The Corporate-Consultant Connection and the Problem of Interactive Expertise
Lisa Bonchek* • Rutgers University

External (foreign competition, governmental regulation) and internal (downsizing, changing demographics and technologies) changes have forced corporations to deal with new uncertainties. One organizational response to these uncertainties is the hiring of consultants. Consultants, as experts, are hired to provide new information, interpret existing information, or legitimate organizational activities in ways that are unavailable to non-experts. Management consultants in modern corporations have become more important as pressures for profits and efficiency have increased. That importance, however, is neither what the consultants nor commonsense would lead us to believe; though it stands for rational decision-making, consultants' knowledge is often more symbolic than practical.

Our usual understanding of expertise, consultants' representations of reality, and commonsense notions of how business works assume unidirectional information exchange: consultants sell information to corporations who either lack this information or the expertise to analyze it. Yet preliminary data show that such a description is simplistic; information transfer between consultant and client is much more interactive, sometimes guided more by the client than the consultant.

The case of consultants shows that expertise operates differently under different conditions, a problem insufficiently theorized in scholarship on organizations and work. Here, I'll mention one of the axes along which this variability occurs: the degree to which consultants and their clients share knowledge. The amount of shared information is an indicator, and predictor, of when consulting relationships are for practical purposes and when they are for symbolic purposes.

According to the traditional notion of ex-

---

A Message from the Section Chair
Paul DiMaggio • Princeton University

Most of this column will be devoted to describing a resource that will become available to researchers later this year. But first let me remind you that the Organizations, Occupations, and Work section is sponsoring a series of sessions at the upcoming ASA meetings in New York City that are likely to intrigue, stimulate, and inspire all of us. Note that the rotation places our sessions on the last day (Aug. 20) this year, so you may have to do some advance planning to catch them.

I will not describe the program in detail, as I did in the last newsletter, because the program appears herein, in the preliminary program many of you have received from ASA, and on our section home page. I will, however, share some new intelligence about a session listed in the

The Dark Side of Organizations, Current Events and Public Sociology
Diane Vaughan* • Boston College

In Power and the Structure of Society, James Coleman described the historic societal transformation to a world dominated by organizations. This change altered social relations: individuals still interacted with individuals, but individuals interacted with organizations; moreover, organizations interacted with other organizations. Coleman observed that this structural transformation and the increased concentration of power in organizations produced both perceived and real loss of power for individuals. However, this redistribution of power also created new possibilities for deviance, misconduct, mistake, disaster. These harmful social outcomes and the extensive social costs—the dark side of organizations—are not a central focus of sociologists who define their specialization as Organizations, Occupations, and Work, nor are they a major concern of Economic Sociology, although economics and market struggles are frequently implicated.

There are, of course, many exceptions in OO&W (e.g., Dalton's Men Who Manage; Braverman's Labor and Monopoly Capital; Burawoy's Manufacturing

In the State of Transition: Interpreting Urban Change in Post-Socialist Budapest
Judit Bodnár* • Johns Hopkins University

Time has accelerated in post-state-socialist Budapest; city dwellers are losing their old points of reference, secure signposts in the cityscape are disappearing at a speed never experienced before. Citizens and recurring tourists alike notice changes in the built environment and the general mood of the city in the last couple of years. The latter also feel more at home: certain elements of the city are becoming similar to other European, north American, and even "non-western" cities. These changes are usually explained by the collapse of state socialism.

In contrast to analyses of new democratic politics, the 'market transition' or elite change, the transformation of the city has received little attention. The
pertise, a lack of information or experience spurs actors to hire experts: they need experts because the experts are the keepers or carriers of valuable knowledge. These are instances of information-deficit, where corporations need step-by-step instructions and guidelines on how to accomplish these tasks. Sometimes corporations head into organizationally uncharted waters, facing unfamiliar problems without ready solutions. For example, a hospital might be interested in setting up a satellite outpatient facility. Or an American bank might be looking to expand operations overseas. In these situations, companies may have no relevant experience to draw on, either from within or outside the organization. These problems of uncertainty are often exacerbated by intense production pressures; corporations have to increase profit rates or show other evidence of improvement. Under conditions where the corporation lacks experience, or is unable to gauge the validity and reliability of available information (i.e. can’t easily tell the difference between noise and data), consultants provide practical knowledge to organizations and those who run them. Interviews suggest that these transactions of expert knowledge are most often of technical information that is measurable, identifiable, and practical. In these cases, the knowledge is indeed esoteric; it is the consultants, not the corporations, who have it. The information transfer is unidirectional, with the consultant giving information to the organization. This type of exchange corresponds to the traditional notion of expertise. Because of the kind of information that’s traded and because of the form of the transaction, it is fairly easy for corporations to assess the value of the expert’s advice. These are the conditions under which the relationship is based on a need for information.

Yet corporations sometimes have equal amounts of, or even more, information and experience than consultants. In these situations, a traditional model of expertise would predict that corporations would not hire consultants: there is no information deficit so why hire a consultant? Why would corporations hire experts when their knowledge-providing services are not warranted? Under these circumstances, one might say that corporate expenditures on consultants are irrational. The answer, I have come to learn, is that the same information carries different social weight depending on who says it. That is, to be valuable, the information must come from those certified as experts, rather than from within the corporation itself (and therefore from non-experts). Under conditions where the knowledge is shared (i.e., corporations and consultants have equal amounts) or where corporations are actually more knowledgeable than consultants, the symbolic value of expert-ness increases relative to the practical value of the consultant’s knowledge. Because consultants are, in many cases, seen as the only legitimate providers of this type of service, the opinions, information, or strategies must come from them—and only from them—to be valuable.

In situations characterized by legitimacy-deficit (as opposed to information-deficit) the consultant-corporation exchange is considerably more interactive, with corporations providing input throughout the relationship. Under these conditions, the expertise is provided as much, if not more, by the client than the consultant. These transactions, it seems, center on products that are harder to measure, i.e., “soft skills” such as leadership or management improvement. This kind of expertise, interactive expertise, calls the very notion of expert knowledge into question, since expert knowledge is traditionally supposed to be esoteric and the form of the relationship assumed to be unidirectional.

The information exchanges between consultants and clients provide rich avenues of research for scholars of work and organizations. The conditions under which corporations hire experts to provide expert information and those under which they purchase expert legitimation are only some of the complicating factors in the notion of expertise. The roles of negotiation, expectation, and trust in modern corporate relations, stressed so heavily in recent advances in economic sociology, are the very life-blood of the corporate-consultant connection. My research on consultants and those who hire them exposes the problem of interactive expertise and its significance for our theories of how corporations work.

*Correspondence to: bonchek@rci.rutgers.edu
Two significant trends within economic sociology have been 1) interest in what Granovetter calls the "social embeddedness" of economic action and 2) the recognition of the institutional and normative character of orientations to action that many economists have posited as universal. The first calls attention to the ways in which exchange is influenced by pre-existing networks of social relations. The second, rather than assuming that individuals act with relentless calculative rationality to maximize utilities best represented by individual objective functions, views the approach to action associated with the figure homo-economicus as an historically relative social construction that involves a drafting meeting.

Work inspired by these insights has proceeded largely without benefit of individual-level quantitative data (the exception being the embeddedness of labor markets). The purpose of the GSS EBA module is to provide a resource for empirical research on these topics. Space permits only a crude enumeration of topics addressed by the survey:

- The social embeddedness of product and service market transactions. Questions cover such topics as the purchase of automobiles and homes, loaning and borrowing money, the purchase of home-maintenance and legal services, and attitudes towards buying or selling to friends or strangers. (Split-sample techniques permit comparison of expected behavior in different roles.)
- Normative constraints on exchange—norms of fairness in markets, ways in which role relations affect the provision of information, and attitudes towards the use of markets for the exchange of such highly personal or quasi-sacred "goods" as body organs, adoptive children, surrogate motherhood, and sexual intimacy (and willingness to let government intervene in these and other market relations).
- Participation in two institutions about which little if any survey data are available—"garage" or "yard" sales and family businesses.
- Attitudes towards inequality and capitalism;
- Division of influence between wives and husbands in domestic economic decision-making;
- A related set of detailed questions (replicating several on Independent Sector's giving and volunteering surveys) on giving and volunteering (with a fourteen-category typology of charitable causes).

Note that the GSS also contains an extensive set of demographic indicators and responses to many other attitude questions on topics as diverse as trust in human nature, views of various kinds of government spending, and support for civil liberties. The data will both establish baselines on matters often reserved for speculation, so that replication could explore, for example, whether markets inexorably drive out other ways of thinking about human social relations, or tap change over time in the prevalence of informal lending arrangements or participation in family businesses. They will also permit users to compare people on the embeddedness of their market relations, and on their orientations towards impersonal markets, their attitudes towards inequality, domestic division of economic labor, and many other factors.

Data are currently being prepared for release later this year. GSS data are distributed by the ICPSR in Ann Arbor. (Contact the ICPSR liaison at your nearest research university for information, or contact GSS directly at the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, 1155 E. 60th St., Chicago 60637.)

As my term as section chair comes to a close, I’d like to say what a pleasure it has been to work with so many of you on our common goals. In particular, I’d like to call attention to Chip Clarke’s superb performance as newsletter editor, Julian Dierkes’ stellar work in creating and keeping updated a section home page, and Rick Phillips’ outstanding efforts to keep the newsletter looking good. Chip and Rick will be a very hard act to follow; Julian, fortunately, has agreed to succeed himself.

So many people have worked so hard in so many ways that any list of acknowledgments is of necessity incomplete. Among the many who deserve thanks, I’d like to call special attention to the service of Diane Vaughan and Neil Fligstein, for their stewardship of the Thompson and Weber prize selection processes; Carol Heimer, who chaired the nominations process; and Rikki Abzug, chair of the membership committee. I have felt especially lucky to be sandwiched between two dedicated and resourceful former chairs—Judith Blau, who has been a continuing source of information and wisdom, and Dan Cornfield, whose counsel has also been of great value, and who is already moving quickly to accelerate the Section’s progress upon his assumption of the chair in August. Finally, my thanks to two Secretary-Treasurers—Pat Roos, whose emeritus standing has not kept her from being helpful in many ways large and small, and Jerry Jacobs, the Section’s current Secretary/Treasurer, who has likewise been a most valued colleague. I could go on at much greater length, but the rest will have to await our business meeting in August, at which I hope to see you all.

From the Editor

This is my last newsletter issue. Thanks to all who cooperated in the newsletter’s production. Special thanks to Rick Phillips (rphill@eden.rutgers.edu) whose attention to detail and conceptual creativity made the newsletter beautiful and hence more interesting.

About OOW

OOW is the newsletter of the Organizations, Occupations, and Work section of the American Sociological Association (home page: http://www.princeton.edu/~orgsocwks). Editor: Lee Clarke, Department of Sociology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903. Office: 908/445-5741. Fax: 908/445-0974. Email: lclarke@rci.rutgers.edu. Inquiries concerning submissions should go to Dan Cornfield at comfjdp@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu.
Book Sampler: A Non-Random, Non-Systematic Collection

Kevin D. Henson, Just A Temp, Temple University Press.

Ethnography of what it's like to be a temp: demeaning, mundane, but they survive and struggle through in small ways that preserve some measure of dignity.


Richly detailed description of the United States government's attempts to punish naval officers for sexual misconduct at Tailhook. Treats the institutionalized mind-set that led to the assaults and to the huge failure to cooperate with government investigators.

Paul Rabinow, Making PCR: A Story of Biotechnology, Univ of Chicago Press.

Tells the story of polymerase chain reaction. Uses interviews to say what it means to be a scientist and situates it all in the occupational hierarchies.


Richly detailed account of mass media images, revealing how the public enemy provides a far-reaching critique of modern culture.


Based on extensive interviews and observations, this is an insightful look at the a sea change in corporate governance - the growing role of institutional investors.

Peter Evans, Embedded Autonomy: States and Industrial Transformation, Princeton University Press.

This book analyses the role of the state in economic development and explains why that role and its results vary so much from place to place in the context of a comparative analyses of states, entrepreneurs, and transnational corporation in the emergence of computer industries in India, Brazil, and Korea.

Daniel Chambliss, Beyond Caring: Hospitals, Nurses, and the Social Organization of Ethics, Univ of Chicago Press.

Ethnography of hospitals and nurses and their moral crises.


Case study of an holistic health center that draws out the lessons for understudying problems women face in organizations, the failure of social movements to live up to their ideals, and how progressives can avoid perpetuating inequalities.


On commercial radio and t.v.; shows the government creates the market rather than intervenes in it. But why no Lucy Show?


Twenty-nine chapters, three parts: I: Frameworks of analysis, II: Current Issues in Organization Studies, III: Reflections on Research, Theory, & Practice.


Case study of plant closing and a national labor force survey to show such readjustments are bad for people and economic productivity.

Anne Figert, Women and the Ownership of PMS: Structuring a Psychiatric Disorder, Aldine.

Explains why the decision to put PMS in DSM3-R was controversial in three domains: health and mental health domain, woman domain, science domain.


Main concern is with medical professionals as claims-makers in constructing the social problems of childhood. Examines: "dissatisfied pediatrician syndrome," crisis in oversupply of doctors, jurisdictional expansion.


Show how seemingly irrational business decision, inspired in part by the self-interest of the owners but also by their nostalgia for the game, transformed baseball into a national pastime.

Todd W. Crosset, Outsiders in the Clubhouse: The World of Women's Professional Golf, SUNY Press.

What is it like to be a professional female player in this the most wonderful of frustrating pursuits? Tells an ethnographic story, tells an organizational story, tells an occupational story.


Based on the national Organizations Study, defines what we know about the structures and human resource practices in U.S. organizations. Describes the study and examines employment practices—hiring, training, promotion, performance measurement, benefit packages, contingent work—and how they compare between different business.


Lists every major world organization, detailing its leading sta budget and resources, and current involvement in world issues.
theoretical relevance of the topic for urban and organizational studies is, nevertheless, striking. At the conception of the field of urban sociology, the "metropolis" assumed a special significance as both an object of inquiry and a paradigm of modern society. Amidst the current "crisis of urban sociology," searching for a proper subject-matter for the field, Castells identified the theoretical relevance of the "urban" as the site of collective consumption orchestrated by the state.

Castells' interpretation of the urban makes the state socialist experience particularly relevant. If state socialism made a difference in the urban context, that difference originated mainly in the sphere of collective consumption. The highly restricted private ownership of urban land and the role of the state in the planning, financing, construction and distribution of housing translated into differences between "capitalist" and "socialist" cities.

An analysis of the post-state-socialist city should, thus, focus on the relationship between property change and the use of urban space. The housing landlordism of the state has been on the decline since about one generation before the collapse of state socialism. This has recently culminated in the widespread privatization of formerly state-owned housing. Furthermore, privatization in the broader sense—the privatization of formerly public goods and public space—is the leitmotiv of post-socialist urban change. Taking upon the Great Transformation—that from feudalism to capitalism—the urban context is transformed by creating enclosures of former common space: "pieces of common land are," indeed, "converted into private property."

Privatization, the fiscal crisis of the over-indebted post-socialist state, and the restructuring of the economy—which is dictated by the world economy in a more direct manner than earlier—create a situation which opens up the possibility of converting redistributive privileges into market advantages, and, eventually, accelerates the accumulation of advantages and disadvantages. The twin processes of the social and spatial polarization of urban dwellers and the homogenization within their class- and geographically contiguous groups shape the cityscape in ways which imply a stricter socio-spatial order than the immediately preceding, late-state-socialist period. In a similar vein, there is a growing tension between the increasing ethnic diversity of the city and a vigorous tendency towards social and, to a lesser extent, ethnic unmixing.

Any interpretation of the east central European urban transformation is a thoroughly comparative project. Those interested will have to consider, beyond direct issues concerning the collapse of state socialism's urban reign, also questions that have lingered for a long time but whose significance was overshadowed by the ideologically loaded and conceptually all-too-easy capitalist-socialist dichotomy:

1. How much of the distinct character of the 'socialist urban' was due to the specificities of state socialism, and to what extent was it an idiosyncratic consequence of pre-state-socialist east central European patterns of (under)development?
2. How does the east central European urban experience compare with other areas of the semi-periphery? The role of the state as the differentia specifica in semi peripheral urbanization links the two in a meaningful way.
3. How far does the parallel run between the well-documented north American and west European processes of urban restructuring and the post-state-socialist urban transformation(s)? Is the east European departure from state socialism merely the local version of the "western" departure from high modernity? Is the collapse of state socialism but another expression of the process of globalization? These questions are more complicated by the fact that recent studies reveal a considerable difference between the U.S. and west European experiences of urban change, especially in terms of advanced marginality, and suggest that it may be due to differences in the role of the state. This can be instructive for deciphering the potentials of post-socialist urban development where the solidity of state socialism has not quite melted into air yet.

4. On a more general note, to what extent do the specific ("western") origins of urban sociology determine its treatment of non-pattern-setting development? The unease with which generic concepts of the discipline apply to different circumstances may explain why, as suggested by a colleague writing about Shanghai and Calcutta, "the paradoxes and contradictions of the landscape, if noticed at all, are treated as the signs of an interim stage, of transitional urbanism" ultimately assumed to be resolved along the lines of well-known "western" patterns.

These are challenges for those interested in deciphering developments in east central Europe and for (urban) sociology as a discipline. Responding to both concerns promises a radical globalization of the field in the best sense of the term.

---


*Correspondence to: jbodyard @jhunix.hc.fsu.edu
of Al Reiss, who identified the organizations has been left to sociologists who extent, however, the dark side of organizations has been left to sociologists who define their specialty as Deviance and Social Control.

If there is a Sociology Department where research and theory on the dark side of organizations have been integral to departmental history and tradition, it is Yale. That tradition is rooted in the work of Al Reiss, who identified the organizational bases of deviance and social control in his 1966 classic, "Where the Action Is," then continued to explore the socially organized aspects of many forms of deviance and social control; in the work of Stan Wheeler, whose wide-scoped White-Collar Crime Project resulted in many publications that tapped the organizational roots of that problem; in the work of Kai Erikson, whose Everything Path exposed a modern disaster, originating in organizational deviance and bringing extensive social harm upon a devastated community. And that tradition is capped by the work of Charles Perrow, whose Normal Accidents was followed by his book (with Mauro Guillen) on AIDS and the political/institutional/organizational failure to respond to it.

Part of this Yale tradition is a policy link. What is interesting is that this theoretically and methodologically rigorous work on the dark side of organizations was met with a demand for policy input that originated outside academia. We must wonder why. Certainly, exposing the dark side of organizations and problems of social control is in keeping with the debunking traditions of sociology: when we consider, for example, the impact of the Challenger tragedy on the space program, it struck a chord with citizens, grief-stricken and angry at the time of the disaster, still looking for answers to why the astronauts died. In call-in talk shows and letters, they revealed their deep mistrust of government and lingering anger about the tragedy. It struck a chord with media personnel, who grieved not only as citizens but because the event was part of their professional history: they covered the story. Ritualistically, before or after every interview media representatives told me moving accounts of where they were and what they were doing when the Challenger tragedy happened and afterward, as they investigated and wrote about the accident. Finally, it struck a chord—and continues to do so—for people working in many kinds of organizations. They read the book because it’s about history, or space, or an event that disturbed and shocked them, then realize that the structures of power and organizational and environmental contingencies that undermined excellence and safety at NASA are unfolding in their own workplace. Calling or writing to lament that "NASA is us," they contact me because they want to develop policy that will prevent mistake, misconduct, disaster, fatalities.

While generalizing from an "n" of one is always risky, this response suggests a keen public interest in sociological research and theory about current events and the organizational roots of social problems that span the many sections of our fragmented discipline. The following anecdote, I believe, holds promise for a public sociology. In the week preceding the ten-year observa-

At the same time that it shows individuals that their personal problems originate in larger historical and organizational forces, it reveals the common patterns across organizations, institutions, markets, and technologies, showing deviance, misconduct, mistake, and disaster not as anomalous events, but as systematic products of complex structural arrangements. The average citizen tends to interpret harmful organizational outcomes as anomalies—the product of individual stupidity, evil actors, conspiracy, or individual wrongdoing. Consequently, a sociological focus that shows the systematic social forces that produce the dark side of organizations and resist attempts at social control is debunking. For both powerless citizens and powerful policy makers, it can strike a frightening but resonant chord.

These factors, I believe, explain the unexpected and near-overwhelming public response to The Challenger Launch Decision: Risky Technology, Culture, and Deviance at NASA. The book is both social history and historical ethnography. It deconstructs the historically accepted explanation of the launch decision, which blames amorally-calculating managers. The conclusion is that the tragedy was neither an anomaly nor the result of evil middle managers, but a mistake rooted in the banality of organizational life and facilitated by an environment of scarcity and competition, historic bargains by political elites, uncertain technology, incrementalism, patterns of information, routines, hierarchies, organization structure, and a complex cultural nexus. The book is ruthlessly sociological. It is filled with phrases like "cultural belief systems," "structures of power," "thick description," "aligning actions," and the new institutionalism in organizational analysis," "work group culture," "tacit knowledge," and our perennial favorite, "the macro-micro connection." Despite explicit discussions of theory and method, it, too, struck a chord.

It struck a chord with citizens, grief-stricken and angry at the time of the disaster, still looking for answers to why the astronauts died. In call-in talk shows and letters, they revealed their deep mistrust of government and lingering anger about the tragedy. It struck a chord with media personnel, who grieved not only as citizens but because the event was part of their professional history: they covered the story. Ritualistically, before or after every interview media representatives told me moving accounts of where they were and what they were doing when the Challenger tragedy happened and afterward, as they investigated and wrote about the accident. Finally, it struck a chord—and continues to do so—for people working in many kinds of organizations. They read the book because it’s about history, or space, or an event that disturbed and shocked them, then realize that the structures of power and organizational and environmental contingencies that undermined excellence and safety at NASA are unfolding in their own workplace. Calling or writing to lament that "NASA is us," they contact me because they want to develop policy that will prevent mistake, misconduct, disaster, fatalities.

While generalizing from an "n" of one is always risky, this response suggests a keen public interest in sociological research and theory about current events and the organizational roots of social problems that span the many sections of our fragmented discipline. The following anecdote, I believe, holds promise for a public sociology. In the week preceding the ten-year observa-
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tion of the Challenger tragedy, Malcolm Gladwell's article, "Blow-Up," was published in the January 22 New Yorker. He observed that post-disaster rituals—official investigations and reports—routinely deceive the public into thinking that the problem is resolved: changes have been implemented; all is well and safe. Not so, wrote Gladwell. Citing the "new risk theorists" and featuring my book, Perrow's Normal Accidents, and work on "risk homeostasis" by a Canadian psychologist, Gladwell made the point that the causes of disaster are routine and systematic, rooted in the complexity of both organizations and technology. Not only did he "get it," but he raised the larger societal question of what kind of technologies are worth the risk in a prominent venue that boosted the discussion into the international arena.

When the post-publication dust settled, I called Gladwell to thank him. I also wanted to know how he happened to read the book. The answer lay in serendipity and history. He told me that when the publisher sent out the bound pages in November, the book landed on his desk at the New York Bureau of the Washington Post. By the time the New Yorker editor called to ask him to write a Challenger anniversary piece, Gladwell had already read it. "But it is long and complex," I said, "Whatever prompted you?" He reported that several years before, he had "discovered sociology." Whenever he was writing a story on urban problems or race relations, he found that sociologists had interesting and useful things to say. In fact, for the past two years he had gone to the ASA meetings, attending sessions that were related to his current writing project. "Before your book arrived," he concluded, "I had already discovered that you guys do neat stuff."

*Comments prepared for "Policy-Relevant Research," Deviance, Social Control, and Law Panel, Department of Sociology Ten-Year Reunion, Yale University, April 12-13, 1996.

Announcements and Calls

The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Scholars in Health Policy Research Program is recruiting its fourth cohort of Scholars for the 1997 academic year. To be eligible for the two-year postdoctoral program, applicants must have received a doctoral degree in economics, political science, or sociology received after July, 1994. We are especially interested in attracting talented candidates in the field of sociology who would be eligible for the program. The deadline for application is November 1, 1996. For information call Katherine Raskin. Telephone: 617/353-9220; Email: kraskin@bu.edu; or Fax # 617/353-9227.

Election Results

Barbara Reskin is the OOW Chair-Elect and the new by-laws passed. William Bridges and Don Tomaskovic-Devey are the new council members.

OOOW Newsletter Editor

The O, O, & W section needs a newsletter editor. If you're interested in applying, please send a letter of inquiry and a vita to both Paul DiMaggio (dimaggio@pucc.princeton.edu) and Dan Cornfield (cornfidb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu). The nomination deadline is July 15.

OOOW Sessions at the 1996 Meetings of the American Sociological Association

Section day: Tuesday. Business meeting: 3:30

Sessions:

110, 8:30-10:30, Saturday, Regular Session. Social Ties and Social Constructions in Organizations. Organizer: Jan-ice M. Beyer, University of Texas, Austin; Presider: Paul Hirsch, Northwestern University

1. Third-Party Gossip and the Rhetoric of Derision. Ronald S. Burt, University of Chicago

2. Between Personal Ties and Organizational Imperatives: The Formation of Exchange Networks among Hospitals. Ly-yun Chang, Academia Sinica

3. Tales from the Grave: Organizations' Accounts of Their Own Demise. Mark Hager and Joseph Galaskiewicz, University of Minnesota; Wolfgang Bielefeld, University of Texas, Dallas; and Joel Pins, University of Minnesota


Discussion: Charles Fombrun, New York University

continued on page

1. Gender Representation in Corporate Law: Normative and Coercive Effects on the Structure of Corporate Legal Departments. Kevin Leicht, Pennsylvania State University; and Mary L. Fennell, Brown University

2. The Effects of Labor Market Characteristics on the Earnings Differences of Male and Female Clergy in Protestant Denominations. Patricia M.Y. Chang, University of Notre Dame

3. Gender Effects on Self-Perceived Role Performance among Directors: Correlates or Institution. Ilan Talmud and Dafna Izraeli, Bar-Ilan University


Discussion: Joan E. Manley, Louisiana State University


3. In Search of the Class Ceiling: The Career Trajectories of Immigrant and Native-Born Engineers. Roger Waldinger, University of California, Los Angeles; Mehdi Bozorgmehr, The City College, City University of New York; and Nelson Lim and Lucila Finkel, University of California, Los Angeles

4. Brown Collar Jobs: Occupational Segregation and Earnings of Recent-Immigrant Latinos. Lisa Catanzarite, University of California, San Diego

Discussion: Judith R. Friedman, Rutgers University


1. Institutional Sources of Stability and Change in the Israeli Kibbutz, 1990-1995. Raymond Russell, University of California, Riverside; and Shlomo Getz and Menachem Rosner, University of Haifa

2. Isomorphism with a Moving Target: Curricular Change in Colleges and Universities. Harriet P. Morgan, University of Chicago

Discussion: Jitendra Singh, Rutgers College, Oxford


1. The Capitalist Firm in the 21st Century: Emerging Patterns. Walter W. Powell, University of Arizona

2. The Post-Socialist Firm: Asset Ambiguity and Organizational Innovation. David Stark, Cornell University and Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences

3. The Influence of Changes in the State System. Charles Tilly, New School for Social Research

4. The Influence of Law in Cross-National Context. Reinier Kraakman, Harvard University

5. The 21st Century Firm from the East Asian Perspective. D. Eleanor Westney, Massachusetts Institute of Technology


1. Genetic Counselors and Their Non-Directiveness Ideology: Establishing Professional Legitimacy and Negotiating Jurisdictional Boundaries. Elizabeth J. Lock, Northwestern University

2. Managing Moral Challenges to Professional Techniques and Authority: Oc-

3. Drug Policy and Professional Conflict: The War between the Docs and the Cops. Robert Granfield, University of Denver; and Kevin Ryan, Norwich University

4. Changes in Organizational Structures and Growing Dissent in the Workplace. Joyce Rothschild, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; and John Jermier, University of South Florida

Discussion: Steven P. Vallas, Georgia Institute of Technology

277, 4:30-6:30, Sunday, Regular Session. The Role of Culture in Creation, Change, and Adaptation in Organizations. Organizer: Janice M. Beyer, University of Texas, Austin; Presider: Carolyn R. Dexter, The Pennsylvania State University, Harrisburg


2. Effecting Organizational Change: The "Cultural Tool Kit" of Quality Improvement Programs. Joan E. Manley, Louisiana State University

3. Culture and Corporate Action. Joanne D. Darlington and Dennis S. Mileti, University of Colorado, Boulder

4. Myths of Success at a "Distinctive" Community College: An Exceptional Organizational Culture in an Isomorphic Environment. Regina Del, Northwestern University

Discussion: Janice M. Beyer, University of Texas, Austin

305, 8:30-10:30, Monday, Regular Session. Work and Workplace: Workplace and Union Issues Organizer and Presider: Tom Juravich, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

1. Attitudes that Create Disabling Work Environments. Pamela M. Robert, State University of New York, Albany; and Sharon L. Harlan

2. "Here They Don't Order You Around": "Nontraditional" Femininities in the Service of Managerial Control. Leslie Salzinger, University of California, Berkeley

3. Striking Out: A Case Study of a Supermarket Strike. Marietta Morrissey and Barbara Thomas Coventry, University of Toledo


379, 2:30-4:30, Monday, Regular Session. Work and Workplace: Institutional Issues Organizer and Presider: Tom Juravich, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

1. Job Changes Following Childbirth: Are Women Trading Compensation for Family Responsive Work Conditions? Sara Beth Estes and Jennifer L. Glass, University of Iowa


397, 4:30-6:30, Monday, Regular Session. Authority in the Workplace: Patterns of Access to Upward Mobility. Organizer: Nancy DiTomaso, Rutgers University; Presider: Natalie J. Sokoloff, John Jay College of Criminal Justice and Graduate School, City University of New York

1. Ladders, Ceilings, and Trap Doors: The Promotion of Women and Men. Heather K. Smith, University of Delaware; and Ronnie Steinberg, Temple University

2. Who Pushes the "Revolving Doors"?: An Event History Analysis of Women's Transition between Male-Dominated and Nonmale-Dominated Occupations. Tracy F.H. Chang, University of Iowa

3. The Gender Gap in Authority: Changes over Time in the United States and Australia. Janeen Baxter, The Australian National University; and Eric Olin Wright, University of Wisconsin, Madison

4. Change in the Occupational Aspirations of Youth. Xiaoling Shu, University of Minnesota

Discussion: Jerry Jacobs, University of Pennsylvania


1. Which kinds of network member communicate by email for face-to-face for what kinds of work? Caroline Haythornthwaite and Barry Wellman, Univ of Toronto.


430, 10:30-12:30, Tuesday, Roundtables (listings below)


1. Mentors and Economic Contests in the American legal Profession, Tony Tam, Academia Sinica, Taiwan
2. Third party effects on reputation, Ronald Burt and Marc Knez, Univ of Chicago
3. Managerial career patterns and the structuring of interorganizational competition, Jesper Sorensen, Univ of Notre Dame.

Discussant: Robert Faulkner, Univ of Mass, Amhurst

449, 2:30-3:30, Tuesday, Author meets critics: Organizer: Neil Fligstein, Univ of CA, Berkeley; President: Daniel F. Chambliss, Hamilton College. Max Weber Award Winner, Forging Industrial Policy: The United States, Britain and France in the Railway Age, Frank Dobbin
Panelists: Charles Perrow, Yale University, Richard R. Nelson, Columbia University School of International and Public Affairs

3:30-4:15, Tuesday, Business Meeting

463, 4:30-6:30, Tuesday, Are Organizations and Occupations Gendered?, Organizer: Christine Williams, Univ of TX, Austin. Presider: Patti Giuffre, Univ of TX, Austin.
2. We didn't hire you for your children: the gendered consequences of nonstandard working hours in the service sector, Linda Blum, Tufts and Peggy Kahn, Univ of Michigan, Flint.
4. The occupational masculinity of computing, Rosemary Wright, Farleigh Dickinson.
Discussant: Dana Britton, Kansas State.

Refereed Roundtables

Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, Catherine Zimmer, Jacqueline Johnson, Shealy Thompson, North Carolina State University

1. International Management, Table Presider: Jo H. Kim, Columbia University
b. Victor N. Shaw, University of California, Los Angeles, Organizational Control: A Comparison of China with the United States.
c. Michal Frenkel and Yehouda Shenhar, Tel-Aviv University, Managers and Nations: The Political Embeddedness of Managerial Ideologies.
2. Decision-Making in Higher Education, Table Presider: Sylvia Fuller, Rutgers University
a. Sylvia Fuller, Rutgers University, Implementing University Sexual Harassment Policies: Conflicts and Contradictions.
b. Erich Studer-Ellis, Duke University, Effects of Internal and External Organizational Learning Forces on Fundamental Organizational Change.
3. Organizational Theory, Table Presider: David Jaffee, SUNY-New Paltz
c. David Barron, Jesus College, Oxford University, A Dynamic Model of Population Structure: Density and Concentration.
4. Union Development, Table Presider: C.R. Portz, Kiev-Mohyla Academy
b. Won Kim, Beloit College, Public Sector Unions and Post-Socialist Transition: A Case Study of the Hungarian National Railroad.
5. Self-Employment, Table Presider: William Danaher, Western Carolina University
a. Michael McCrary, Ohio State University, Men's and Women's Social Networks: How Do They Affect the Chances for, Growth of, and Success in Self-Employment and Small Business Ownership?
6. Social Service Organizations, Table Presider: Eli Teram, Wilfrid Laurier University
a. Eli Teram, Wilfrid Laurier University, The Case Against the Control of Clients as a Negotiable Contingency for Interdisciplinary Teams.
b. Alan Kirschenbaum and Idit Schuman Idatto, Technion-Israel Institute of Technology, The Organization of Vocational Rehabilitation: The Structure of Success.
7. Work and Organization Measurement Issues, Table Presider: Catherine
1. Catherine Zimmer and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, North Carolina State University, Who Knows What?: Employer and Employee Sources of Organizational Information.

2. William T. Bielby, Matt Huffman, and Steven Velasco, University of California, Santa Barbara, Employee and Employer Narratives about Workplace Arrangements: Who is a "Knowledgeable Organizational Informant?"


4. Ryan A. Smith, Rutgers University, Race and Authority at Work.


6. Part-Time Work, Table Presider: Phyllis Hutton Raabe, University of New Orleans
   b. Melinda K. Pitts, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Do Part-Time and Full-Time Wages Really Differ?: What We Learn about the Labor Market from Wage Equations.

7. Health Care Management, Table Presider: Melanie Allison, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina

8. Social Psychology of Work, Table Presider: Shealy Thompson, North Carolina State University
   a. Melinda J. Milligan, University of California, Davis, Loss of Site: Viewing the Organizational Move as an Organizational Death.
   c. Carol A. Caronna, Stanford University, Through the Glass Ceiling: Using Accountability to Explain the Experience of Women Sol os in Organizations.

9. Gender and Managers' Careers, Table Presider: Jacqueline Johnson, North Carolina State University
   a. Matt L. Huffman and Steven Velasco, University of California, Santa Barbara, The Effect of Sex Composition of Managerial Positions on Earnings: The Case of Work Establishments in the United States.
   b. Debra Branch McBrier, Ohio State University, A Queuing Approach to the Organizational Determinants of Women's Share of Managerial Jobs.
   c. Paul M. Perl, University of Notre Dame, Promotion Structures of Managers and Professional-Technical Workers.

10. Organizations and their Environments, Table Presider: Patricia H. Thornton, Duke University
    a. Patricia H. Thornton, Duke University and William Ocasio, Northwestern University, Outside In: The Internal and External Influences on Leadership Succession and Corporate Control.
    c. Yoshito Ishio, University of Tsukuba, When Do Interest Groups Participate in Coalitions? An Analysis of Events and Organizational Characteristics.
    d. Thomas W. McFadden, University of Arizona, Competition, Regulation and the Development of the Early American Aviation Industry.

11. Career Mobility, Table Presider: Thomas L. Steiger, Indiana State University
    c. Kees Van Veen and Robert Althauser, Indiana University, Structural Aspects of Single Job Shifts: Do Careers Follow Formal Job Ladders?

12. Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction, Table Presider: John C. Gorden, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
    a. John Gorden, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Spouse and Parents in the Workplace: Rewards, Values, and Attitudes.
    b. Saeid H. Al-Hajri, The Institute of Public Administration (Saudi Arabia), Job Satisfaction and Job Involvement Among Saudi Arabian Public Employees.
c. Abeid A. Al-Amri, King Saud University (Saudi Arabia), The Relationship between Worker Satisfaction and their Perception of Organizational Effectiveness Among Saudi Workers in the Private Sector.

d. John R. Hepburn and Marie Griffin Lambert, Arizona State University, Side Bets and Reciprocity as Determinants of Organizational Commitment Among Correctional Officers.

16. Corporate Downsizing, Table Presider: Brigitte U. Neary, The University of South Carolina, Spartanburg
   a. Shin-Kap Han and Phyllis Moen, Cornell University, Early Retirement, Before and After: Tracing the Pathways.

17. Alternative Organizational Forms, Table Presider: Ira Silver, Northwestern University
   b. Judith Biewener, University of California, Berkeley, Workplace Transformation in the United States: Moving Beyond the Participative Model.
   c. Sandra Harding, Queensland University of Technology, Guild Industrial Organization: Work, Organization, and Community Well-Being.
   d. Rebecca L. Bordt, University of Notre Dame, What Do Women's Nonprofits Look Like?: Measuring Organizational Structure.

18. Gender Segregation in Jobs and Occupations, Table Presider: Keiko Aiba, Washington State University
   b. Melissa Bonstead-Bruns and Scott R. Eliason, University of Iowa, Measuring the Communal/Agentic Gender Structure of Occupations and Its Effect on Wage Attainments.
   c. Jennifer Sheridan, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Determinants of Women's Mobility Into and Out of Sex-Atypical Occupations.

19. Skill Issues in Employment, Table Presider: David K. Brown, University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire
   b. Shazia Rafiullah Miller and James E. Rosenbaum, Northwestern University, Inadequate Information: Dysfunction in the Youth Labor Market.