or even the presence of a union. Culture and norms represent the “opening” position of the workforce and what ensues is implicit negotiation between employees and management over effort. The ethnographic literature on workplaces strongly suggests this is an important phenomena.

We have already seen an example of this in the Gouldner study (Gouldner, 1954, pp. 161-162) cited earlier in which he showed that employee views about the legitimacy of management specific management practices varied and that if the practices
(i.e. ILM rules) were seen as illegitimate then effort was withheld. This pattern was found to be important in a very broad range of published ethnographic workplace studies surveyed by Hodson (1999). The ethnographies represented in the survey were undertaken in varied settings both unionized and non-unionized factories as well as white collar settings such as banks and restaurants. Hodson systematically compiled and coded the reports and examined the relationship between management adherence to work group norms and the degree of effort provided by the labor force. By norms he meant expectations about fair treatment of individual employees as well as expectations regarding the organization of work and of production. By effort he meant both what he termed “resistance behaviors” such as acting dumb and sabotage, as well as “citizenship behaviors” such as offering ideas, training peers, and providing extra effort. The coded research demonstrated a strong and significant relationship between management adherence to work group norms and citizenship behaviors. This represents strong evidence of implicit bargaining between groups of employees and management over a core element of the ILM.

Strategies For Using Contingent Employees

The use of temporary workers has surged in recent years and is an important element in the fraying of closed ILMs (Autor, 2003, Hausman and Osawa, 2003). One explanation that is consistent with the NPE approach is that firms often use contingent work as a strategy for working around compensation rigidities that result from the
persistence of fixed wage differentials based on work-group ideas of fairness (Abraham and Taylor, 1996). Related to this is the view that contingent employment enables firms to avoid the constraints that some courts have imposed via restrictions on the employment at will doctrine (Autor, 2003). What ties these views together is that contingent work is seen as an effort to avoid ILM rules and to return to a more classical labor market.

An institutional perspective would begin by observing that the motivations for contingent work outlined above have their origins in the strength of institutional constraints on the firms’ employment practices and hence the spread of contingent employment is in a sense an indirect acknowledgment of the power of institutional considerations. However, institutional considerations are more than a backdrop against which contingent work is played out, they shape how precisely is contingent work used, i.e. the rules that govern its implementation.

One example is found in the ethnographic research of Smith and Neuwirth (2008) who studied how a temporary help firm interacted with both the HR staff and the line managers of a client firm. How the temps were utilized was the result of a complicated three way political process within the organization with each interest group having a distinct perspective. The HR group struggled to maintain its role and status, line management sought flexibility, and the temp agency not only searched for business but also negotiated the relationship between the two internal factions. Smith and Neuwirth write, “What appear to be purely market-mediated employment relationships are constructed in the negotiations and occasional struggles between HR staff, line
management, and personnel from labor market intermediaries. (Smith and Neuwirth, 2008, p. 143).”

Similar struggles occur between managers and regular employees. When firms use temps they have to pay attention to the reactions of the regular workforce and the specifics of the ILM rules around temps are often shaped by the need to maintain status differentials. In her study of a Boston area call center and a manufacturing firm Lautsch (2002) observed that the balance of relations between the two employee groups was a central concern of managers as they decided how to implement contingent work. She notes that “regular workers favored the maintenance of status differences between themselves and temporary workers” (Lautch, p. 30). Management responded by “asserting that management would limit the scope of contingent work and its impact on regular jobs.” (Lautch p. 32). She adds that “management learned…that regular workers would rebel if teams were set up so that temporary workers had majority membership, or so that temporary workers were in supervisory roles over regular staff. Gradually these practices were eliminated.” (Lautch p. 34) In short, efficiency considerations were important and managers pressed forward with the use of temps as a source of cost savings but the manner in which they were used and rules governing their work were significantly shaped by institutional factors.

**Diversity of Employment Systems**

Another characteristic of the current period is that dominate models have lost their hold and there is considerable variety in ILM systems among similarly situated organizations. Yet if firms that face similar external constraints have different ILM
practices then this diversity poses a problem for NPE models, which suggests that when faced with the similar constraints organizations make similar choices. By contrast, the diversity can be understood from an institutional perspective that emphasizes different internal political configurations across firms.

There is considerable empirical work that demonstrates diversity. At the anecdotal level are examples such as the contrast in employment practices between Wal-Mart and Costco (Greenhouse, 2005; Cascio, 2006), the divergence of Southwest Airlines from the practices of other large carriers, or the HRM practices of the software firm SAS compared to its competitors (Pfeffer, 1998). More systematic work within industries, such as automobiles and telecommunications, also points to the same conclusion. For example, in their study of telecommunications and automobiles Katz and Darbishire (1999, p. 4) report that “within both union and non-union sectors the extent of variation in wages, work practices, and other employment conditions has increased.” In a review of the literature on call centers Batt and Moynihan (2002) identify alternative approaches towards organizing work (which they label “mass production,” “professional service,” and “mass customization”). Drawing on a survey of 354 American call centers they find that these models are all represented and the diversity of practices remained after the sample was divided into those centers serving residential and those serving business customers. Additional evidence of diversity of practices within customer segments is provided in Batt (2002).

A similar finding regarding substantial diversity emerges from research in a very different set of firms: small, young, non-union start-ups in the Silicon Valley (Baron, Burton, and Hannan, 1999; Burton, 2001). The study followed a sample of start-ups and
collected data on their personnel practices with respect to hiring, promotion, compensation, and retention. Firms varied in their approach towards motivation and retention and the researchers identified five HR models (which they termed Star, Bureaucratic, Commitment, Engineering, and Autocracy) each with a different set of personnel practices. As examples, a characteristic description of practices in a Star firm was “We recruit only top talent, pay them top wages, and give them the resources and autonomy they need to do their job” whereas an HR executive in a bureaucratic model said “We make sure things are documented, have job descriptions for people, project descriptions, and pretty rigorous project management techniques.”

Broader survey research also finds substantial diversity. Osterman (1994, 2000) surveyed roughly 700 establishments and, after holding constant a wide range of characteristics, found considerable variation in the adoption of teams, job rotation, and training practices. A similar pattern was observed by Bloom and Van Reenen (2007) in their survey of firms.

Because there is not a unified literature on diversity each of the different studies offers its own set of explanations. The Silicon Valley research focused upon the values of the founders of the firms and how those founders enforced their values and imprinted their organization. Bloom and Van-Reenen emphasize the importance of ownership patterns and in particular whether the firm is family controlled. The relative power of different internal constituencies—unions, personnel professionals, the finance function—show up as key variables in much of the research. In short, the literature suffers because it does not always succeed in holding constant key variables. For example, at the anecdotal level one can reasonably ask whether Wal-Mart and COSTCO compete in
the same market segment and in the more formal studies one can ask to what extent the variation in call center practices is due to the demands of different customers. Some of the other examples, e.g. SAS, can be seen as a-typical because they are privately held and the owner may be indulging his or her preferences.

These qualifications notwithstanding, the evidence of diversity is quite substantial and, taken as whole while recognizing that the definitive test has not been undertaken, a fair reading would be that an important component of the very substantial observed diversity in ILMs can only be understood as flowing from institutional considerations. It is also worth noting in passing that this diversity, and the fact that there is more than one way to achieve success, is reminiscent of the old institutional idea of a “zone of indeterminacy” an idea that was applied to wage setting (Pierson, 1957).

Due Process and Equal Opportunity

Although little remarked upon by NPE scholars, one of the most widespread shifts in ILMs—a shift certainly as important and as widespread as the diffusion of performance based pay—has been the implementation of a broad range of personnel practices associated with equal employment opportunity and with non-union due process and grievance procedures. These practices obviously have important implications for career pathways and promotions within firms.

A large literature has emerged seeking to explain the origins of these practices within firms. Much of this literature is rooted in the “institutional” stream of thought in Organizational Sociology, a line of thinking that focuses on how organizations adopt
practices in order to legitimize themselves in the eyes of other powerful actors or because the practices enhance the power of interest-groups within the organization (Selznick, 1949; DiMaggio and Powell, 1983). This latter perspective is clearly congruent with the argument developed in this paper. The challenge in this literature is to distinguish the institutional explanations from more efficiency based arguments that the adopted practices make economic sense for the organization.

Although it is not always possible to definitively prove that efficiency considerations are unimportant, the body of research taken as a whole does convincingly demonstrate that institutional considerations played a central role in the diffusion of the new practices and in determining the specific forms that they have taken. In an early foray into this field Edelman (1990) studied the adoption of grievance procedures in non-union firms, specifically in a sample of 52 firms in the Bay Area. Her broad argument was that organizations adopted these practices not because of any specific legal mandate (there was none) nor because of unions (the firms were non-union and a variable measuring whether they faced a union threat was insignificant). Rather, the process appeared to be that the general normative environment coming out of the Civil Rights movement put heavy moral or societal weight on firms to build “fairness” into their procedures and that firms with personnel departments were more likely to respond to this pressure.

In later research Edelman, Abraham, and Erlanger (1992) put even more emphasis on the role of personnel departments in pushing for practices that were self-aggrandizing. In this instance they studied the adoption of practices related to wrongful-dismissal charges. They show that the personnel profession as a whole systematically exaggerated
the risks that firms faced in these law suits, in some cases using estimates that were “absurd” (p. 65) and in other cases simply misleading (by, for example, reporting data from California as if it applied to all states). As result, senior managers were convinced to implement personnel practices that enhanced the power and role of the personnel professionals.

In another set of studies Dobbin, Jennings, Scott, and Meyer (1993) and Dobbin and Sutton (1998) study the adoption of promotion policies in response to Equal Employment Opportunity mandates from the Federal Government. There is certainly an underlying efficiency explanation in that firms faced the risks of lawsuits and contract loss if they did not respond in some way. However, in understanding what specific practices emerged there are important subtleties. First, Dobbin, Jennings, Scott, and Meyer (1993) show that the particular practices adopted “converged on a set of personnel practices that were isomorphic with the procedurally oriented, quasi-judicial administrative configuration of the federal government-formal, merit-based, employment and promotion conventions complete with an internal system of grievance adjudication.” In other words, the particular practices that were adopted were based upon imitation of those of the more powerful external organization, not upon an internal optimization logic. Of course, an NPE response to this might point to the search and information savings that such an approach might bring. However, Dobbin and Sutton (1998) demonstrate that even after Federal pressures sharply diminished in the Reagan years, and hence the costs of non-compliance sharply fell, personnel professionals continued to press for new practices and that they shifted their rhetoric from that of legal risk to the alleged internal benefits of diversity. Put differently, the personnel staff constructed
(without any evidence) a new argument once the legal risk argument was no longer valid.

A fair reading of this literature is not that efficiency explanations were unimportant or irrelevant but that they are strikingly incomplete and perhaps even naive with respect to the forces that drove adoption of the wide range of personnel practices associated with equal employment opportunity and fairness in the workplace. The self-interest of a specific interest group within the firm, as it competed for resources and power, was a big part of the story.

**Objections And Responses**

The foregoing showed that in many areas—the emergence and evolution of ILMs, the diffusion of HPWO systems, the use of contingent employees, obtaining effort, the diversity of employment systems, and the creation of EEO programs within the firm—institutional considerations loom large. An important counter-argument is to acknowledge some divergences from expectations of the standard model but argue that they are only short term phenomena that will be swept away by market forces which inevitably, and quickly, select optimal behaviors and punish sub-optimal ones. One response to this point is a variant on the aphorism attributed to Keynes that in the long run we are all dead. If our scholarly interest lies in explaining observed reality and if ILM practices are slow to adjust then ignoring the considerations invoked in this paper by relying on long run adjustment is not very satisfying. There is, however, also a deeper criticism. While the mainstream economics literature does assume convergence to optimal practice there is an alternative vein of theory that points away from this view.
Nelson and Winter (1982) argue that standard theory “cannot address such questions as the duration of the struggle or the durability of mistakes made in the course of it (Nelson and Winter, 1982, p. 32)” and they go on to describe what is essentially a search model for adoption of practices which is “groping, disorderly, and error ridden” with “general habits and strategic orientations coming from the firm’s past.” (pp. vii and viii). Their explanation is different than that of the current paper in that they focus on the nature of the managerial decision making process while this paper emphasizes the importance of group conflict. Nonetheless the central point of importance here is the rejection of the view that market forces inevitably force out practices that seem sub-optimal from the standard perspective.

A similar conclusion regarding the persistence of “non optimal” practices is found in the literature on increasing returns. Arthur (1989) argues along these lines with the idea being that in the presence of increasing returns a technology that is adopted is advantaged relative to a competing technology because it improves more quickly. As a consequence an event can set the adoption on a particular path whereas with a different event or accident a different path and different technology would win. Arthur shows that while “Under constant and diminishing returns the evolution of the market reflects only a-priori endowments, preferences, and transformation possibilities…but while this is comforting it reduces history to the status of a mere carrier, the deliverer of the inevitable. Under increasing returns, by contrast, many outcomes are possible.” (p. 127) and “competition between economic objects…takes on an evolutionary character…with a ‘founder’ effect mechanism…history becomes important…” (p. 128)
This argument about “lock-in” has a parallel in the political science literature that examines the adoption of institutions as well as the sociology isomorphism literature. The general point in both fields is that existing institution take on normative or customary legitimacy and thus are hard to change (Thelen, 2004; Mahoney, 2000; Dimaggio and Powell, 1983). In addition, Stinchcomb long ago argued that institutions are “imprinted” by the environment in which they are founded and are often unable to adapt to new conditions (Stinchcomb, 1965). The population ecology literature in sociology has taken off from this insight to argue that the source of change in response to environmental shifts is less the reconfiguration of existing institutions but rather the gradual rise of new organizations (Hannan and Freeman, 1984).

There is extensive empirical research in the literatures on technology, population ecology and political science that documents these arguments concerning persistence and lock-in. The literature in institutional labor economics has not been as systematic but a good deal of scattered observations supports it. As already noted, long history of empirical work demonstrates the power of customs and norms in the workplace and these customs and norms clearly serve to lock past practices into place. The earlier observation about the slow diffusion of new high performance work systems is also evidence of how slow change can come. Numerous business school cases focus on firms that were slow to adapt due to the weight of past practice. It is not that the market has not had an impact, it certainly has, but a reasonable conclusion is that the discipline of the market-- the pressure to converge to a single “optimal” model-- is considerably weaker than often assumed. In short, the problem, from the perspective of the NPE literature, is that the “death” of old institutions is very long, if ever, in coming and the
final result is best understood as the complex interaction of multiple pressures. Hence any effort to understand the current landscape is radically incomplete if viewed simply through an optimizing lens.

**CONCLUSION**

This paper has aimed to describe an approach towards institutional labor economics that recognizes the role of standard efficiency and market considerations yet brings to bear a deeper understanding of how organizations make decisions about how to organize work. One central characteristic of the argument developed here is that it does not develop a universal model which is parallel to the universalistic tendencies of neo-classical economic theory. Rather this paper is pitched at the level of the firm or organization. Nor does it address the psychology of individuals (i.e. whether or not they are utility maximizers) or the operation of external markets. The creation of employment rules within organizations is the terrain on which I think that institutional ideas have the most purchase but the claim is not that these ideas should replace the entire apparatus of standard theory.

The argument in this paper seeks to move beyond the conventional view regarding the debate between institutionalists and standard theorists. This conventional view is that the institutionalists argued from a list of empirical observations that appeared to be inconsistent with standard theory (McNulty (1980), Boyer and Smith, 2001). This led to the claim that early institutionalists were a-theoretical and simply “fact based and deductive (Boyer and Smith, 2001 p. 201), a claim that other scholars have rejected.
(Hodgson, 1998; Kaufman, 2007). In any case standard theorists succeeded in enriching their models by incorporating ideas such as search costs and incomplete information and this seemed to undermine the institutional critique. The weakness of the institutional strategy was that standard theory is sufficiently supple to develop reasonable explanations of seemingly deviant observations. Rather than starting with a laundry list of complaints it seems more helpful to distinguish among different levels of theory and to see where the core disagreement really lies. The argument developed in this paper emphasizes an understanding of the internal dynamics of the firm as it makes decisions regarding its personnel rules or ILM.

It is important in this context to understand that even at the level of the organization the approach proposed here does not reject market forces, this would be foolish indeed and particularly so in a period when established forms of work organization are under a great deal of pressure from competition. Rather the goal is to develop a more sophisticated understanding of the dynamics of Internal Labor Markets. The central proposition, one which as noted has a long tradition in the literature, is that these systems are the result of a political process in which competing objectives play out a contest. These competing objectives are not simply interest based in the sense that different groups are struggling for more resources or power nor are they grounded in individualistic principal-agent theory. But they rather represent alternative conceptions of the legitimate purposes and goals of the organization. Market or efficiency considerations are certainly one player in this contest and in the examples I presented I made an effort to give them their due. But they are not the only player. It is also important to recognize that the resources available to different positions in this contest
will vary over time. It would not be unreasonable, for example, to argue that in the Depression and World War II period the external environment favored internal actors who opposed NPE style thinking whereas today cost minimization advocates hold an advantage. But this ebb and flow does not alter the fundamental argument.

The emphasis on group processes and politics point to an important limitation of this paper: the question, which is not addressed, of how groups are formed and re-reformed. This, of course, goes to the issue of how people and collectivities come to identify themselves as having commonalities and how they frame what they regard as legitimate interests and goals. This is a topic of growing interest (Barley, 1989; Scully and Segal, 2002; Piore and Safford, 2006;) but it would take this paper too far afield to enter into it.

The goal of good social science should be to understand the determinants of the empirical realities that we observe, both at a point in time and as they change. Elegant theory is not an end in itself. This is important to understand because the arguments developed in this paper are certainly less clean and elegant than are NPE models. Furthermore they run the risk of devolving into what has been a weakness of institutional theory, namely a tendency to simply provide a long list of factors that should be taken into account without any strategy for assigning relative importance or for testing the arguments. However, to say that institutional theory runs this risk is not to say that it should be abandoned. Rather, advocates of institutional models have to be willing to be clear about their arguments and the strategies for testing them. The gains from such an effort should be a richer understanding of how employment systems are evolving and what drives this evolution.
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The idea that organizational behavior/decision making is not of the optimizing "machine model" mode has certainly been put forward before in the literature by both economists and sociologists. Cyret and March (1963), in the Behavioral Theory Of The Firm note that organizations are coalitions and that “basic to the idea of a coalition is the expectation that the individual participants in the organization may have substantially different preference ordering (i.e. individual goals)….with the obvious potential for group conflict” (p. 31). However, the book itself emphasizes different goals and coalitions among functional units as they make business decisions (production, accounting, sales, etc.) and devotes only two pages (186-187) to employment issues.

In another important contribution Zald and Berger (1978) applied social movement theory to organizations and identified three types of political conflict within organizations, coup d’etats, bureaucratic insurgency, and mass movements. The first type represents a struggle for power among the elite and is not relevant for the arguments developed here and the third is too episodic to be relevant. However, bureaucratic insurgencies can indeed represent on-going struggles over the purposes and procedures of the organization that are driven by competing views of appropriate objectives held by different groups.
There is an NPE literature on organizational politics but it remains at the level of individuals and how they maximize their self interest rather than at the level of group political contests over rules. For example, Lazear (1989) examines whether wage compression is good or bad for efficiency given that it may enhance cooperation but perhaps also reduce incentives for the best employees. However, his analysis asks how individuals react to different wage distributions with respect their private self-interest and he maintains the view that there is a decision maker within the firm who can set the optimal wage structure. In another effort along these lines Prendergast and Topel (1996) model the behavior of supervisors who exhibit favoritism towards particular employees. But, again, the modeling is purely at the individual level. Supervisors simply “like” some workers and not others, there is no sense of group action or interest. Finally, Gibbons and Waldman discuss politics but again it is purely individual. They write, “In our usage political models are slightly different from agency models. Both describe interactions between individuals at different levels of a hierarchy…[but] in political models the supervisor’s actions cannot be governed by a contract…” (Gibbons and Waldman, 1999, p. 2409).

Other efforts to introduce “social” considerations into standard models are also similarly limited. For example, Robert Solow (1990) argues that the labor market is a “social institution” but his emphasis is basically upon variants of efficiency wage models of wage determination and the macro-economic consequence of the fact that individuals respond to fairness considerations and
salary norms. There is no discussion of groups, group conflict or competing visions of the objectives of the firm (Solow, 1990).

6 The understanding that culture and norms are important in eliciting effort may be foreign to NPE but is increasingly shared in the broader economics literature. However, there remains a tendency to cling to the notion of a decision maker within the firm who, with this more sophisticated understanding, optimizes the firms organizational structure and culture to obtain effort (Akerlof and Kranton, 2005).

7 I am grateful to Sandy Jacoby for clarifying this point for me.