

They accumulate and control resources because of their signalling effect. Since seduction is largely emotional, men amass more resources than needed (the author relates this behaviour to a wasteful consumerist lifestyle). Seabright underpins his argument with a large number of examples from different species, for example male dance flies making their gathered food look more abundant or male scorpions drugging their partners. Men also need to signal commitment and intention to support their female partners in raising children. Whereas men compete for sex, women compete for the most reliable provider of that care. Despite conflict at the core, human beings are also the most co-operative species on earth since human childhood is extraordinary long as compared with other offspring. Caring for children is very elaborate and requires a large degree of co-operation between the parents and beyond. Throughout history, women have often been constrained in making autonomous choices that would conform to their reproductive interests. In prehistoric hunter-gatherer societies, women enjoyed a larger degree of autonomy because they played an important role in foraging. Men's and women's brains evolved so similarly precisely because both sexes faced similar cognitive challenges throughout this period. Later, in agricultural societies, men exercised more control over women.

The War of the Sexes is a very inspiring book and an impressive scientific contribution. It analyses the inequality between the sexes in a compelling way, lightly crossing the borders between biology, history and the social sciences. The author gathered a remarkable amount of empirical data covering various disciplines and periods in history. He presents this wealth of information in a clear and coherent way, thus bringing forward a highly readable book full of fascinating and witty anecdotes.

Since Seabright adopts such a broad perspective, however, the connection be-

tween the first part (biological inheritance and historical foundation) and the second part of the book (present inequalities) is not always comprehensible. One reason may be that the author proceeds directly from pre-history to contemporary times, omitting the period of agricultural societies.

This book adds an interdisciplinary perspective to the social scientific literature on gender inequality. The author argues that these inequalities have a biological basis without suggesting that the differences between the sexes are large or that divergent economic outcomes are inevitable. Moreover, focusing on the work sphere, this contribution complements many recent studies which have concentrated on the unequal distribution of paid and unpaid work within families. Seabright's work-related policy suggestions are closely tied to the arguments presented and are reasonable and practical.

Caroline Berghammer
University of Vienna and
Austrian Academy of Sciences
caroline.berghammer@univie.ac.at

Patrick Emmenegger, Silja Häussermann, Bruno Palier and Martin Seeleib-Kaiser (eds.): *The Age of Dualization. The Changing Face of Inequality in Deindustrializing Societies*
Oxford 2012: Oxford University Press, 368 pp.

Do all industrialised democracies experience problems of social, political and labour-market exclusion? Are these problems here to stay, and will they change for good the politics of contemporary welfare states? Do we know and understand the dividing lines between insiders and outsiders when it comes to employment prospects and policy preferences? *The Age of Dualization. The Changing Face of Inequality in Deindustrializing Societies* tackles these big questions. It

brings together a very interesting and coherent set of contributions on the issues of labour-market segmentation, insider-outsider politics and poverty. The contributions follow a 'multidimensional approach' (p. 312) to the issue of dualisation and deal with the sizeable variation in a sample of OECD countries ranging from France to Korea. The authors employ a good variety of empirical methods ranging from comparative case studies to in-depth panel-data analysis of selected cases.

The first part takes stock of empirical trends and conceptual innovations. Starting with the letter, the editors suggest identifying key 'structural drivers' which determine political choices for labour market and social policies (broadly defined), which in turn lead to political divides, cleavages and exclusion (p. 11). Chapter 2, by Silja Häussermann and Hanna Schwander, is an impressive attempt to map the structure and amount of outsiders in the fields of poverty, social protection and political behaviour. Perhaps the major finding is that the same social groups do not end up as outsiders in different welfare regimes. Comparing British and German panel data, Mark Tomlinson and Robert Walker show how welfare states affect the spell and depth of poverty for different occupational groups.

The second part discusses the huge variety of political responses to forms of non-typical employment and social exclusion. Werner Eichhorst and Paul Marx show how non-typical forms of employment such as fixed-term contracts or agency works have been on the rise to differing degrees in five Continental European countries. Daniela Kroos and Karin Gottschall compare the differing fates of male and female service employees in Germany and France, demonstrating that atypical, 'precarious' jobs are more frequent in Germany. Patrick Emmenegger and Romana Careja discuss the role of migrants in dualisation processes and show that these are

the most heavily affected segment in the population. Martin Seeleib-Kaiser, Adam Saunders and Marek Naczyk compare the private-public mix of social protection in France, Germany, the United States, and the United Kingdom. They find different types and degrees of exclusion from social insurance. Herbert Obinger, Peter Starke, and Alexandra Kaasch do the same for five small open economies, with a focus on labour market reforms and industrial relations. Bruno Palier and Kathleen Thelen analyse the institutional complementarities between French and German industrial relations, labour-market and social policies in the processes of dualisation. Finally, Ito Peng compares the fates of Japanese and Korean outsiders and points to similarities and differences to Continental European welfare states.

The third part looks at the politics of dualisation. Daniel Clegg points out that the different adjustment strategies of the French and Belgian systems of unemployment benefits reflect the way welfare-state institutions affect the incentives of trade unions in both countries. Johannes Lindvall and David Rueda show the political behaviour of Swedish outsiders in the form of vote abstention and of voting for more radical left parties in those Swedish general elections in which the Social Democrats decided to appeal more to the needs of key insiders than to those of outsiders. The editors conclude the volume by summarising the main findings before proceeding to some speculation about the stability of the processes of dualisation.

Given such an empirically rich and well-balanced set of contributions, the qualities of this edited volume are self-evident: the book is very careful in defining and measuring the number and types of outsiders; it deserves high praise for combining somewhat disparate literatures from sociology, economics and political science; and finally it shows the complexity in both the different national responses and the

different cause-effect relationships between socio-economic fundamentals and the politics of dualisation. Therefore, I proceed straight to some aspects of the book where I see room for further research. I start with some minor issues, before going on to some substantive problems. The minor issues are quickly told. Sometimes the structure of the contributions does not clearly follow the conceptual framework of the introduction. For example, Clegg's contribution could have been part of the institutional-varieties section, which constitutes by far the main part of book. This brings me to a related problem: some countries, those of Continental Europe in particular, feature very prominently, whereas others such as southern Europe are rarely mentioned. This is interesting in as much as the latter would be important suspects of dualisation. If my naïve understanding of these processes serves me well, the authors have restricted the domain of the major 'dependent variable', dualisation.

Let's proceed to some more substantive concerns: One is the definition of insiders and outsiders. As stated above, the book goes beyond a simple understanding of outsiders as unemployed, but it still sticks to a 'dichotomy plus': unemployed, plus involuntary part-time employed, plus temporary agency workers, etc. But if the fundamental concerns of outsidership are risk and remuneration, a dichotomy is not necessarily plausible. For instance, a highly risk-averse insider might be more closely related to an outsider than a risk-loving outsider who cares little about social protection. More importantly, what about spillovers from one segment to another? For instance, the German Hartz IV reform carefully tried to protect insiders from adjustment pressures, and nonetheless insiders protested and felt attacked. And probably for a good reason: it could affect them in the long run, as they now fear becoming unemployed even more. These are very important issues if we want to understand

the socio-economic impact and the political consequences of dualisation.

My second concern deals with the problem how to identify a policy that leads to dualisation. Let's make a thought experiment. If you cut coverage rates of unemployment benefits from 100% to 80% you might call this dualisation, especially if it only affects specific types of workers. But what do you call a cut from 20% to zero? There are clear non-linearities in processes of dualisation and liberalisation that need to be addressed *ex ante*. Otherwise there is always the risk that you call whatever you see a dualisation process, even if it turns out to be (neo-)liberalisation in the long run. More importantly, many of the policies have an ambivalent status if you don't deal with them from a decidedly theoretical perspective. Are wage subsidies or temp agencies dualisation strategies or do they aim at activating outsiders and thereby affecting insiders? Without the latter perspective we would not understand why trade unions and other political agencies so often complain about these policies.

A similar argument holds for different levels of protection for different types of occupation. This may be a sign of detrimental dualisation. However, it may also reflect the flexible variety of a welfare state. If for instance, the introduction of a high social wage would effectively drive specific jobs out of the market, it becomes a normative statement whether you want to cover all segments of a society, but risk driving some types of (low-wage) occupations out of the market or not. Moreover, it is not so clear if a two-tiered system is normatively bad from a political-economy point of view. If a first-best solution is not at hand (i.e. all are employed, and all are covered by social insurance), a two-tiered system might be better than doing nothing.

Finally, and perhaps most important, the authors clearly avoided a more explicit theoretical approach, arguably for good reasons. The authors talk about complex is-

sues, spanning economics, sociology and political science, as well as a broad array of issues ranging from labour-market outcomes to political behaviour. But this strategy comes with a loss of clarity: who are in- and outsiders; what policies are good or bad for outsiders; what is endogenous and what exogenous to the process? For instance, what type of political cleavage is 'insiders vs outsiders'? Political economists have long debated the question what sets rich and poor voters apart. These are complex issues, but in some ways much simpler than the issue of dualisation. For instance, you might assume that what sets rich and poor voters apart is their (latent) productivity, which is assumed to be independent from the level of redistribution. You would then deduce that more (less) productive voters are against (in favour of) redistribution. With insiders vs outsiders the issue is much more complicated. The cleavage is endogenous, it lies in the institutions themselves. For instance, in many cases you need to have some level of employment protection to create the cleavage, which is then important for maintaining the level of employment protection. This characterisation produces huge problems for theories and empirical interpretations. Do we think that an institution somehow 'falls from heaven' or drives a wedge between voters and then stabilises the institution? The book gives answers to these questions, but it rarely reflects on them in a theoretical way. Similarly, different dimensions of the phenomenon do not need to go hand in hand. Let's use minimum wages as an example. If there are none, political economists would say, no rents are created, no political outsiders exist, but there may still be social outsiders (e.g. the working poor). With sectoral minimum wages we see that protection may create rents, and hence a strong incentive for pork-barrel politics for trade unions and employers. With national minimum wages, again we might find no sectoral/occupational divides, but maybe a

national minimum wage creates unemployment or social exclusion. A stronger theoretical focus might have helped to unravel these different scenarios.

Despite these criticisms the edited volume is a very valuable addition to the literature. It sharpens our understanding about outsiders in terms of poverty, labour-market exclusion and political alienation; it maps the different national paths to dualisation; and it reveals some of the structural and political determinants of dualisation in the long run.

Achim Kemmerling
Central European University
Kemmerlinga@ceu.hu

Kai Leichsenring, Jenny Billings and Henk Nies (eds.): *Long-Term Care in Europe. Improving Policy and Practice*
Basingstoke 2013: Palgrave MacMillan, 416 pp.

A growing number of books in recent years are addressing different issues and perspectives on Long-Term Care (LTC) in Europe, examples being the articulation between formal and informal care in different Welfare regimes, interaction with other social policy sectors, such as employment and gender equality, the governance of home care, or the more general matter of the ongoing reforms in LTC in different European countries. What has prompted such a large amount of research is the important challenge that is facing decision makers, academics and citizens: the ageing of society. This phenomenon and its consequences on health care, social care, insurance systems (including pension systems), employment markets, and housing are often portrayed as the 'ageing tsunami' or as a threat to the sustainability of developed welfare systems [Colombo et al. 2011].

Analysis of measures in the field of LTC introduced by policymakers does not