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Citer ce compte rendu
l’industrie de la construction est de juris-
diction provinciale, c’est-à-dire qu’elle
relève essentiellement et distinctement
de chacune des dix provinces cana-
diennes. Le cas québécois peut toutefois
paraître comme exceptionnellement
réglementé lorsqu’on le compare non
pas à certains pays européens, mais aux
États-Unis, surtout à cause de l’impor-
tance de la négociation collective, de
l’appartenance syndicale obligatoire et
du caractère centralisé de la négocia-
tion et de l’application des conventions
collectives dans les quatre grands sous-
secteurs de l’industrie.

Finalement, un des grands effets de
la déréglementation est la multiplication
des sous-traitants et des travailleurs
autonomes, souvent déguisés en entre-
preneurs indépendants. Ce mouvement
traduit une perspective à court terme
combinaison à la fois recherche de flexibi-
lité certes, mais couplée aux économies
de coûts se réalisant aux dépens des
conditions de travail et de la qualité des
produits, puisque l’encadrement des
qualifications des employeurs et des
travailleurs est minimal ou inexistant
dans certains pays. Même lorsqu’il
existe une réglementation formelle, les
politiques publiques ne prévoient pas un
cadre institutionnel pour en assurer le
respect (ex., le Royaume-Uni).

Pour conclure, ce volume contient
des informations utiles pour un lecteur
curieux de savoir comment les activi-
tés d’une même industrie peuvent se
déployer dans des conditions réglemen-
taires et selon des formes structurelles
et organisationelles très différentes
et même opposées selon les pays. Si le
lecteur reste sur son appétit quant aux
informations sur le niveau de conflic-
tualité dans les pays où la négociation
collective demeure un outil influent
pour la détermination des conditions de
travail, il appréciera le portrait général et
le souci des auteurs de chaque chapitre
de respecter une structure commune
dans l’organisation et la rédaction de
leur chapitre respectif.

MICHEL GRANT
Université du Québec à Montréal

---

Labour Market and Social Protection Reforms in International Perspective:
Parallel or Converging Tracks?
edited by Hedva SARFATI and Giuliano BONOLI, Aldershot: Ashgate

This is a sprawling collection trying
to cover a sprawling reality: the
interaction between recent and pro-
jected trends in the labour markets
of the industrialized countries and current
and anticipated changes in the existing
systems of social protection. The book is
the result of a project sponsored by the
International Social Security Association
and directed by the energetic former
head of the ILO’s Industrial Relations
and Labour Administration Department,
Hedva Sarfati, with the help of Giuliano
Bonoli, a social policy researcher at
the University of Fribourg. The book
brings together an international group
of experts on labour markets and social

protection to compare notes on this
broad set of issues. Given its prov-
enance, it is perhaps not surprising
that there is also a clearly recognizable
subplot: that recent trends in Europe
refute the “standard interpretation”
according to which there is an inescap-
able trade-off between low-quality jobs
(the Anglo-Saxon model) and chronic
unemployment (the European model),
raising new hopes that Europe can have
its social cake and eat it too, after all.

In the opening chapter, the editors of
the volume do an admirable job of
surveying and documenting the most
recent important trends in labour mar-
ket and social protection policies. This
will be useful and informative even for many experts as few of them will be fully on top of every one of the trends reviewed. Thus they remind us of how important the growth of service sector jobs has been in accounting for the “job miracles” in some countries and their absence in others, and how it has interacted with trends in female labour force participation to produce quite distinctive employment and participation patterns between otherwise roughly equally “developed” economies. The editors review the trends in (early) retirement and youth (un-)employment, including the looming pensions crisis. While discussing the “diversification” of employment forms at some length, they wisely steer clear of unguarded endorsements of the recent hype about the supposed rise in insecurity due to the spread of “non-standard” jobs.

Unfortunately, not all contributors exhibit such restraint. Several of them happily parrot the latest inflated rhetoric about the impending demise of stable jobs as we used to know them. Thus, for instance, French economist Jacques Freyssinet serves up the standard litany of disappearing stable jobs, deteriorating social protection, diversification of lifestyles, and dramatic new requirements of the knowledge-based economy, without a shred of evidence, and then goes on to call for a totally new approach to linking social protection to work, without bothering with any details as to what exactly that might mean. Ironically, while bombarding the reader with a plethora of not always very readable graphs and tables documenting trends in unemployment, employment and demography, Futuribles consultants Hugues de Jouvenel and Alain Parant proceed to talk gravely of “the extension of McWorld” (p. 160) in which “atypical jobs foreshadow the jobs of the future” (ibid.), with only very little in the way of solid evidence. Similarly, Jean-Michel Belorgey, a high-ranking French official, takes all the loose talk about precarious jobs, diversifying lifestyles and declining social protection at face value in order to present a long list of vaguely worded desiderata and principles that are to ensure that everyone has access to work, a decent income, protection from undue risk, etc. Is there something of a Gallic pattern here? In any case, the repeated dishing up of such hype is a little surprising, particularly since the book also contains a short contribution by Auer and Cazes making their now familiar point that while the cognoscenti were busy pushing their sweeping claims, in reality, average job tenure rates have remained surprisingly stable or have even increased.

But the book also contains a number of highly informative and well-argued pieces on, for instance, the Danish flexibility model (by Per Madsen), Dutch difficulties in reactivating the disabled (Frans Pennings), British efforts to create an active welfare state (Jane Millar), and an excellent analysis of the available reserve pool of older workers in the U.S. by Doeringer, Sum and Terkla.

The book is divided into three parts. Part I sets out the “key issues.” In addition to the Introduction by the authors, the best piece in this section for my money is the chapter by Andersen and Jensen. Presenting a large amount of comparative data on unemployment and employment rates and durations, poverty rates and earnings dispersions, they argue forcefully that the success of several European countries in achieving both high employment rates and low unemployment without allowing earnings inequality and poverty rates comparable to those in the U.S. or Great Britain puts the “standard interpretation” into serious doubt. The heroes of the piece are, of course, the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden and Austria.

While impressively argued, I still fear that the sceptic will not be entirely convinced. And this scepticism would be further strengthened by several of
the contributions that, inadvertently or not, provide less self-evident support for the European Social Model than the authors might intend. Thus, the figures presented by de Jouvenel and Parant on the relation between real wages, employment and wages as a proportion of total value added in the European Union and the U.S. (p. 146), for instance, actually look like pretty strong evidence for the standard interpretation. But the proof of the pudding is perhaps to be had in Part II of the book which is devoted to a series of country reports documenting and evaluating national responses to the trends outlined. This is the place where one would expect to find detailed evidence to bolster the European case that “there is no necessary incompatibility between high levels of social protection and economic performance” (p. 5). Yet the evidence turns out to be less than overwhelming. Harbridge and Bagley’s report on Australia briefly recounts the Labour government’s 1993 introduction of various activating policies, which were subsequently swept aside by the new Liberal-National coalition’s commitment to deregulation, Work for the Dole and privatization. The evidence for and against the effectiveness of these policies is, the authors tell us, apparently ambiguous and controversial along entirely predictable party lines. But then there is New Zealand, which underwent perhaps the most spectacular revolution of labour market and social protection policy in the industrialized world. If anywhere, here we should find evidence for or against radical deregulation and privatization as a long-term solution to chronic employment problems. But unfortunately, the two contributions devoted to the case of New Zealand provide little in the way of useful information in this regard. Harbridge and Walsh report on the Labour government’s elimination of various forms of market protection in the 1980s and on the Conservative National government’s apparently successful attack on the unions, and reductions in social protection benefit levels in the 1990s. But they report no clear effects on either employment patterns or inequality. It is not even very clear from their account how exactly the Conservative anti-union Employment Contracts Act managed to produce the dramatic decline in union density that occurred in its wake, nor in what ways the subsequent Labour government’s repeal of the Act is likely to change things. A second brief “Feature” by Anne de Bruin simply asserts, with little evidence, that the Conservative reforms led to much inequality and poverty, and proclaims the new Labour government’s “commitment to the growth of an inclusive knowledge society” (p. 223). The contribution by European Trade Union Confederation advisor Henri Lourdelle about the Central and Eastern European transition countries contains little information beyond the fact that these countries are dealing with problems quite different from those discussed elsewhere in the collection, and unsurprising warnings—from a union advisor—that these countries should not be tempted to go too far down the path of deregulation.

The three remaining country reports, on Denmark, Great Britain and the Netherlands, are much more informative but they do not provide unambiguous support for the European Social Model either. Jane Millar’s contribution on Great Britain reviews the plethora of new activating programs and regulations introduced by the Labour government since 1997 with the aim of helping or nudging specific groups, including youth, women and the handicapped, (back) into the labour market and sustainable jobs. It is a clear carrot-and-stick approach, involving individualized counselling and incentives as well as compulsory participation under the threat of benefit loss. The evidence that these programs have worked is, by Millar’s own admission, only slightly encouraging, particularly since it is hard
to say how much of the result depends
on the wider macroeconomic context.
What the chapter does not in any way
address is the degree to which the rela-
tively good employment record of Great
Britain is, or is not due to the greater
earnings differentials resulting from
earlier deregulation. But then there are
the two flagbearers for the case against
the U.S. Market Model: Denmark and
the Netherlands. Per Konghøj Madsen’s
chapter on the Danish flexicurity model
is quite informative on the typically
Scandinavian combination of extremely
generous benefits with active labour
market policies and a relatively low
level of job protection, but unfortunately
is less so on the celebrated Danish
experiments with educational leaves. In
addition, he reports that since 1994 the
Danish government has been gradually
tightening up the eligibility require-
ments and especially the maximum
duration for ‘active’ benefits. So far,
the findings of the evaluation studies he
cites appear to be mixed, however. The
activating effects of the standard array of
activating programs (training, counsel-
ing, etc.) appear to be modest whereas
the recent tightening up seems to have
had a clear effect in terms of pushing
people back into the labour market.
The educational leave programs appear
to have done more to hide unemploy-
ment by reclassifying the unemployed
than by creating new positions for the
previously unemployed. Moreover, as
Madsen, to his credit, reminds the reader
several times, it is impossible to say
whether the recent relative success of
the Danish “model” is primarily due to
an exogenous economic upswing or to
the improved functioning of the labour
market. Hans Pennings’ report on the
Netherlands is even more sobering.
Pennings focuses on efforts to move the
Dutch inactive population of working
age back into the labour force. There
appear to be few efforts to activate those
on unemployment insurance benefits.
The considerable efforts to reduce the
notoriously swollen ranks of Dutchmen
receiving disability benefits appear to have come to little, as have recent
attempts to reactivate long-term social
assistance recipients, while participa-
tion rates of older workers and women
remain low by international standards.
In addition, the Dutch ‘job miracle,’ as
even its celebrations concede, was largely
based on a concerted effort to keep
down Dutch wages. Thus, not even the
flagbearers for the European Model look
quite as impressive as they appeared at
first sight.

The final section of the book consists
of 10 pieces discussing “alternative
policy mix scenarios.” These are an
even more uneven lot than the rest of the
book. There are several pieces on older
workers and the looming pensions crisis
which do not strike me as presenting
anything particularly new or exciting.
There is another visionary piece by
Robert Salais heralding a “Third Age
in Relations between Work and Social
Protection” which will provide us with
“[n]ew forms of security and concepts
of work, rights to, [sic] the quality of
the supply of employment, access to the
capacity to control one’s life, [which]
must be available right away to all
workers” (p. 448), without the slightest
consideration of actual empirical trends
or of the concrete meaning of these
noble principles. Another couple of
pieces more or less piously proclaim the
desirability of cooperation and dialogue
between the social partners. It includes
another lengthy piece by the afore-
mentioned Henri Lourdelle, apparently
presenting the official line of the ETUC
which is, as official lines tend to be, full
of statements about the need to sustain
the European Social Model that are as
noble as they are vapid, much talk about
the need for “social partners” (read:
unions) to be consulted in reforms, the
usual jabs at neoliberal and pro-market
thinking and some veiled threats to
those who would seek to reform, say,
the floundering pension system without
properly consulting the aforementioned “social partners.”

The concluding chapter by the editors does an admirable job of trying to tie all these disparate strands together and to derive some coherent conclusions from them. “Overall,” they say, “the case studies in this volume suggest that there are alternatives to the trade-off between equality and jobs, based on carefully balanced policy mixes of flexibility, regulation and ex post intervention” (p. 472). A little later, they reiterate that the “findings suggest that, in contrast with the views that were widely held at the beginning of the 1990s, there is probably more than one route to successful labour market and social protection adjustment” (p. 480). It seems to me that the contents of this volume lend more support for the latter than the former statement. The evidence of success in keeping inequality low while at the same time raising employment levels and participation rates as a result of judicious policy intervention (as opposed to more or less fortuitous macroeconomics) is not overwhelming.

The editors are keen to promote non-ideological dialogue. This is important and timely. It is not entirely successful, however. Several of the contributions simply state the official lines of the organizations their authors represent, sounding more like lengthy press releases or propaganda than scholarly analyses or reports. Some simply make the case for some preferred policy on basically ideological grounds without seriously considering any of the empirical evidence or practical implications and complications. This is the case, for instance, with the chapter by Jepsen and Meulders decrying the “forms of injustice” that they claim result from “derived” social protection rights, mainly for female spouses. While their claim that it favours “couples over others” (p. 108) would hardly seem controversial, it also would not, at least in the eyes of traditionalists, qualify as an “injustice.” On the other hand, we are not presented with any hard evidence of the claim that such rights discourage women from seeking work (although this would seem plausible enough and not difficult to document), that it encourages atypical forms of employment (another “injustice”?), or that it increases the risk of dependence (true by definition?) and poverty for spouses who stay at home (pp. 108-110). As against this, Jay Ginn, in her contribution, quite sensibly points out that traditional work insurance-based individual forms of social protection tend to hurt women so long as they continue to take on most of the burden of family care. She advocates a system of state pension schemes that compensate for women’s periods of absence from the labour force to take care of family members, but she neglects to consider costs or political considerations. Almost all contributing authors recommend “active” labour market policies of various kinds without worrying much about the rather large body of existing empirical evidence questioning their effectiveness. At the same time, these same authors routinely dismiss “Anglo-Saxon” style workfare as socially regressive and uncivilized, without ever facing up to the thorny issue of the work or training obligation which is an almost unavoidable aspect of the “active” measures they so enthusiastically recommend.

Let me conclude with one last word on what I found to be by far the most interesting and well-argued piece in the volume, the chapter by Doeringer, Sum and Terkla on “Older Workers and Active Labour Market Policy in a Full Employment Economy: The Case of the United States.” After first carefully documenting the emergence in the U.S. of a growing pool of underutilized older workers who could be drawn back into the labour force by proper incentives and training opportunities, Doeringer and his colleagues zero in on nearly full-employment Massachusetts. They
argue that the older worker population represents the only ready labour reserve capable of alleviating impending labour shortages that might choke off growth altogether in the future, not to mention capable of lightening the growing pension burden. After careful analysis of a number of factors that keep these older workers out of the labour force today, the authors present a series of practical recommendations to overcome those obstacles. There are several indications in the other contributions to this volume that suggest that Europe may well be headed in the same direction, given current demographic and economic trends. So perhaps the U.S. presents Europe with (part of) its future after all!

Axel van den Berg
McGill University

La relation de service : opportunités et questions nouvelles pour l’ergonomie

Cet ouvrage regroupe différentes présentations faites dans le cadre d’un séminaire organisé par le département Ergonomie et Écologie humaine de l’université Paris 1. Chaque année, chercheurs, universitaires et praticiens d’horizons disciplinaires différents sont invités à échanger autour d’une question collective. Le thème retenu pour l’année 2001 était celui de la relation de service. Dans son avant-propos, François Hubault indique que le séminaire cherche à préciser la notion de relation de service selon différents points de vue (économique, social, psychologique, ergonomique) et à poser ainsi des questions à l’intervention en milieu de travail.

Pour Borzeix, la « relation de service » met au jour l’usager, qu’il soit usager prétexte, usager destinataire et usager coproducteur et interroge certains clivages ayant cours en sociologie. À l’aide d’une analyse du travail réalisée dans une gare, elle nous montre l’intérêt de la relation de service comme objet d’étude pour aller au-delà des clivages traditionnels en sociologie du travail comme entre micro et macro, entre individu et organisation, et ouvrir ainsi sur des retombées très opératoires.

Le sociologue Beyer suggère quant à lui qu’à travers la relation de service, l’agent et le client contribuent à façonner la société. Le propos est illustré par l’exemple du métro de Paris où le marketing a fait passer l’usager, celui qui n’a pas le choix d’utiliser un service, au statut de client, qui choisit ce service plutôt qu’un autre. L’auteur plaide pour une interdisciplinarité qui inclurait des spécialistes du management et du marketing puisque les services peuvent être définis comme des « systèmes d’alliance et de compromis entre dirigeants-personnels-clients ».

Weller s’intéresse pour sa part au maintien de la distance avec le client, selon deux modèles d’organisation. En prenant l’exemple de la Sécurité sociale, il discute du délicat équilibre que doivent maintenir les prestataires de service entre distance et compassion : comment assurer une réponse individualisée tout en conservant une égalité de traitement. Ainsi, d’un service très technique où les réponses standardisées sont garanties de l’égalité de traitement, on est passé à un service davantage centré sur le client et qui encourage plutôt la réponse personnalisée. C’est maintenant la distanciation qui est difficile et qui nécessite de recomposer l’organisation du travail afin de favoriser les régulations. D’ailleurs, comme le soulignent Hubault et Bourgeois, il existe une difficulté de penser les activités de travail associées à la relation de service et de concevoir les