such could only serve to constrain market growth. Efforts to popularize the use of credit cards led to a second strategy, which issued salary cards to workers through their employers. Guseva argues this was a stick strategy, since banks maintained a great deal of control in card distribution through “relational benefits: since employers have ongoing control over workers, they facilitated both access and screening” (p. 118). This strategy came closer to addressing complementarity, while still diminishing the degree of uncertainty card issuers bore. However, Guseva also contends that the association of these cards to employee salaries meant that cardholders were unlikely to use the cards for purchases, but simply for accessing cash for purchases. The third, and most current, strategy sought to dangle a carrot before prospective cardholders by offering credit cards through retailers who “have the power of escalating consumers’ desires to make them want more than they can afford at the moment” (p. 119). Guseva says this strategy accrues what she calls the “locational benefit of bi-level networks: in order to reach mass consumers, a company needs to identify a way they can be targeted as a group” (p. 39). It serves the need for complementarity, yet at the same time exposes banks to greater uncertainty than they were in the previous strategies. Since screening has yet to be supported institutionally through credit bureaus, banks are left far more exposed to default and delayed payments (p. 122).

All three strategies, according to Guseva, are responses to the conditions of social change in Russia. These conditions compelled banks to develop unique methods for developing the credit card market. Lacking the institutions and consumer culture, both of which were critical to the U.S. market’s development, the bi-level networks used in employer and retailer card distribution offered strategic ways to expand Russia’s credit card market. By tracing these developments, she demonstrates that the different structural features of post-Soviet Russia shaped new markets, like the credit card market, and that new markets are important in shaping societal changes. In this specific case, the credit card market brings Russians from the communist past into the capitalist consumerist future, out of the red and into the red (p. 157).

In studying the development of the credit card market in a newly emerging market economy like Russia, Into the Red contributes to broader discussions surrounding international development and economic restructuring. It demonstrates why reformers’ emphasis on formal institution building in transitional societies captures only one aspect of a multi-dimensional process affected by history and by unknown consequences of action. Through her research in Russia, Guseva convincingly demonstrates that markets not only shape, but are shaped by, consumers’ collective behavior.


Reviewer: Geny Piotti, Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies, piotti@mpifg.de

In this book, Barbera and Negri have two ambitious aims – to paint a single, coherent picture of the heterogeneous discipline (and moving target) that is economic sociology and to provide insights for strategies of empirical research in economic sociology. To this ends, the book’s main merit is its identification of ways of arguing across the different subdisciplines of economic sociology – potentially minimizing the growing complexity and removing the seemingly insurmountable barriers to dialogue between these subdisciplines. It also accounts for some new trends within economic sociology. In order to bring more structure to the discipline, the authors offer a typology to classify different studies in economic sociology more precisely and to identify the convergences between them. The dimensions of the typology follow economic sociology’s three main approaches – new economic sociology, comparative political economy and new sociological institutionalism – and three rhetorical styles that cut across these approaches – the rhetoric of extension, the rhetoric of context and the rhetoric of the alternative.

The rhetoric of extension stretches the logic of the homo oeconomicus to non-economic topics (like family studies) or to topics that are economic in nature but not generally addressed by traditional economics, such as communities instead of markets. The rational choice-based model of behaviour and the network’s configuration explain the generation of more complex social formations like norms and institutions, whereas, at least initially, agency is supposed to be independent from those norms and institutions. The rhetoric of context “identifies those characteristics of social and political organization that enable the functioning of economic and market action” ( pg. 32). Here, agency depends on political and institutional context. Finally, the rhetoric of the alternative differs from that of
context in that it conceives markets and economic exchange as intrinsically and constitutively social and political and not as simply externally influenced by politics and institutions. More important, it is offered as the alternative to economics under the philosophy that a market theory cannot be limited to one of optimal allocation of resources and equilibrium prices; a theory of real market functioning has to account for the political, cultural, structural and cognitive embeddedness of economic exchange (Zukin and DiMaggio 1990).

By emphasizing the importance of the analysis of networks and institutions, the book pleads for a dialogue between approaches and for strategies of empirical research that transcend the borders, combine rhetorical approaches, and provide less partisan – and hence more accurate – explanations of economic phenomena. To this aim, the authors conclude the book with a typology of markets framed by one institutional dimension (degree of institutional intensity) and one structural dimension (degree of network density); they also include suggestions for which approaches/rhetorics – alone or in combination – tend to be more suitable in the study of a particular market. For example, they argue that markets characterized by low-density networks and low institutional intensity are best studied through the rhetoric of extension, while markets with high-density networks and high institutional intensity should be the domain of the rhetoric of the alternative. The authors contend that mixed cases should use a combination of approaches and rhetorics.

Chapter 1 deals with the problem of markets in economic sociology and presents the three kinds of rhetoric described above. Chapter 2 illustrates two institutional approaches, neo-institutionalism and comparative political economy, while Chapter 3 is devoted to structural approaches. Chapters 4 and 5 deal with the interaction between networks and institutions in the real economy and provide examples of studies that demonstrate the relevance of those interactions. The authors devote Chapter 6 to the role of models in economic sociology, suggesting that models should not be rejected a priori but should be selectively applied, because using the tools of economics would be an effective way to point out the weaknesses of economic reasoning. In the epilogue, the authors offer a final typology that spans all approaches and rhetorics in economic sociology and the typology of markets.

While this might be a relevant book that every concerned economic sociologist should read, and it might even respond to a real necessity for order in a fragmented discipline, the book also has three significant weaknesses. First, the authors should have more systematically framed their position in the larger context of the directions and challenges of economic sociology, in order to give the reader a better sense of the importance of their claim. Second, the reader is left with the impression of having read texts that would fit into a handbook of economic sociology but that have not been adequately related to each other according to the general question the book seeks to answer.

Third, while it is valuable to identify common lines of argument across the discipline, to emphasize the benefit in combining different approaches and to underline the theoretical and empirical relationships between networks and institutions, crossing rhetorics with traditional approaches results in redundancies and unnecessary complexity reflected in the authors’ guidelines for researchers. First, authors create further sub-approaches that have to be recombined anyway in the study of most of the market pure types and hybrids. Second, it is basically left to the reader to grasp how to deal concretely with all the distinctions and combinations proposed for the empirical analysis of markets. This creates more confusion than clarity.
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