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Our section enters the academic year with an old and distinguished tradition and a new name (Organizations, Occupations, and Work). In the coming year, I hope we can build on our existing strengths and cultivate some new ones.

One reason the Organizations, Occupations and Work section has been so successful—one of the ASA’s largest and most active—for so long is that it occupies a turf that is right at the center of the discipline. I suspect that one could observe a great deal about changes in sociology with an old and distinguished tradition. We produce “obvious results;” the ASA’s outreach programs to the core; we bicker more; political biases affect our choices of problems and solutions; we are more harmonious intergroup relations should occur as rates of cross-group interaction increase. Since opportunities for such interaction increase as groups become more similar in size, this perspective leads to the prediction that women in departments with a larger proportion of women should face a more favorable social environment than women in departments with a smaller proportion. Insofar as such an environment contributes to lower turnover rates, the rates of turnover among women faculty in departments with a larger proportion of women should be lower.

In this study, we drew on two dominant theoretical perspectives to derive hypotheses about the effects of group proportions on group relations, and used longitudinal data on sex composition and rates of turnover among the faculty in a sample of 50 sociology departments to test these hypotheses. One perspective, social contact theory, suggests that more harmonious intergroup relations should occur as rates of cross-group interaction increase. Since opportunities for such interaction increase as groups become more similar in size, this perspective leads to the prediction that women in departments with a larger proportion of women will face a more favorable social environment than women in departments with a smaller proportion. Insofar as such an environment contributes to lower turnover rates, the rates of turnover among women faculty in departments with a larger proportion of women should be lower.

The second perspective, competition theory, leads to the opposite prediction. According to this perspective, a majority group is expected to feel that their relative power and control of resources are increasingly threatened as minority groups increase in size. Such perceptions lead to greater hostility and discrimination against the minority group, and hence to an unfavorable social environment for minority members, at least until the minority group attains a level of power that permits such behavior to be combatted. While most research in this tradition has focused on the absolute size of the minority group, we argue that in organizations, the power of a group depends on its distribution at higher levels of the organizational hierarchy. Therefore, the logic of this perspective suggests that increases in the proportion of women in a
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Academic characteristics that make them well-suited for tests of these theoretical perspectives. First, they represent work groups that normally are characterized by a high level of face-to-face interaction among members. Moreover, members are likely to share superordinate goals, created both by collective responsibility for managing day-to-day tasks of the department, and by the individual and collective advantages to be gained by maximizing the department's status. Finally, departments exercise a large measure of control over personnel assignments; such assignments can easily be perceived as a scarce resource that can become the object of competition.

Thus, we tested our hypotheses using data on a sample of 50 sociology departments obtained from the annual editions of the American Sociological Association's Guide to Graduate Departments from 1977-1988. One potential problem in using such archival data is inaccuracy in the lists of faculty members. We took a number of steps to identify and correct such inaccuracies, and it is not likely that they affected the outcomes of our analyses. We also included a measure of the likelihood of a department not having women faculty at given ranks, to correct for possible sample selection biases.

In brief, the results indicated a curvilinear relationship between the proportion of women in a department and the likelihood of turnover among women faculty: Turnover rates increased until the proportion reached a given level (tentatively estimated to be around 40%), and then decreased subsequently. Net of this, having a higher proportion of women among the tenured faculty decreased the rate of turnover. These general findings were largely duplicated in analyses focusing specifically on untenured faculty, but did not hold up in analyses of tenured faculty. Taken as a whole, these results are consistent with the predictions derived from a competition perspective. Comparable analyses examining the effects of group proportions on turnover among male faculty did not show the same pattern. In fact, the only consistently strong predictor of turnover among men was the number of men in the departments: The larger the number, the more likely that some men would leave, a result that seems statistically obvious.

In concluding, we note that this research contains some potential implications for the effective implementation of affirmative action policy. In particular, we suggest that in order for the policy to effectively fulfill broad, long-run objectives of reducing occupational segregation by race and sex, more attention must be given to understanding and mediating group dynamics that may accompany demographic changes.

We're witnessing a widening of a “Great Divide” between competing voices on the issue of feminization and women’s integration into sociology, similar to the larger public discourse about such issues as political correctness and affirmative action. Some say that women have already closed the gender gap in sociology. Women have moved into ASA governance positions, editorships of major journals, and Chairs of major departments. Why have a Committee on the Status of Women when women are already powerful players in the discipline? At the other end of the Divide are those who see women as “victims”. Pointing to the negative reaction to the all-female slate for the 1994 ASA elections, these colleagues believe that institutional sex discrimination is alive and well in the sociological workplace. The Great Divide has an interpretable middle ground, where I place myself.

We’re witnessing a widening of a “Great Divide” between the proportion of women in a department and the likelihood of turnover among women faculty: Turnover rates increased until the proportion reached a given level (tentatively estimated to be around 40%), and then decreased subsequently. Net of this, having a higher proportion of women among the tenured faculty decreased the rate of turnover. These general findings were largely duplicated in analyses focusing specifically on untenured faculty, but did not hold up in analyses of tenured faculty. Taken as a whole, these results are consistent with the predictions derived from a competition perspective. Comparable analyses examining the effects of group proportions on turnover among male faculty did not show the same pattern. In fact, the only consistently strong predictor of turnover among men was the number of men in the departments: The larger the number, the more likely that some men would leave, a result that seems statistically obvious.

In concluding, we note that this research contains some potential implications for the effective implementation of affirmative action policy. In particular, we suggest that in order for the policy to effectively fulfill broad, long-run objectives of reducing occupational segregation by race and sex, more attention must be given to understanding and mediating group dynamics that may accompany demographic changes.
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We're witnessing a widening of a “Great Divide” between competing voices on the issue of feminization and women's integration into sociology, similar to the larger public discourse about such issues as political correctness and affirmative action. Some say that women have already closed the gender gap in sociology. Women have moved into ASA governance positions, editorships of major journals, and Chairs of major departments. Why have a Committee on the Status of Women when women are already powerful players in the discipline? At the other end of the Divide are those who see women as “victims”. Pointing to the negative reaction to the all-female slate for the 1994 ASA elections, these colleagues believe that institutional sex discrimination is alive and well in the sociological workplace. The Great Divide has an interpretable middle ground, where I place myself. Women have entered the field in large numbers and they have made inroads into sociology's governance. But troubling aspects of their integration do remain, and we also need to thoughtfully examine these.

Why Did Sociology's Recruitment Pool Feminize in the 1970's?

My research in the feminization of sociology grew from my interests in the causes and consequences of occupational feminization. Katharine Jones and I (Roos and Jones, 1993) examined explanations for women's inroads into sociology's
recruitment pool since 1970, and speculated about women's continued progress in academe. Adapting Reskin and Roos' (1990) queuing model, we explained changing occupational sex composition via the operation of two queues: a gendered labor queue (whereby employers rank potential employees) and a job queue (whereby people rank potential jobs). There were three explanations for women's increased presence in sociology's recruitment pool: First, academic sociology fell in men's job queues during the 1970s. Federal R&D funding dropped significantly during the 1970s, hitting the social sciences especially hard. Moreover, the field's real earnings declined in the 1970's, and underemployment and underutilization increased, leading men to search elsewhere. Second, women rose in the academic employers' labor queues during the 1970's in part because of affirmative action and in part because women themselves organized to pursue their interests. Third, women viewed sociology as desirable because the field permitted them to study issues central to their lives, including family and gender equity. Contrary to the conventional wisdom that feminization leads to occupational decline, our data strongly suggest that the field declined in prestige and earnings, men moved to other training programs, thereby opening up additional graduate slots for women, who were themselves newly interested in the field.

The Picture Then and Now

So what has changed between then and now? When I received my Ph.D. in 1981, 40 percent of sociology doctorates went to women, up from 18 percent in 1970. By 1993, 47 percent of sociology's doctorates were women. The change in the 1970's was sudden and dramatic. In the late 1970s, studying gender was still unusual, and accomplished through the theoretical lens of subfields such as stratification. Graduate students now have a larger number of departments to choose among, a larger number of female role models, a larger number of faculty with explicitly gender interests, and an even larger number of both female and male faculty members sympathetic and interested in working with them as the students' interests intersect their own (e.g., stratification, culture, organizations).

After reaching a peak of 53 percent in 1988, women's representation among sociology doctorates has actually declined somewhat, but not because women are avoiding the field. Rather, after a nearly decade-long decline, men are again choosing to earn sociology Ph.D.'s, and their numbers are increasing faster than women's. Currently, women are only slightly more likely than men to be enrolled in sociology graduate programs and only slightly less likely to get sociology doctorates. The median annual salaries of sociologists continue to increase, and underemployment and underutilization continue to decline. Female sociologists have also successfully narrowed the gender gap in earnings: in 1991 full-time women sociology doctorates earned on average 92 percent of what men earned, quite respectable considering their differing distributions by rank and institutional affiliation. Despite comprising nearly 43 percent of the ASA membership in 1995, women represent 63 percent of the 1995/96 elected ASA officers and council. In 1994, they were 57 percent of the candidates and 72 percent of the winners. Women's representation on ASA journal editorial boards also increased, from 30 percent in 1987 to 42 percent in 1995.

Not everyone sees these data as good news. Depending on their position on the Divide, some see these changes as symptomatic of sociology's decline, while others view them as a sign that governance has resegregated with women now taking care of the field's devalued "housework". To my mind, women's increased entry into sociology training programs, their presence in the field's lower ranks, their nearly comparable earnings, and their entry into local and ASA governance should be taken as indicators of women's success. To bridge the Great Divide, we must at least agree on what constitutes "progress," and move from there.

Yet gender boundaries do remain in the sociological workplace. Women's representation in academic sociology is notably lower than one might predict given their representation in sociology's recruitment pool. By 1985, only 26 percent of all full-time sociologists in doctorate-granting universities and colleges were women. This is partly because training time is lengthy; it takes years to be tenured and promoted. Eliminating forced retirement has exacerbated the problem. But this average masks women's greater inroads into the field's lower ranks. By 1993-94, fully half of instructors and assistant professors in sociology graduate programs were women. Although women have clearly progressed into academe's lower ranks, this is not yet true at the upper ranks: women represent only 17 percent of full professors.

Moreover, not all women are progressing at the same rate. Asian and Hispanic women, for example, are not doing as well as black and white women in their relative earnings, suggesting that it's probably more sensible to break down the category "women" or "men" into its constituent demographic parts. Other gender differences exist as well. Cappell and Guterbock (1990) found that shared membership in what they called "visible colleges"—ASA sections—are determined in part by ascriptive characteristics like race and sex. Despite representing about 46 percent of all those in sections, women are 68 percent of the members in the family section, 87 percent of those in sex and gender, and 62 percent of those in the sociology of children section. Alternatively, women are 29 percent of the members in the methodology section, 28 percent in theory and Marxist, and 20 percent in rational choice. Whether by inclination, channeling, or mentoring relationships, women and men tend to...
operate in quite different sociological spheres.

So what are we left with? To the extent these gender differences within sociology further ossify we run the risk of resegregating into intellectual ghettos with little scholarly interchange across the gendered divide. First, we should keep our eye on the sociological ball. Gender studies should build from and inform existing sociological scholarship, not operate in a separate dimension altogether. Second, politicization or ideological language is fine for popular or political writing, but does little to advance the discipline, and does a lot to turn people off to the message. Finally, established disciplines also need to be open to contributions from "outsiders". Communication cannot be one way. One need only look at the contributions of the "new structuralists" and the gender scholars within stratification—both male and female—to see how new ideas can transform a field. Closing off communication or talking only to the converted will do little to advance the discipline or scholarship. Rather than viewing feminization as something to fear, I see it as offering exciting new avenues of scholarship that can help to revitalize our discipline.
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Indeed, the organizational level of analysis has become a privileged site within many of sociology's subdisciplines — from political sociology (which brought the state back in shortly after the firm was invited back into stratification research) to the sociology of culture (where the production of culture approach set a speed record for moving from insurgency to establishment). Indeed, the study of organizations and work is less a subfield of sociology than a part of the discipline's core, essential equipment for the study of anything else.

This creates both opportunities and challenges for the section. The opportunities inhere in the fact that our subject matter is relevant to nearly everyone. As the demographers would put it, any sociologist is at risk of joining. The challenge is to remain connected to our core constituencies while reaching out to new ones in a way that reflects the movement of the field.

For the most part, OOW has been successful in doing this. After a relatively modest decline, membership stabilized last year. The addition of "work" to the section's name confirmed the centrality of the study of work, labor process, and labor markets to the section's mission. Now we are ready for membership to grow again.

At August's ASA meeting, chair-elect Dan Cornfield and I made a 2-year commitment to increase the Section's membership during the next two academic years, with a target of 1000 members by fall 1997. Such a membership level would entitle us to an additional section on the ASA annual meeting program, would generate sufficient revenue to expand the section's newsletter, and might even yield a modest amount of risk capital to explore occasional new initiatives in such areas as electronic publishing.

The effort to reach 1000 has three prongs: Membership, Program, and Services. Our new Membership Chair, Rikki Abzug of NYU's School of Business, with committee members Vicki Smith (U.C. Davis) and Mark Chavez (Notre Dame), will lead the effort to reach potential members and explain the benefits of joining the section. The first priority will be to reach those members of ASA who define their areas of interest as organizations, occupations, work, or labor markets, but who have not yet joined the section, or who have let their memberships lapse.

A second priority will be to reach out to additional groups who may not think of the OOW section as a natural home but who, in fact, have much to gain from affiliating with the section. One such group are sociologists and sociologically oriented organization behavior scholars in business and management schools, which for the last two decades have housed
some of the most interesting work in the field. Although many, probably most, of this group are section members, many others are not. Even if the primary allegiance of the latter is to the Academy of Management, most still view themselves as sociologists; if we can provide services and information, over and above the section program, that they find of value, we can recruit them as members.

I also suspect that we have a natural constituency among large proportions of students of economic sociology. Economic sociology is a rapidly growing subfield: departments are offering courses in this subject, journals are publishing papers (winners of both the Weber and Thompson awards during the past year were works of economic sociology), and the 1993 Handbook of Economic Sociology, edited by Neil Smelser and Richard Swedberg, demonstrated the diversity and maturity of this field. Although some economic sociology focuses on individual behavior, most of it entails research on the behavior of organizations: financial institutions, accounting firms, securities exchanges, other business corporations, government regulatory agencies, and others. Our section is the natural home for most economic sociologists, and, just as we grew to accommodate the growth of labor-market research in the 1980s, we can do the same for economic sociology in the next several years.

Finally, an increasing number of gender scholars are focussing on issues close to the Section’s heart — for example, gender concentration within occupations and job titles, the gendered quality of many work settings, or the manner in which organizational practices constitute gender relations and identities. Increasingly such scholars are finding OOW a sympathetic source of information and collegueship.

These are only a few fields that can benefit from OOW membership, and the membership committee will be recruiting aggressively. (Rikki Abzug will have more to say about this in her article in the next newsletter.)

In order to recruit, we must expand the range and quality of services that members receive. One of the most important services, albeit one that cannot be restricted to members, is the section program at the annual meetings. There are many kinds of good programs and it probably makes sense to alternate between sessions that focus on debates internal to OOW fields, on the one hand, and sessions that underscore the relevance of research and theoretical progress in organizations, occupations, and work to understanding critical social changes of broad interest to most sociologists, on the other.

In keeping with ASA President Maureen Hallinan’s theme of sociology’s contribution to the understanding of social change, this year’s program will focus outward, highlighting our fields’ relevance to issues central to the discipline and to our changing societies. One reason that economic sociology has become so energetic a subfield is that the pace of economic change has laid bare the socially constructed institutional and organizational underpinnings of the market. Heather Haveman of Cornell University is organizing a session on “The Organized Economy,” which will highlight research on economic institutions. Gender remains a fulcrum of change in our organizations and an area of great theoretical progress: We are co-sponsoring a session, which Christine Williams of the University of Texas will chair, entitled “Are Organizations and Occupations Gendered,” with the Section on Gender (the first part of a two-year collaboration). Few developments have altered work and organizations as dramatically as the rise of new high-speed digital technologies: Kathleen Carley of Carnegie Mellon University has agreed to organize a session that will interpret these developments. Finally, I have organized a session on “The Organization in the 21st Century,” in which invited presentations will focus on selected aspects of organizational changes that are shaping our society, work lives, and economies.

Sections also serve their membership by providing information, noting achievement, and convening discussion and debate. There are many ways in which OOW pursues these missions. One is to provide a liaison between our section and organizational scholars in other parts of the world, a service that will be pursued by a new International Liaison Committee under the leadership of Tom DiPrete of Duke University. A second is through the Thompson and Weber awards, which feature exceptional work by graduate students (Thompson, for the best paper) and all comers (Weber, this year for a book). Thanks to Diane Vaughan (Boston College) and Neil Fligstein (Univ. of California, Berkeley), for agreeing to chair these committees.

The most pervasive form of member service in ASA sections is probably the newsletter, and I feel particularly fortunate that Chip Clarke has agreed to take on the editorship of this publication during a crucial technological juncture. As Chip’s editorial indicates, the newsletter is growing in length and coverage, adding several sections (e.g., book notes) that should increase its utility. At the same time, the Section’s publication committee is exploring how OOW can best use the Internet. Indeed, we now have our own Web page, http://www.princeton.edu/~orgsocwk. The Publications Committee is also exploring a range of options, from bulletin boards to e-mail conferences. Please contact Chip or me (our e-mail addresses are elsewhere in this issue) to suggest ways in which our Section can use the information highway to further our shared objectives. (Indeed, get in touch if you have any ideas about ways in which the section can be more effective in serving us all.)

As I’ve organized the committees and program for the coming year, I’ve been deeply gratified by the willingness of section members to play active and occasionally arduous roles. Thanks to all of those mentioned above, to Carol Heimer of Northwestern University, who has agreed to chair the nominations committee, and to the many other people who have agreed to serve on section committees in the coming year. Let me conclude with a special thank you to Judith Blau, 1994-95 section chair, first, for having moved the section forward and leaving it stronger than she found it, and, second, for keeping me in the loop throughout her year as chair and for countless other collegial kindnesses that made the annual transition an easy one. Her conduct provides a model that I hope to replicate in working with chair-elect Dan Cornfield over the next year.
ship. There have been changes as well in the representation of men and women of color among the leadership. While recognizing the importance of crosscutting dimensions, we focus on gender per se in this newsletter article.

We explore the meaning of women’s growing representation in the ASA using data on all candidates for office or Council in the 1975-1995 elections, a total of 314 candidacies, counting repeat contenders each time they ran. We start in the mid-1970s because this is after the very sharp increase in women’s participation, as well as after changes in the composition of Council (as Roby 1992 discusses). Our main sources of data were ASA Footnotes, SWS Newsletters (later Network News), and ASA and SWS election supplements. We used published and on-line sources to fill in career histories. The ASA and SWS Executive Offices provided us with other information. We also conducted semi-structured interviews with several senior sociologists as part of the background for this research.

The composition of leadership can change through processes at two levels: forming a ballot and voting. External sociopolitical changes (in particular, the influence of the mainstream women’s movement), political activism within the ASA (especially by SWS), and organizational change (increasing concern of the ASA with teaching, lobbying, nonacademic practice, and wider political issues in addition to disciplinary scholarship) can have effects at both levels. We begin with a brief overview of how candidates are chosen and ballots are formed, then discuss the evidence with respect to each of these three forces.

ASA Elections

Elected officers of the ASA are the President, Vice President, and Secretary (who serves for three years). In addition, there are currently 12 elected Council members-at-large, with 4 beginning their terms each year. Elections are contested, and most membership categories entitle one to vote. Candidates for offices, Council, and most elected committees appear on the ballot one of two ways. The first is through the Committee on Nominations, itself elected from candidates nominated by the Council at-large members. The Committee on Nominations does not present a particular slate. Rather, it prepares a confidential, ordered list of many more candidates than needed to run for a particular slot and gives this to Council. The Secretary then contacts those nominated to see whether they are willing to run, continuing until there are two candidates for each position. The second way is by petition—requiring 100 members’ signatures for President and Vice President and 50 for other positions. The number of petition candidates varies irregularly over elections.

Gender & Gender Attitudes

One explanation for the feminization of ASA governance is that ASA membership has been influenced by the contemporary women’s movement. The US women’s movement has led to more favorable expressed public opinion toward women holding positions of authority, with a large jump in such approval in the early 1970s and less dramatic, but sustained increases since then. Sociologist might be especially responsive to the demands for inclusion of women. We therefore look first simply at the gender of candidates and winners.

Overall, men were more likely than women to be candidates, but women candidates were more likely to be elected: about 60 percent of the 105 female candidates were elected, compared with 33 percent of the 209 male candidates. The odds of being elected if one is a female candidate are three times greater than the odds of being elected for male candidates. In contrast to the continuing increases in favorable public opinion, there is only a rather weak tendency for the disproportionate representation of women to increase, with 1994 an outlier. Likewise, the female candidates were about as likely as the males to be elected in the last half of the 1970s, but have had a great advantage since, though not a strictly increasing one. Looking at Council races more closely, we found that, relative to their representation among candidates, women were disproportionately winners in 16 out of 21 years, with an increase in this advantage appearing mainly after the 1970s.

Since 1975, 23 races for office have had only male candidates and 5 only women. In the other 21 races, where women competed against men, women won over 70 percent of the contests—and won all but two such races since 1981. However, women have not advanced disproportionately into ASA’s most visible position of president. The ASA has had only 6 women presidents, 5 of whom were elected since 1975.

SWS

The women’s movement not only affects individual members’ opinions, but also encourages the development of movement organizations. In 1971, Sociologists for Women in Society was founded. SWS is not an ASA group, but acts both within and outside it to advance the causes of women in sociology and in the larger society. Among its other activities, SWS has paid special attention to ASA elections and regularly reminds its members to vote. The proportion of eligible ASA members voting has declined over the decades, from 55 percent in 1970 to 29.8 percent in 1995. D’Antonio and Tuch (1991) showed that while under half of non-SWS members voted in the 1985 and 1986 elections, three-quarters and two-thirds of SWS members did. There are approximately 1600 SWS members, according to the 1994-95 membership list, about 15 percent of the Association (if all SWS members were also ASA members, as most are). But if we generalize D’Antonio and Tuch’s results and assume that about 70 percent of SWS members still vote in ASA elections, then they could be as much as one-third of the voters in 1995 (.70*1600/3200). There could be enough SWS members voting to have a significant impact on election outcomes, if they vote for the same candidates.

SWS tries to help its members decide for whom to vote. Since 1972, SWS leaders have surveyed candidates on the extent of their feminist attitudes and activities and endorsed candidates in 1977-82. Over the years, most candidates have responded to the survey, and responded favorably to SWS goals, although many outside of SWS have objected to this procedure, citing it as pursuit of single-issue politics. The seeming lack of interest
among most ASA members in who runs their organization makes it possible for SWS to have an influence on ASA leadership, if its members not only vote, but are also more willing to run when nominated and to promote SWS’s goals once elected. While we could not observe these processes, we did find that SWS members were overrepresented among candidates—35 percent were identified as SWS members in the year of their candidacy, which is a conservative figure due to our missing SWS information on some elections. Fifty-seven percent of these candidates won, compared with 33 percent of other candidates, although this advantage worked only for women and did not increase over time. Endorsement did not seem to have much effect; in fact, the men who were endorsed were actually less likely to win than men not endorsed. The few nonrespondents to the surveys in general did not get elected. Those who were more enthusiastic in their answers did, although the impact of this enthusiasm was stronger for women.

Organizational Change / Elite Dilution

Sewell (1992:57) argues that women were excluded from participation in ASA leadership roles before the 1970s because they were excluded from attaining success according to ‘universalistic’ criteria set by the white male power structure. Sociologists whom we interviewed held the opinion that the President, especially, should be a distinguished scholar, since this person represents the discipline to the public. As women increase their standing on these criteria, we would expect that they would be more likely to be candidates and elected, all else being equal. As Roos shows, women have increased their relative representation in graduate education and academic jobs, although the absolute changes have not been dramatic. We also might still expect that women candidates and elected officials would be younger than the men with whom they are competing, because the pool of “distinguished” women is younger on average than the pool of “distinguished” men. Further, female candidates might have less “distinction,” by the usual measures, because they have had shorter careers and may still have had more constraints on their career choices and opportunities.

We did find that women candidates had held their doctorates for a somewhat shorter time than men—a median of 18 versus 24 years. Despite this, there are few differences in measures of “distinction,” in so far as we can measure this problematic concept. The female candidates had, at the median, published fewer books over their careers than the male candidates, but had the same number of recent articles (though they had a slightly lower mean). Men and women candidates had been equally represented on editorial boards of major sociological journals and had relatively the same number of major awards, with women having a slight edge due to winning Jessie Bernard awards. They had been equally active in ASA sections and regional sociology associations (although women were less likely to have been president).

Aside from book publication, where the candidates differed by gender was in institutional location and prior ASA leadership. Fewer than one-third of the women were in graduate departments recently rated in the top 20, compared with half of the men. Women candidates were also less likely to have previously served on Council or as ASA officers. Simpson and Simpson (1994) argue that in general, ASA leadership is less likely now to come from the “elite” and interpret this as part of the broadening of the ASA’s function. To the extent that change in the ASA is simply “elite dilution,” there should be a decline in the credentials of both male and female candidates and winners. There was not a consistent pattern of either male or female credentials declining—in fact, for both men and women, productivity and locational prestige have actually risen recently.

When we looked at how gender, SWS membership, productivity, prior professional service, and location simultaneously affect election, we found that being a woman and having published more books consistently lead to winning. Broader based gender politics (and not SWS membership per se) and distinction (at least as measured by book production) both seem to play a part in who wins ASA elections.

Conclusions

Since the early 1970s, women have increased their participation in all aspects of the American Sociological Association. They currently serve as officers and on committees in higher proportions than expected from their share of membership. In this paper, we focused on the process and outcomes of ASA elections to understand the meaning of this change. Women’s increased representation in these positions has been more than merely a reflection of organizational change or internal social movement activity. We found little evidence to support the idea of elite dilution occurring due to organizational change. SWS, as the most highly organized group concerned with the elections, certainly plays a part. But general changes in attitudes about women in leadership roles combined with increases in the pool of distinguished women who might be considered viable candidates certainly are major factors in the continuing (over)representation of women in ASA governance. What will happen in the future? On the one hand, many of the processes underlying the feminization of ASA leadership are self-reinforcing. On the other, to the extent that women are accepted as making sociological and professional contributions at least equal to men’s, gender could become a less salient characteristic in our governance.
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Minutes of the Council Meeting of the Organizations, Occupations, and Work Section
American Sociological Association • Monday, August 21, 1995 • Washington, D.C. • Washington Hilton

Present: Judith Blau (Chair), Paul DiMaggio (Chair-Elect), Daniel Cornfield (newly elected Chair-Elect), Patricia Roos (Sec'y/Treasurer), Jerry Jacobs (newly elected Sec'y/Treasurer-Elect); Council Members: Paula England, Randy Hodson, Robert Kaufman, Patricia Martin, Mark Mizruchi, Ronnie Steinberg, Mayer Zald; Grad Rep (Thompson Award winner): Vincent Roscigno.

Officers and Council members of the Organizations, Occupations, and Work Section met over dinner at the 1919 Grill in the Washington Hilton. Chair-Elect Paul DiMaggio called the meeting to order at 7:20 p.m. Chair Judith Blau arrive shortly thereafter.

Newly elected members of the Council included Daniel Cornfield (Chair-Elect), Jerry Jacobs (Sec'y/Treasurer-Elect), Ronnie Steinberg (Council), and Mayer Zald (Council). The election also established a new name for the section: Organizations, Occupations, and Work.

Chair-Elect Paul DiMaggio discussed his Nominations Committee recommendations, which the Council unanimously approved. DiMaggio also asked for nominations for the International Committee, established to maintain contacts with ISA and other related organizations focused on issues of organization, occupations, and work. DiMaggio discussed alternative uses of the two-hour session time at the 1996 ASA meetings. Those assembled were most enthusiastic about having an author meets the critics session on the 1996 Weber award winner.

DiMaggio noted that the percentage of OOW members that are graduate students is somewhat lower than in other large sections. All agreed that it was a realistic goal to increase the number of graduate students. The new section’s name should help bring in those with interests in work, inequality, stratification, and economic sociology.

DiMaggio announced that Rikki Abzug (NYU Stern School) will chair the Membership Committee, and that last year’s chair—Vicki Smith (U.C. Davis)—will continue to serve on that committee. Abzug will explore ways to increase graduate student enrollments, as well as enrollments from business schools. The membership goal for 1995-96 is 970, with 1,000 for the following year. DiMaggio also announced that Lee Clarke will edit the OOW newsletter in 1995-96.

Chair Judith Blau discussed the changes in bylaws she undertook over the past year. Roos presented the Sec’y/Treasurer report, noting that the section had approximately $30 left in its budget, after payments for assistance to the newsletter editor, the Thompson prize, the prize plaques, and the section reception.

Council members discussed additional ways of increasing membership and member participation, including a joint session with Sex and Gender (Council member England is the incoming Chair of the Sex and Gender section). DiMaggio will begin the process of setting up a section home page, and will explore the possibilities of multiple listserves and email conferences to better serve the specific constituencies within OOW.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Patricia A. Roos, Secretary/Treasurer.

OOW Officers

Chair: Paul DiMaggio
Chair Elect: Daniel Cornfield
Past Chair: Judith Blau
Secretary-Treasurer: Jerry Jacobs
Council: Ronnie Steinberg (Temple), Mayer Zald (Michigan), Sarah Fennstermaker (UC-Santa Barbara), Randy Hodson (Indiana), Bob Kaufman (Ohio State), Patricia Yancey Martin (Florida State), and Ezra Zuckerman (graduate student member, University of Chicago).

Publications Committee: Lee Clarke (chair, Rutgers), Julian Dierkes (Princeton), Pamela Tolbert (Cornell), Rick Phillips (Rutgers).

Nominations Committee

We need nominations for a chair and for two council members. Send nomination, by 1 February 1996, to nominations committee chair, Carol Heimer. Addresses for the committee are in the List of Committees, elsewhere in this document.

From the Editor:

Paul DiMaggio promised me I could swim in his pool if I agreed to edit our newsletter. I agreed, obviously, even though Paul won’t turn the water heater on in January. No matter; June comes quickly enough. We’d like OOW to become useful in the trading of ideas about organizations, occupations, and work. And we welcome any ideas on how to make that happen (and we’d like a real name for the newsletter). I welcome, especially, manuscripts of one to two thousand words that advance that worthy cause. Such manuscripts might cover some recent developments in your thinking, or even what you think we ought to be thinking about. Reasoned criticism of other ideas, theories, or schools of thought is appropriate. Since newsletters are partly, by nature, inward looking it is also appropriate for you to send your comments on the profession as well as the discipline qua intellectual activity. Whether you write about the discipline or the profession meaningful provocation is, here, a good thing. But I can’t pay you for your contributions. Maybe Paul will let you swim in his pool.

With the considerable skills of graduate students Julian Dierkes of Princeton (who has assumed primary responsibility for OOW webbing) and Rick Phillips of Rutgers (who is responsible for the beautiful layout of what you’re reading) we are writing a OOW web page. We welcome ideas, materials, and URLs — especially URLs relevant for OOW scholars. Send them electronically, please.

You’ll see I’ve started a book listing section, beginning on page 10. If I didn’t list you, and your book is recent, take no offense. Send me the material and I’ll print it next time.
1995 Max Weber Award

This year's choice is a paper published in ASR (December 1993) titled “The Social Organization of Conspiracy: Illegal Networks in the Heavy Electrical Equipment Industry” by Wayne E. Baker (Department of Organizational Behavior and Human Resource Management at the University of Michigan Business School) and Robert R. Faulkner (Department of Sociology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst). Said the award committee:

“Baker and Faulkner examine three well-known price-fixing conspiracies in the 1950s discovered during the Kefauver Committee Hearings of the U.S. Senate Committee on the Judiciary. They apply a network approach to identify directly how collusive activities were organized and to demonstrate the effects of the organization of these activities on critical outcomes, specifically individual verdicts, sentences and fines. Their results demonstrate that the structure of intercorporate “secret societies” does not follow the underlying efficiency logic associated with legal business activities. Also, they find that the relative centralization of network structures and the structural locations of individuals in these networks predicted verdicts, sentences and fines in expected ways.

“This study makes a solid sociological contribution to a problem area long dominated by other fields. It has broad relevance to several substantive areas in sociology, including organizations, deviance, stratification and communication, among others. It makes creative use of archival data and takes the network approach beyond technique to develop theoretically significant propositions linking network structure to individual and social outcomes. The Weber Award Committee is convinced that this project will stimulate future research.”

Thanks to committee members Gary L. Albrecht, Charles G. Kadushin, Angela M. O’Rand, Chair.

1996 Weber Award Announcement

The Weber Award is for an outstanding article or book (in alternating years) published over the past three years. The 1996 Award will be for a book and the nomination deadline is 31 January 1996. Authors can nominate themselves or section members can do the nominating. To nominate, send the nominee’s institutional affiliation, address, and phone number to the committee chair and have publishers send a book to each committee member. Chair: Neil Fligstein; committee members: Dan Chambliss, Mary Ellen Kelley. Addresses for the committee are in the List of Committees, elsewhere in this document.

1995 James Thompson Award

The 1995 Thompson Award went to “Social Contagion in the Health Policy Domain: The Social Construction of Organizational Identity”, by Ezra W. Zuckerman (Department of Sociology, University of Chicago). Said the award committee:

“Although debate over the Clinton health plan had little immediate impact on health care policy itself, it served to highlight the structural complexity of the health care field and the diversity of interests among organizational actors in that field. It is these critical issues that Ezra Zuckerman addresses in his innovative secondary analysis of Laumann and Knoke’s (1987) data on 135 influential organizations in national health care policy. Zuckerman makes both conceptual and analytic advances in his evaluation of the influence of social structural proximity on interest similarity among these organizations. He distinguishes two aspects of structural proximity, cohesion and structural equivalence, and shows how they both have additive and interactive effects on interest similarity. He finds that these influences in turn differ between routine and confidential networks. He identifies the role of monitoring capacity in heightening the impact of both forms of structural proximity. Finally, he clarifies the role of governmental organizations. The paper thus refines key conceptual distinctions between organizations and charts new directions for research on interorganizational relations.”

Thanks to committee members Russell Schutt, Judith Gerson, Nicole Biggart, & Robin Leidner.

1996 Thompson Award Announcement

The Thompson Award is for an outstanding graduate student paper written in the three years prior to the award. The winner gets $500 for travel to a professional meeting and serves as a representative to the Section Council that year. The nomination deadline is 31 March 1996. Authors can nominate themselves or section members can do the nominating. To nominate, send three copies of the paper and the nominee’s institutional affiliation, address, and phone number to, Diane Vaughan, chair; committee members: Miguel Guiltarte, Anne Miner. Addresses for the committee are in the List of Committees, elsewhere in this document.

About OOW

OOW is the newsletter of the Organizations, Occupations, and Work section of the American Sociological Association.

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. Home page: http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~lclarke. I invite you to send news, articles, or other items that might be relevant to OOW members. Articles should be 1,000 to 2,000 words, other items considerably shorter. I will edit what you send. You can send things via email, but if they’re long please send a uuencoded file (ask a nerd if you don’t know what that is or how to send it) of any major word processor or send it on a non-Mac disk. Please note that I have no scanner or secretary so items not in electronic form stand no chance of appearing in OOW.
Committees for 1995-1996

Program Committee:
Chair: Paul DiMaggio  
Department of Sociology  
2-N-2 Green Hall  
Princeton University  
Princeton NJ 08544  
dimaggio@phoenix.princeton.edu  
609/497-9780

Members:
Kathleen Carley, Dept. of Social and  
Behavioral Decision Sciences,  
Carnegie Mellon University  
Heather Haveman, Johnson School of  
Business, Cornell University  
Neil Fligstein, Sociology Dept., Univer-  
sity of California - Berkeley  
Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, Sociology  
Dept., University of North Carolina -  
Raleigh  
Christine Williams, Center for Ad-  
vanced Study in the Behavioral Sci-  
ences, Stanford, CA

Nominations Committee
Chair: Carol Heimer  
Department of Sociology  
Northwestern University  
1810 Chicago Avenue  
Evanston IL 60208  
c-heimer@nwu.edu  
718/491-5536

Members:
Joanne Miller, Sociology Department,  
Queens College, CUNY, 718/520-  
7088, hlrq@cunyvm.cuny.edu  
John Sutton, University of California  
at Santa Barbara, sutton@alishaw.ucsb.edu  
Wayne Villemmez, University of Con-  
nnecticut, 203/486-4422, ville-  
mez@uconnvm.uconn.edu

Membership Committee
Chair: Rikki Abzug  
Management/Organizational Behavior  
Stern School of Business  
New York University  
44 West 4th St.  
New York, NY 10012  
rabzug@stern.nyu.edu  
212/998-0250

Members:
Mark Chaves, Sociology Department,  
Notre Dame University,  
chaves@irishmvcs.nd.edu  
Vincent Roscigno, Sociology Depart-  
ment, North Carolina State University,  
vincen_roschigno@ncsu.edu  
Vicki Smith, Sociology Department,  
University of California, Davis,  
fzv-smith@bullwinkle.ucdavis.edu

Weber Award Committee
Chair: Neil Fligstein  
Sociology Department  
410 Barrows Hall  
University of California  
Berkeley CA 94720  
phone: 510/642-4575/6567  
fligst@cmsa.berkeley.edu

Members:
Dan Chambliss, Sociology Dept.,  
Hamilton College, Clinton, NY 13323  
315/859-4291, dcham-  
blt@its1.hamilton.edu  
Mary Ellen Kelley, School of Engineer-  
ing, E40-281, M.I.T. 50 Memorial  
Drive, Cambridge, MA 02139,  
617/252-1613, mkelley@mit.edu

Thompson Award Committee
Chair: Diane Vaughan  
Sociology Department  
Boston College  
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167  
phone: 617/421-9680

Members:
Miguel Guirarte, Sociology Dept.,  
4028 LSA, Univ. of Michigan, Ann  
Arbor MI 48109, 313/747-4444,  
miguelg@umich.edu  
Anne Miner, School of Business, Uni-  
versity of Wisconsin, Grainger Hall,  
975 University Ave. Madison, WI  
53706, 608/263-4143,  
aminer@bus.wisc.edu

Publications Committee
Chair: Lee Clarke  
Department of Sociology  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, NJ 08903  
phone: 908/445-5741  
lclarke@rutgers.edu

Members:
Julian Dierkes, Sociology Department,  
Princeton University (609) 258-4539,  
jdierkes@phoenix.princeton.edu  
Rick Phillips, Sociology Department,  
Rutgers University,  
rphill@eden.rutgers.edu  
Pamela Tolbert, School of Industrial  
and Labor Relations, Cornell University,  
pst3@cornell.edu

International Liaison Committee
Chair: Tom DiPrete  
Sociology Department  
Box 90088  
Duke University  
Durham, NC 27708  
phone: 919/660-5612  
email: tdiprete@soc.duke.edu

Members:
Marshall Meyer, Wharton School of  
Management, University of Pennsylva-  
nia, 215/898-6992,  
meyer@xman.wharton.upenn.edu  
Toby Parcel, Ohio State University,  
614/292-8235, parcel.1@osu.edu  
Patricia Yancey Martin, 3119 Brock-  
ton Way, Tallahassee, FL 32312,  
pmartin@coss.fsu.edu

Visit the Organizations, Occupations and Work page on  
the World Wide Web at:  
www.princeton.edu/~orgocckw
Calls for Papers

1996 ASA Meetings, New York City

Please send papers for the following OOW-sponsored sessions:

New Information Technologies: Implications for Work and Organizations
Organizer and chair:
Professor Kathleen Carley
Department of Social and Decision Processes
College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Carnegie Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
carley@andrew.cmu.edu

The Organized Economy: Research on Economic Institutions
Organizer and chair:
Professor Heather Haveman
Johnson School of Business
Cornell University
Ithaca NY 14853
haveman@johnson.cornell.edu

Are Organizations and Occupations Gendered?
Organizer and chair:
Professor Christine Williams
Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences
202 Junipero Serra Blvd.
Stanford CA 94305
williams@casbs.stanford.edu

Refereed and Discussion Roundtables
Co-Organizers:
Professor Donald Tomaskovic-Devey and Professor Catherine Zimmer (both:)
Department of Sociology
P.O. Box 8107
North Carolina State University
Raleigh, NC 27695
don@server.sasw.ncsu.edu, cathy-zimmer@ncsu.edu

Work and Occupations invites you to submit your manuscripts for peer review and possible publication. Now in its 23rd volume, WO is a scholarly, sociological quarterly that publishes original, research articles in the sociology of work, employment, labor, occupations and professions. Consult the latest issue of WO for manuscript formatting and submission instructions. Manuscripts will not be returned. Send three copies of your paper to: Daniel B. Cornfield, Editor, Work and Occupations, Box 1811, Station B, Department of Sociology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235. Inquiries may be directed to the Editor at this internet address: cornfidb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu

8th International Conference on Socio-Economics. July 12 - 14, 1996, Geneva, Switzerland. The theme of the 1996 program is the “Socio-Economic Foundations of a Just Society.” The program organizers encourage sessions and papers that focus on the building of trust and institutions that promote the development of just and fair societies. This is an important theme at this moment in history as welfare states are under attack and, in some instances, being dismantled. In some cases nation states are disintegrating. Indeed, this is a time of considerable institutional change. The Program Committee intends to develop sessions that will make important contributions to theoretical understandings and policy initiatives addressing the conference theme. Deadline for session proposals: January 2, 1996; for papers: January 16, 1996; deadline for offers to be moderator/chair: April 1, 1996. Contact: SASE, 2808 Central Avenue SE, Albuquerque, NM 87106 USA, TEL: +1-505-277-5081, FAX: +1-505-277-4215; E-MAIL: sase@unm.edu

The Association Latinoamericana de Sociologia del Trabajo (Latin American Association for the Sociology of Work) is a new professional association which issues a new Spanish-language journal, Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios del Trabajo (Latinamerican Journal of Research on Work), that includes English-language abstracts of the articles. For membership information, contact the president, Francisco Zapata, Centro de Estudios Sociologicos, El Colegio de Mexico, Camino al Ajusco 20, CP 01000 Mexico D.F., MEXICO; fax: 645 04 64. For journal subscription information, contact the editor, Dr. Enrique de la Garza, Apartado Postal 55 536, 09340 Mexico D.F., MEXICO; EGL @ XANUM. UAM-MX; fax: 525 724 47 89. For more information, contact Dan Cornfield, (615) 322-7535; fax: (615) 322-7505; cornfidb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu.
Call for ElectroPublishing

Administrative Science Quarterly has gone all modern on us, establishing a list server to facilitate exchanges of ideas over the net. Cool.
To Subscribe:
(1) Address an email message to: asq@umich.edu.
(2) Type the following on the subject line: ASQ listserv subscription
(3) In the body of the message:
   (a) Type your e-mail address on the first line (please proof it to make sure it is correct)
   (b) Type your name and institutional affiliation on line 2.
(4) Send the message. You will be notified that your subscription has been received. If you do not receive notification within several days, please subscribe again.

To Send a Message:
(1) Type the message as the body of an email message.
(2) Specify the topic of the message in the subject line.
(3) Send the message to: asq@umich.edu

Messages received will be distributed in digest form (all messages received since the last posting will be sent to your email address as a single message) to keep from cluttering your in-box.

Book Sampler: A Non-Random, Non-Systematic Collection

Nota Bene: I intend this sampler to include recent books, and I define recent as 1995. There are, though, a few books here from 1994. That transgression will not be repeated.


Interesting thinker asks why states organize their economies in such different ways, and uses the emergence of the railroad industries in three countries to empirical ground his answer. A masterful, well written comparative application of institutional theory to problems of political and economic organization.

Mauro F. Guillen, Models of Management: Work, Authority, and Organization in a Comparative Perspective, Univ. of Chicago Press.

Stunning achievement. A remarkable comparative historical analysis of the impact of scientific management, human relations theory, and structural analysis on organization theories, management writing, and management practice in the U.S., U.K., Germany and Spain over seventy years. Roll over, Reinhard Bendix.


A brilliant synthetic analysis of the political orientations of professionals, demonstrating the interacting roles of work context and occupational subcultures in shaping the heterogeneous political positions of the most highly educated members of the work force.

Mark Granovetter, Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers, University of Chicago Press.

Pivotal book on transmission of information about jobs gets a new preface, a new afterward, and a reprint of “Economic Action and Social Structure: The Problem of Embeddedness.”

Albert O. Hirschman, A Propensity to Self-Subversion, Harvard University Press.

From the creative political economist, these twenty essay he casts his sharp analytical eye on his own ideas, questioning and qualifying some of his major propositions on social change and economic development. He also forays into new puzzles, such as the likely impact of the Eastern European revolutions of 1989 on the Third World, the on-and-off connections between political and economic progress, and the role of conflict in enhancing community spirit in a liberal democracy. Also, rare autobiographical fragments deepen our understanding of how the author’s penetrating insights have taken shape.


“Deeply imperfect,” the NYRB reviewer said, “also exhilarating.” Big treatment by a big player at the New Republic of immigration issues, class, and the new nature of the U.S. economy.

Clever economist reflects on some of the most fundamental concerns of economists over the past two centuries (also said things sociologists would be interested in). In fifteen essays, Coase evaluates the contributions of a number of outstanding figures.


New one from the ever-engaging author of *Choosing the Right Pond* and "if homo economicus could choose his own objective function, would he choose one with a conscience?" The subtitle says it all.


What causes conflict among high-level American corporate executives? How do the executives manage their conflicts? Based on remarkably candid interviews with over two hundred executives and their support personnel, Morrill provides an intimate portrait of these men and women as they cope with problems usually hidden from those outside their exclusive ranks.


Up-to-the-minute, review of the institutional approach to organization theory, with ample attention to related literatures, from a central progenitor of neo-institutionalism.

Naomi R. Lamoreaux and Daniel M.G. Raff, *Coordination and Information: Historical Perspectives on the Organization of Enterprise*, Univ. of Chicago Press.

Case studies from the late 19th and early 20th centuries explore the relationship between coordination and production technologies, regulation, and coordination within industrial districts. The authors are economists, but the stories our gris for the sociologists' mill.


Marta Tienda and David Grusky have a series with Westview called "Social Inequality Series". Here are some titles:

- James Baron, David Grusky, and Donald Treiman, *Social Differentiation and Social Inequality*.
- David Grusky, editor, *Social Stratification: Class, Race, and Gender in Sociological Perspective*. (text)


Applies a feminist and environmentalist approach to how the global economy affects rural women, land ownership and use, cropping systems, and women's work with animals in highly industrialized as well as developing countries.


Explores the large-scale impacts of economic restructuring in the Midwest in response to the 1980s farm crisis. Working from surveys, authors analyze farm restructuring and its social, economic, and political consequences.


Powerful and deeply felt collection of essays that examines the context and consequences of the controversy. Includes essays by Eleanor Norton, Anna Smith, Leon Higginbotham, and members of Hill's legal team.

Amartya Sen, *On Economic Inequality*, Oxford University Press.

Classic text with a new introduction in which creative economists relates the theory of welfare economics to the study of economic inequality. He presents a systematic treatment of the conceptual framework as well as the practical problems of measurement of inequality. Sen assesses various approaches to measuring inequality and delineates the causes and effects of economic disparities.


"If you are a woman alive today," opined Leslie Stahl "you will recognize yourself on every page of Kathleen Hall Jamieson's brilliant new book about the progress of women as leaders. There are catch-22s for women—or double binds, as she calls them—where whatever we do, we lose. But Jamieson shows how we have surmounted these binds in the past and in the process moved forward. And she's confident we will continue to."

continued on page 14

A concise and authoritative account of the future prospects for the Chinese economy, this volume brings together distinguished contributors to cover recent policies and trends. An essential reference in its field, the book covers the likely directions of economic strategy and gives good coverage to all the main issues.


Powerful and absorbing account of the model of factory management and organization that the Chinese communists formulated from 1949 to 1953. She reveals that their "new" management techniques were adapted from Soviet propaganda during the harsh period of Stalin's postwar reconstruction.


What kind of state structure facilitates industrial transformation? Evans explains the conditions under which state intervention helps and hurts local entrepreneurs, in a comparative analysis of the emergence of computer industries in Brazil, India and Korea.


Leading sociologists critically confront their legacy. The eight original chapters survey the issues that defined the department's agenda: the focus on deviance, race, and ethnic relations, urban life, and collective behavior; the renewal of participant observation as a method and the refinement of symbolic interaction as a guiding theory.


Tells the story of what the 1988 closing of the Chrysler assembly plan in Kenosha, WI, meant to the people who lived in that company town. Dudley describes the painful, often confusing process of change that residents of Kenosha, like the increasing number of Americans who are caught in the crossfire of deindustrialization, were forced to undergo.


Inequality has been increasing in the United States. Is this trend or aberration? The authors compare patterns of inequality in the U.S., Asia, Australia and Europe to understand the relationship between global economic trends, local industrial institutions and inequality in cross-national perspective.


Why have both the United States and Great Britain been unable to create effective training and work programs for the unemployed? Integrating extensive, previously untapped archival and documentary materials with an analysis of the sources of political support for work-welfare programs, King shows that policymakers in both the United States and Great Britain have tried to achieve conflicting goals through these programs.


Based on interviews with 100 of the most active philanthropists in New York, as well as quantitative analysis of gifts by hundreds of additional donors, Ostrower analyzes the connection between elite philanthropy and nonprofit organizations, with attention to variation among donors and among sectors of the nonprofit world.


Focuses on the various types of organizations within the movement and how they serve as the base for advocacy and reform.

Jennifer Hochschild, *Facing up to the American Dream: Race, Class, and the Soul of the Nation?* Princeton University Press.

A chilling analysis of the alienation of African-Americans from the American dream. Helps explain why many middle-class African-Americans were pleased by the O.J. verdict.


Why identity politics is sometimes rational, how Bosnian conflicts can result from rational behavior, and what kinds of institutions you need to shift the balance.

Joel Rogers and Wolfgang Streeck, editors, *Works Councils: Consultation, Representation and Cooperation in Industrial Relations*, Univ. of Chicago Press.

An international survey of works councils and their role in bargaining and relation to the state in nine countries.


An institutional analysis of how historical patterns shape debates and limit solutions to America's most pressing social dilemmas.


The author of *Democratic Eloquence* has produced a very different kind of book an organizational history spanning 124 years that uses a single orphanage — Chapin Hall — as a vehicle for
exploring the meaning of family, childhood, and child welfare from the Civil War to the present.

Ivan Light and Carolyn Rosenstein, Race, Ethnicity, and Entrepreneurship in Urban America, Aldine DeGruyter.

Compares 272 largest SMSAs to examine entrepreneurship of different ethnic groups and explores implications for urban economic development.


An analysis of the Jewish immigrant experience in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, demonstrates how an ethnically insulated entrepreneurial niche economy enabled the Jewish community to survive and, at times, prosper in a small industrial town.

Roger V. Gould, Insurgent Identities: Class, Community and Protest in Paris from 1848 to the Commune, Univ. of Chicago Press.

Gould documents a shift from class to neighborhood as the organizational basis of collective resistance and collective identity between 1848 and 1871.

Christopher H. Achen and W. Phillips Shively, Cross-Level Inference, University of Chicago Press.

So what does this have to do with organizations? Try using variables that aggregate individual attributes or behavior to the organizational level, and you'll see. An useful reference for research across the organizational and individual levels.

Frank J. Weed, Certainty of Justice: Reform in the Crime Victim Movement, Aldine de Gruyter.

Focuses on the various types of organizations within the movement and how they serve as the base for advocacy and reform.


Globalization and the declining ability of states to control their own economies will challenge future living standards throughout the world, say the authors, who set out a policy agenda for softening the blows.


A history of the federal system's decline, from an organizational perspective, notes the baleful effects of decentralization, lack of coordination, and malign neglect on the U.S.'s ability to collect the information needed to make sensible policies.

George E. Peterson, editor, Big-City Politics, Governance and Fiscal Constraints, The Urban Institute.


Chip Berlet, editor, Eyes Right! Challenging the Right Wing Backlash, South End Press.

Organizational theory in action, as the authors prescribe community organizing strategies to stymie the new right.


Who says that leftists can't teach at business schools? Wharton School Sage Edward Herman revisits the relationship between markets and democracy, arguing that the victory of the market has ushered in a consumerist politics and a corporate hegemony.


How can it be that Congress and the center of policy discourse keep moving to the right at the same time American's responses to public opinion polls stay firmly on the center left. According to this economic/organizational analysis of electoral politics, one-man one-vote has become one-dollar, one-vote, with the people the losers.

Donald A. Wittman, The Myth of Democratic Failure: Why Political Institutions are Efficient, Univ. of Chicago.

Another economist applying economic approaches to the political system, but with a difference — this one argues that democratic institutions are just as efficient as markets, and that markets are just as inefficient as democratic institutions. A challenging contribution to institutional analysis.


What happens to professional expertise when the professional hits the real world? Based on interviews with professional planners, this book explores the compromises these professionals make when confronted by politics and budgetary constraint.


Case studies of scientific discoveries, along with some heavy ontological discoursing, show the role of social factors in the development of science and in the way that scientists do their work.

Michele H. Bogart, Artists, Advertising and the Borders of Art, Univ. of Chicago Press.

Historical analysis of the links between high and commercial art, describes the change of artists' professional identities and the emergence of new professional roles like that

continued on page 16
Three books that will arm you to argue with Republicans:

Sheldon Danziger and Peter Gottschalk, America Unequal, Harvard Univ. Press.
Explains why an unusual convergence of economic expansions and increasing poverty has exacerbated inequality in the U.S during the past 15 years, and why budget cutting will make things worse.

Think Newt’s welfare reform will work? Take another puff— even if those cast off the welfare roles can find job, most of them won’t pay enough to raise families. Suggests adding some carrots to the stick.

Two economists investigate empirically the effects of increases in minimum wages in New Jersey and California and demonstrate that economic orthodoxy is wrong: higher minimum wages have no malignant effects on jobs, prices, or employee benefits.

American Sociological Association
1722 N Street NW
Washington, DC 20036