

used meant that all of the JTPA's programs for in-school youth had to be omitted from the study design. Hence, the full range of JTPA clientele could not be evaluated. Furthermore, JTPA performance standards for adults differ from those for youth; AFDC and food stamp usage by JTPA enrollees was not available at all study sites; persons are considered by some SDAs to be enrolled in JTPA when they are initially processed, whereas other SDAs consider them enrolled only when they actually begin to receive specific program benefits; and the list could go on.

In short, this study is a highly professional attempt to provide a factual basis for evaluation of an important public policy initiative, but clearly its results are less than advertised. It is a JTPA study but it is not truly a "national" study, since the methodology precluded random selection of participants, omitted analysis of a key program component, and included no major large cities. For these reasons, it is a serious mistake to imply—as the study does—that other types of evaluation are unneeded. Indeed, most of the key findings of this study are identical to those of other studies of JTPA (as well as of MDTA and CETA) of which the advocates of randomized assignment speak so dismissively.

The major lesson that I take from this study is that JTPA—with its absence of stipends for trainees, its emphasis on performance standards, its reduction in funding levels, and its exclusion of direct job creation—was a step backward from the earlier progressive evolution of legislative efforts to prepare the nation's economically disadvantaged persons for jobs. That story, however, cries out to be told more plainly than it is in this book.

Vernon M. Briggs, Jr.

Professor
New York State School of
Industrial and Labor Relations
Cornell University

Half a Job: Bad and Good Part-Time Jobs in a Changing Labor Market. By Chris Tilly. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996. 228 pages. ISBN 1-56639-381-7, \$49.95 (cloth); 1-56639-382-5, \$19.95 (paper).

Part-time work has long been with us, and it is usually taken for granted that part-time jobs, which are predominantly held by women, are low-status and low-paid. In recent years, how-

ever, labor economists have been puzzled by what seems to be a new phenomenon: the existence of some part-time jobs that do not fit the stereotype of badly paid part-time work.

In 1990, Rebecca Blank asked the question, "Are part-time jobs lousy jobs?", and discovered that in fact, some were not. ("Are Part-Time Jobs Lousy Jobs?" in Gary Burtless, ed., *A Future of Lousy Jobs?* [Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1990].) Once she controlled for differences among women and factors that affected their decisions to work part-time, Blank found that women who had switched into part-time work voluntarily were paid more per hour than comparable women who worked full-time. This result, although surprising at the time, has since been replicated.

Until now, there has been no systematic study of the dichotomy between good and bad part-time jobs and of why one group might be better paid and the other worse paid than comparable full-timers. Chris Tilly fills this important gap with this authoritative book on bad and good part-time jobs. As Tilly points out, this study is especially important because part-time work, and particularly employment in bad part-time jobs, has become increasingly common over time. In 1993, 19% of American workers were part-time, as compared to only 13% in 1957. Moreover, nearly one-third of these part-timers were working part-time involuntarily, a larger share than at any comparable time in the past (taking into account the fact that the rates of involuntary part-time employment will be higher in recessions). This point, too, has been made by other researchers, most notably Rebecca Blank, but Tilly does us a great service by pulling together recent research on this subject and presenting it in a lively and informative manner.

Why is part-time work becoming more prevalent in the United States? Tilly finds that demographic shifts were important in explaining the growth in part-time work until about 1970, but since then the growth has been driven by employer demand for more part-timers. This growth in employer demand has been due in part to the rapid growth of industries such as trade and services that traditionally employ more part-timers than does manufacturing, but there has also been growth in the share of part-timers within industries. To explain this growth in employer demand within industries, Tilly conducted intensive case studies of the retail and insurance industries in the Boston and Pittsburgh metropolitan areas in 1987 and 1988. In the interviews for these case studies, Tilly was

struck by the fact that those he interviewed were describing two systematically different types of part-time work: bad part-time jobs and good part-time jobs. Tilly usefully applies theories of dual labor markets to characterize the distinction between these two types of part-time work.

The bad jobs are entry-level and dead end jobs in a secondary labor market. As such, they demand little skill, training, and responsibility, and afford few opportunities for promotion or advancement. The bad part-time jobs are poorly paid and generally offer few or no benefits. Turnover in these positions is very high, although a few exceptional employees manage to move from them into more permanent full-time positions with a firm.

The good jobs, in contrast, are positions in a primary labor market. Because these positions tend to be used to keep a valued employee on the job, Tilly calls them "retention" part-time jobs. As such, they are well paid and often provide benefits, at least on a pro-rated basis. Although retention part-timers may not exercise much supervisory responsibility while they are working part-time, they nevertheless are in positions that demand skill and training; and although it is rare for them to be promoted while they remain part-time, they retain a position on their firms' internal career ladder. Not surprisingly, turnover in these positions is low.

Having identified the two types of part-time work, Tilly moves on to a closer examination of good and bad part-time jobs and of the implications of both types for employers and employees. He also looks in more detail at the reasons for the growth in part-time work, drawing upon his case studies and also upon national data, and at the relationship of part-time employment to business cycles. This section of the book is helpful in filling out the picture of bad and good part-time jobs. However, the main contribution of the book—the well-thought-out distinction between bad and good part-time jobs—is made in the earlier chapters.

In the concluding chapter, Tilly explores the implications of the growth of part-time work, and in particular bad part-time jobs, for our well-being as a society. He also considers several policy remedies that interested parties such as unions, employers, and legislators might pursue. In considering policy alternatives, Tilly is pragmatic. The goal, as he sees it, is not to seek to limit or eliminate part-time work; after all, many employees prefer this work, and many employers do as well. Rather, Tilly sets a more modest but also more reasonable goal—to identify policies that would help transform bad part-

time jobs into better jobs, whether in the form of good part-time jobs or full-time jobs. Of particular interest in this regard are several policy initiatives that would help reduce the pay and benefits differential between part-timers and full-timers: raising the minimum wage; mandating universal employer health insurance coverage; and mandating equal benefits for part-timers, as Congresswoman Patricia Schroeder has proposed in her Part-Time and Temporary Workers Protection Act.

Tilly clearly speaks with authority on this subject, and his book is must reading for anyone doing research on part-time work. The book also makes an important contribution to the subject of contingent work more generally, since part-timers comprise such a large share of the contingent work force. Readers will be delighted to discover that the material is presented in a lively and engaging manner, making an important and timely book a good read as well.

Jane Waldfogel

Assistant Professor
Columbia University School of
Social Work

Human Resources, Management, and Personnel

On the Line at Subaru-Isuzu: The Japanese Model and the American Worker. By Laurie Graham. Ithaca, N.Y.: ILR Press, 1995. 169 pp. ISBN 0-87546-345-2, \$28.00 (cloth); 0-87546-346-0, \$12.95 (paper).

Laurie Graham has provided an important service for academics and practitioners interested in the implications of "lean production," or Japanese models of production organization, for workers in the United States and elsewhere. She has gone "underground," in the best traditions of participant/observation and investigative journalism, securing employment at a Japanese transplant in the Midwest in order to examine and analyze working conditions and company human resource practices from the inside. This research is especially useful at a time when best-sellers such as *The Machine that Changed the World* (by James Womack et al.) glorify Japanese production models and urge American companies to go "lean"—based on research facilitated by the automobile companies themselves, and often demonstrating little