sensitizing framework for social research? This issue is addressed by Giddens himself in his concluding paper, in which he briefly sums up major criticisms and his responses. Giddens characterizes the epistemological aim of structuration theory as "an attempt to work out an overall ontology of social life, offering concepts that will grasp both the rich texture of human action and the diverse properties of social institutions" (p. 310).

The texture of "Anthony Giddens. Consensus and Controversy" is diverse and rich. The volume demonstrates that Giddens's concepts can be sensitizing devices for research purposes and that at the same time structuration theory would profit from more concrete and empirical specifications of its central concepts and assumptions. The volume under review is a valuable contribution to the critical discussion of Giddens's work. An outline of Giddens's intellectual biography and a bibliography which includes not only texts by and on Giddens but also titles which are relevant for seeing Giddens's topics from different points of view also contribute to the usefulness of the book for everyone who has a serious interest in Giddens's work.
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This book is the third in a series on leading contemporary sociologists. All the books appear under the same editorship and have the same debative format: a body of contributors, including supporters and opponents of the scholar, are given the opportunity to comment on a set of the scholar's essays. Such a treatment is more fruitful than standard books on sociological theories by allowing for illumination of the strong and weak points of the work under examination. It offers the subject scholar an "intellectual mirror" for reflecting his contribution to the discipline as seen by others.

The volume reviewed here is divided into three parts. Part I is an introductory presentation of Goldthorpe's sociology and includes chapters briefly summarizing his biography and style (Jon Clark), and his critique of liberal theories of industrialism and the strength of his arguments against economic determinism (Duncan Gallie). Part II is a collection of 19 essays which examines the central themes of Goldthorpeian sociology, especially multiform class analysis, models of political economy of industrial nations, social mobility and sociological theorizing. A variety of dimensions of class analysis are put under debate due to the centrality of class categories in Goldthorpe's writings. Gordon Marshall elaborates at length on Goldthorpeian class schema and suggests that this model offers "impressive foundations" for ongoing research on class dynamics, but he is unhappy with its underestimating the role of gender (p. 62). Göran Ahrne illustrates the weak points of this schema; he says that the categories of the model are "defined according to very different criteria and thus the systematic logic of the model is lost (p. 72). In the following interchange the arguments presented by Ahrne sound more convincing to this reviewer than do Marshall's defense of Goldthorpe's schema.

The next argument focuses on class and historical development. Giorgio Gagliani presents an analysis supporting Goldthorpe's critique of Marxist theory of proletarianization. Rosemary Crompton defends the proletarianization thesis and is less than satis-
fied with the way Goldthorpe criticizes Marx' theory of historical development. "As a conceptual framework Marxism has proved remarkably fruitful...,” she says (p. 106). In chapters on Goldthorpe’s contribution to class and gender, Susan McRae and Shirley Dex examine the wide range of issues about the place of women in class analysis. McRae reiterates Goldthorpe’s “exclusionist” position and presents serious arguments for a thesis that the investigation of sexual and class inequalities should be kept separate. Dex argues against the family centered research orientation and is in favor of individuals as a unit of class analysis. One may conclude from the arguments that both approaches are worth pursuing for the illumination of different aspects of class and sex inequalities.

Class and political partisanship is discussed in investigating Goldthorpe’s contribution to political sociology. Anthony Heath concentrates on the political attitudes and behavior of the affluent worker and strongly documents its relevance for understanding political changes in Britain over the last decades. Dennis Kavanagh attacks Goldthorpe’s assertion that Labour’s electoral strategy should be promotion of working class interests instead of reliance on the thesis of class dealignment. According to Kavanagh, Goldthorpe’s and Heath’s recommendations “derive more from ideology than sociology” (p. 182). Kavanagh’s critique needs further empirical background to be convincing, but Goldthorpe and his supporters seem evidently to neglect some socio-political trends of importance for understanding electoral behavior.

In an examination and discussion of research relevant to polities and economies of industrial nations, William Roche and William Brown debate Goldthorpe’s contribution to the field of industrial relations and the sociology of inflation. Both note the substantial contribution of Goldthorpe in explaining inflationary pressures, industrial conflict, institutional reform etc. The problem left unresolved is the role of political institutions in constraining distributional conflicts and interest group pressures.

Niamh Hardiman pays tribute to Goldthorpe’s work in providing “an authoritative interpretation of post-war political economy in the developed Western countries” and offering a “framework for understanding the diversity of emergent trends” (p. 243). Josef Esser, while declaring a Marxist perspective, endorses in fact Goldthorpe’s main interpretations of post-war development in capitalist economies. Both contributors point out similar symptoms of the crisis of Keynesian corporatism. In a stimulating essay which ends this part of the debate, Raymond Plant criticizes Goldthorpe for leaving aside the questions of political morality thereby implicitly supporting the neoliberal political philosophy. Criticizing on moral grounds the neoliberal program, Plant doesn’t offer any original alternative except to call upon the democratic left to provide “an acceptable theory of distribution.” Thus, the central dilemma of distributive justice and the desirable role of government persists for further exploration by social philosophers.

John Westergaard and Geoff Payne discuss Goldthorpe’s research on social mobility in the British context. Westergaard argues that Goldthorpe has “reiterated, demonstrated, and pressed home the central relevance of mapping social mobility for understanding social structure, continuity, and change” (p. 277). Payne, while accepting this evaluation, criticizes Goldthorpe for the narrowness of his focus. Walter Muller recognizes the advantages of class analysis for the comparative study of social mobility. On the other hand, Jonathan Kelly strongly opposes the Goldthorpe paradigm; he presents serious and well documented arguments that it should be abandoned.

The final debative section of the volume examines “Theory and Research in Sociology.” Terry Johnson, after extensive examination of Goldthorpe’s methodological stance, comes to the conclusion that in spite of commitment to a social action approach, Goldthorpe has failed to translate this commitment into an elaborated and