From the Chair

By Paula England, University of Arizona (england@u.arizona.edu)

The Section on Organizations, Occupations, and Work is the second largest in the ASA. Members' interests span areas that are often seen as quite distinct literatures -- organizations, stratification, labor process, labor markets, economic sociology, race, class, and gender, to name a few. The challenge that faces this section, as I see it, is to maintain a dialogue between these areas of sociology, so that the centrifugal forces that so many believe are threatening our discipline don't overwhelm even sections of the discipline.

My hope is that those who study social organization and organizations will not become disconnected from those who study stratification of various types. Another concern I have is that scholarship on gender and race be "mainstreamed" into scholarship which has other questions as its central focus, rather than being "ghettoized." These concerns were on my mind as I chose topics and organizers for the 1999 Annual Meetings program (listed in this issue). Organizers for sessions not specifically about race or gender have agreed to be pro-active about including at least one paper looking at the topic through the lens of gender or race. Several sessions mix sub-areas of the section in interesting ways. As usual, other sections have been eager to co-sponsor sessions with us.

I encourage all of you to find ways to participate in the intellectual dialogue across the cross-cutting areas represented by our Section at the ASA meetings and elsewhere.

What Do We Mean When We Say Something is Gendered?

By Paula England, University of Arizona (england@u.arizona.edu)

When scholars of gender say that an organization, a set of state policies, or a cultural form is gendered, what do they mean? It isn't crucial that we all mean the same thing by this term, but we should clarify the sort of claim we are making. Sometimes it means merely that men and women behave differently and are in different positions in the organization (or other entity) that we are labelling "gendered." While it is easy to get people to agree that virtually everything is gendered on this definition, it contains no claim about what social forces produce the gendering. Even sociobiologists believe that everything is gender differentiated!

Sometimes we mean more -- that the entity we call gendered is producing some of the gendering. Within claims of this stronger sort, one can distinguish between whether we are claiming "disparate treatment" or "disparate impact," to borrow terms from federal employment discrimination law that distinguishes between treating persons differently by race or sex (disparate treatment) and facially neutral policies that have a disparate impact. For example, a systematic preference of men to women for promotion, even when qualifications are the same, is disparate treatment, whether the treatment is codified in written policy (the "smoking gun") or not.

Disparate impact is when rules or practices explicitly use criteria other than sex as decision rules, but have different effects on men and women precisely because they are differently situated (sometimes for reasons produced outside the entity we are calling gendered). For example, tying wages or promotion to seniority will have different effects on men and women precisely because women are more likely to leave employment for child rearing, although it does not treat men and women with the same seniority differently. U.S. case law treats disparate impact as discrimination unless the employer can show that the criterion is "job-relevant" (e.g. helps them select more productive workers). We might want to call the practice gendered anyhow, but we should clarify that disparate impact is what we are claiming.

Some claims complicate the distinction between disparate treatment and impact. We may claim that a facially gender-neutral criterion was originally chosen because it advantaged men, or in a way that depended on articulated or tacit assumptions about gender. This is a stronger type of disparate impact claim than one in which the criterion was chosen in less sexist fashion. There are sometimes contentious and hard-to-demonstrate claims. Sometimes it may make our case more cleanly to simply point out the disparate impact. This depends, of course, on our purpose.

(Reprinted from the Winter 1996 issue of the ASA Sex and Gender Section Newsletter.)

Greetings from your incoming OOW newsletter editor: Rosemary Wright, Department of Social Sciences and History, Fairleigh Dickinson University, Madison, New Jersey 07940. If you have suggestions or submissions, please e-mail them to me at wright @ alpha.fdu.edu. Additional information is on page 13 of this issue.
Gender and Organizations: Converging Theory, Research, and Practice

by Patricia Yancey Martin, Florida State University (pmartin@coss.fsu.edu)

The following comments are offered as an hypothesis, not a "finding" based on systematic study. I have participated in many of the developments I describe, however, having worked as an organization sociologist and gender scholar over many years. I want to thank Ronnie Steinberg for inviting me to participate in the 1998 ASA session for which these comments were prepared, which was a panel on "Integrating Gender Into Mainstream Sociology."

What is that hypothesis? It is that gender has infiltrated, if not outright invaded, and improved, organization scholarship. The case for my claim is as follows.

Despite differences in theoretical, methodological, and substantive approaches, practically all organization sociologists agree on one point, which is that organizations (especially work organizations) are central features of contemporary society. Most adults below age 65 spend a large proportion of their waking hours working "in organizations." As the primary instruments of market capitalism and employers of citizens in developed economies, organizations are also sites where people create identities and meaning. As Arlie Hochschild recently reported (in Time Bind), some of us find work more rewarding than home and family life. Although organizations take many forms and we who study them do so in diverse ways, their pervasiveness and centrality are reason enough to take them seriously.

At a Simmons College meeting in June, 1998, Dana Britton reported that her computer search for the phrase "gendered organizations" produced more than 300 cites. Less than ten years ago, before Joan Acker's paper ("Hierarchies, jobs and bodies: A theory of gendered organizations," Gender & Society 1990) was published, few of us knew the phrase "gendered organizations." Dana's search confirms, for me, that gender has "invaded" the organization field. How has this occurred? While there have been a number of factors in the theorization and study of organizations resisting gender's intrusion, gender has gone on and interjected itself anyway, as the following points suggest.

The Resistance of Organization Sociology to Gender Analysis

1. Many gender scholars view organizations as "places" -- sites, arenas, contexts -- where gender is pervasively present, enacted, and consequential. Gender scholars in multiple disciplines (including sociology, anthropology, psychology, economics. No single theory or group of scholars is hegemonic. The field is easily entered by anyone who claims to be working in it. Its multiplicity of theories, approaches, and groups is both a strength and a weakness.

A strength is that multiple approaches in the form of theories and questions are available for studying organizations in their full complexity. A weakness is that our work fails to cumulate, partly because scholars in one discipline or sub-field are either unfamiliar with or unwilling to cite work by scholars in other disciplines or sub-fields. Small groups of mentors and collaborators cite each other's work, review each others' papers, help each other publish, and decide whether to award grant funding. As reported in our journals, organization sociology is done by such groups of highly inter-linked people.

2. Some of the dominant theories are narrow in scope, meaning they account for only a few processes, structures, or phenomena. This situation is not all bad; some do a good job addressing their issues. Due to narrowness, however, collectively we need several different theories to capture the full range of organizational dynamics that occur and to fully explore the place and significance of organizations in society.

3. In the U.S., less so in the UK and Europe, the theories that organization sociologists use tend to be positivist and deductive, rather than social constructionist and inductive. Furthermore, they do not focus on internal dynamics such as members' agency, struggles over control or influence, or identity.

4. Dominant organization theories assume that members' gender is irrelevant to organizational structure, process, impact, and so on. Given their concepts and premises, furthermore, they cannot readily take gender into account, although some can more easily than others. Among the least able to incorporate gender are bureaucracy, resource dependency, and population ecology, whereas institutional/neo-institutional theory is intermediate in its capacity to do so. The most capable are post-modern theory, post-structural theory, discourse analysis, critical theory, labor process theory, and feminist therapy, although many scholars who use these latter theories still ignore gender.

5. While this is changing, most organization sociologists are still men. Men dominate particularly in the theoretical areas that are least able to incorporate gender. Men may fail to see the significance of gender in organizations because they do not perceive that their gender matters, e.g., they may fail to view their advantages of status, pay, and opportunity as related to their status as men.

6. In spite of these inhibiting factors, organization sociologists have recently begun to pay considerable attention to compositional conditions and effects, including gender. To understand why, we need to turn to gender scholarship.

The Infiltration of the Sociology of Gender

1. Many gender scholars view organizations as "places" -- sites, arenas, contexts -- where gender is pervasively present, enacted, and consequential. Gender scholars in multiple disciplines (including sociology, anthropology, psychology, economics. No single theory or group of scholars is hegemonic. The field is easily entered by anyone who claims to be working in it. Its multiplicity of theories, approaches, and groups is both a strength and a weakness.

(Continued on Page 3)
2. Many gender scholars start from the premise that work organizations are masculinist (building on Acker, among others), thus drawing attention to the structures and dynamics of this condition. Kanter pointed us in this direction over two decades ago. She concluded that women act bossy, controlling, etc. at work because they are stuck in dead-end jobs; their location, not sex role socialization, accounts for the negative ways women are viewed at work. Yet Indsco's management was characterized by a "masculine ethic" and most managers and top salespeople were men. Gender "was there," she concluded, even if theories of power, opportunity, and numbers -- rather than sex role socialization -- were needed to account for it.

3. Gender scholars view organizations as gendered in multiple ways, partly because they conceptualize gender as a social institution (Connell; Lorber). To say that gender is a social institution means that gender is an enduring system of social relations that includes at least the following elements: a status system for individuals (boy/man, girl/woman); an ideological system that explains why and how men and women are different and differently valued (Calas and Smirich); a stratification system reflecting social, political, cultural and economic conditions (Reskin; England); identity and meaning for individuals (Pierce, Kondo); cultural discourse (including accounts that justify gender's relevance) that groups use for varied ends (Thorne, Martin); practices or actions/agency -- at individual and collective levels -- that people display and assert in relation to gender, within the societal system of gender relations (Leidner, Hall, Pringle, Fletcher); and a social construction that is both locally situated and societally produced, resisted as well as complied with (Pierce, Ong). Like other institutions, gender is complex and multi-faceted; exists on both micro and macro levels; has normative, ideological, and behavioral components; and is often talked about and framed in ways that contradict behavior.

4. Many gender scholars view organizations as embedded in -- surrounded by or enclosed in -- the gender institution. If organizations are built upon a foundation of gender, the transcendence of gender at work would be unusual. Acker argues that the so-called gender-free "empty job slot" to which organizations recruit presumes the life of a man because "a worker" is someone not encumbered with pregnancy, breastfeeding, child-care, or other non-paid work obligations. A worker must prioritize organizational commitments over home and family demands, and, in the general case, men are better able to do this than women.

5. Just as the study of organizations tends to be dominated by men, the study of gender tends to be dominated by women. Women's experiences of inequality in organizations prompt them to pay attention to the dynamics that produce them. Women have a vested interest in making gender in organizations explicit and visible; men have a vested interest in the opposite. The numbers of women in sociology, women who "experience gender at work", and sociologists who study gender are all growing. These conditions portend continued attention, as an area of inquiry, to gender in organizations.

6. Gender and organization scholars are studying men at work, thus undermining assumptions that gender is primarily about women or relations between men and women. Critical studies of men, masculinities, and masculinity politics reveal how men qua men behave in organizations (Collinson and Hearn; Maier and Messerschmidt; Cheng). This line of inquiry is gaining attention from a growing number of sociologists, thus fostering a convergence of organization and gender studies. A number of examples come immediately to mind.

Convergences of the Two Areas of Inquiry

Theory. Students of gender in organizations (Calas, Smirich, Pringle, Ferguson, and Martin) use one or more of the following theories: social-constructionism, deconstruction, post-structuralism, post-modernism, critical theory, critical realism, and feminist theory. Most of these theories emphasize the agency of individuals and groups of individuals as women and men, and nearly all frame organizational dynamics as at least partly political in nature.

A focus on power, political struggle, and the politics of organizational life frames members as having potentially conflicting identities and material interests, along with the agency to act, including to resist. Many scholars study race, sexuality, age, and social class, as well as gender, and often find that these dynamics are conflated with each other, as well as with "official" organizational dynamics.

Viewing organizations as sites for identity politics is a focus of, for example, Raeburn's study of gay and lesbian networks inside multi-national corporations. Feminist mobilizations "inside mainstream institutions" such as the military and the Catholic Church (Katzenstein) and "the state" (Reinelt) show how collective resistance inside bureaucracies can challenge entrenched structures and practices.

Since theory directs our attention and research, a theory that ignores gender orient us to ignore gender. Sociologists who study and teach about organizations will, in my view, ignore gender or view it as an after-thought until our dominant theories take it into account. Theories that frame gender (and other status-based distinctions and related practices) as fundamental aspects of organizational structures, cultures, and practices will require us to take gender into account -- to ask if, how, and where gender is implicated. While such theory will leave us free to discover that gender is irrelevant, it will also require us to consider that gender is relevant.

Research. Gender research has framed organizations in the following ways: as instruments of social stratification, systemically purveying advantage and disadvantage; as sites for identity and self-construction; as sites where men construct (Continued on Page 4)
and enact masculinities, create communities of relations and meaning, and shape their identities as men; as sites where "gender serves as a cultural resource" that members use in contradictory ways, including to assert gender's irrelevance; and as sites for creating feminist organizations, with goals and practices that resist "institutional" pressures to imitate the mainstream.

Research areas where gender and organization have most extensively converged are organizational demography, organizational ethnography (Kondo, Leidner, Traweek), and social movement dynamics in organizations, e.g., around gender and sexuality (Katzenstein, Farrell, Eisenstein). Dozens of books have been written on gender and work, many of them with an organizational focus and/or taking the organization into account as context. New journals have appeared, such as Gender, Work, and Organization and Women in Management in the UK. Countless articles and book chapters have appeared in journals and edited volumes.

Practice. In recent years, the media have drawn attention to gender in organizations. Women's failure to rise in hierarchical organizations has drawn attention to gender dynamics in promotion and advancement. Women's pay disadvantages have been documented and reported. The devaluation of women's jobs has increased awareness among men of penalties associated with "women's work". Celebrated sexual harassment cases (Tailhook, Clarence Thomas) have raised awareness of the dynamics of sexuality, as well as gender, in organizations.

Conclusion

Does it matter if theory and research on organizations ignore gender? Yes, it does. If gender structures and dynamics are "at play" in organizations, and we ignore them, our theories and research produce flawed understanding (Thorne). One reason to understand gender at work is that women, who comprise a growing proportion of the labor force, deserve a fair shake in the form of the opportunity to obtain jobs and other rewards based on qualifications and performance, not on gender. Another reason is that men's predominance in the most powerful jobs in the most powerful organizations -- business, government, education, and the military -- makes attention to masculinity in organizations imperative (Collinson and Hearn).

Turning to practice, if men who occupy the seats of power in such organizations enact "destructive" kinds of masculinities under the guise of behaving as "gender-free" bureaucrats, capitalists, or scientists, we all have a stake in understanding this situation (Maier and Messerschmidt). If practices such as competing to win at any cost or to always be in control are exposed as gender prescriptions, not required ways of "doing business," men and children, as well as women, can benefit.

In my view, research and theorizing about gendered organizations will increase. I do not believe that gender permeates every aspect of organizations, but neither do I accept the premise that organizations are gender-free. Turning to the social organization of work, both paid and unpaid, the dynamics of gender create a lode of sociological inquiry that is rich, deep, and promising. The study of the dynamics of race/ethnicity, sexuality, and age, in addition to gender, would enhance both even more.


Editor's Note: While Pat Martin's piece reviews the current invasion of organizational studies by gender, a related piece just published by Joan Acker asks where the intersection of the two areas might lead in the future. It is "The Future of 'Gender and Organizations': Connections and Boundaries," Gender, Work and Organization, 5(4): October 1998, pp. 195-206.

CATHY (©) Cathy Guisewite. Reprinted with permission of UNIVERSAL PRESS SYNDICATE. All rights reserved.
Careers of Life Scientists: Dimensions, Causes, and Implications of Recent Trends

By Mary Frank Fox, Georgia Institute of Technology (mf27@prism.gatech.edu)

With a charge to analyze trends in the training and early careers of life scientists, a committee appointed by the National Research Council recently released its report, Trends in the Early Careers of Life Scientists (Washington, DC: National Academy Press, 1998). In its recommendations, the report urges the life-science community to "constrain the rate of growth in the number of graduate students [so that] there is no further expansion in the size of existing graduate-education programs in life sciences and no development of new programs, except under rare and special circumstances" (p. 5).

By numbers of indicators, life sciences in the United States have been a phenomenal success. The research enterprise is large and vigorous, funded in 1997 with over $32 billion for health-related research and development from the federal government, private foundations, and industry; and $5 billion for agricultural and environmental research from government and private support. Investment in life sciences has produced results leading to new strains of disease-resistant and high-yield crops of plants, methods of managing sustainable resources for future generations, understanding of the molecular basis of numerous diseases resulting in the elimination of some and containment of others, and knowledge about the arrangement of genes and behavior of biological macromolecules.

Underlying the structure of this scientific enterprise is an uninterrupted flow into the field of highly trained, skilled, and motivated young persons, who, as graduate students and postdoctoral fellows, do most of the experimental work. Among cohorts of newly minted doctoral-holders, the expectation has been that, following a period of training, they would be able to pursue their own scientific ideas in permanent positions. The premise, in turn, rests upon continuous expansion of independent research positions — and signs are, that premise is eroding. The rapid growth of academic science positions occurring in the 1960s and early 1970s slowed down, but the growth of Ph.D. recipients did not. The generation of life scientists trained in the last ten years are finding it increasingly difficult to find permanent positions using their research training.

In brief, the data are these: Since 1987, the number of doctorates awarded in the life sciences by US universities has risen 42%, from about 5,000 annually in the mid-1980s to more than 7,600 in 1996. However, the number of life scientists holding faculty positions at research universities has increased only 2.5% a year; industry appointments have risen 7% each year; and employment in government laboratories has grown only modestly. In consequence, five or six years after receiving their doctorates, up to 38% of life scientists are unable to establish themselves in independent research positions, and, instead, are holding post-doctoral fellowships, non-faculty jobs in universities, are employed part-time, or working outside of science. In 1973, the comparable proportion was only 11%.

What about "alternative careers" for the current supply of life scientists? Doctoral recipients in science have been encouraged recently to consider positions in law, finance, or journalism, for example. But the committee finds that opportunities in these areas are fiercely competitive; they often require special preparation or certification; and none makes full use of the hard-earned research skills of the scientists. Tellingly, in 1995, only 7% of life science Ph.D.s held full-time positions outside of academia, industry, or government nine or ten years after receiving their degrees.

Basic to both the problem — "over-supply" of life science Ph.D.s — and the struggle for solutions — including curtailed Ph.D. production — are established "stakes in the status quo." Federal funding for life-science research is expected to continue to grow, and graduate students and post-doctoral fellows have been the groups conducting the experimental work in laboratories, supported by research funding to the principal investigators. Growth in research funding, however, does not ensure that trends in obtaining permanent jobs will improve, and "potential conflicts of interest can arise between trainers and trainees" (p. 6). The quality of training that students receive as research assistants has little or no surveillance from funding agencies. Thus, in another recommendation, the committee "encourages all federal agencies that support life-science education and research to invest in training grants and individual graduate fellowships" (p. 6) as preferable for doctoral education. No evidence exists that the career outcomes of students supported by training grants exceed those of students supported by research grants; but because training grants are subject to stringent review of the training processes themselves, they offer pedagogical advantages.

In addition, in order to promote informed decisions about careers, the committee recommends that "accurate and up-to-date information on the career prospects in the life sciences and career outcome information about individual training programs be made widely available to students and faculty." Further, as one antidote to the protracted intellectual dependence of postdoctoral fellows upon the research projects of their supervisors, the committee recommends that public and private funding agencies establish and annually award some 200 career-transition awards to promising fellows, giving them "financial independence to begin new scientific projects of their own design in anticipation of obtaining fully independent positions" (p. 7).

The study was funded by the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, the Burroughs-Wellcome Fund, and the National Research Council. The Committee members are: Helen Astin (UCLA), William Brinkley (Baylor College of Medicine), et al.
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Medicine), Mary Dell Chilton (Novartis Biotechnology), Michael Cummings (Marine Biological Lab/Woods Hole), Ronald Ehrenberg (Cornell), Mary Frank Fox (Georgia Tech), Kevin Glenn (Seattle), Pamela Green (Michigan State), Sherrie Hans (Pew Charitable Trusts), Arthur Kelman (NC State), Jules LaPidus (Council of Graduate Schools), Bruce Levin (Emory). J. Richard McIntosh (Colorado), Henry Riecken (Pennsylvania), Paula Stephan (Georgia State), and Shirley Tilghman, chair (Princeton).


Committees Announce 1998 Awards

Max Weber Award to Elisabeth Clemens

The 1998 Max Weber Award Committee (consisting of Robin Leidner from Penn as chair, Lee Clarke at Rutgers, and Heather Havemann from Cornell) has awarded the 1998 award to Elisabeth S. Clemens for her book, The People’s Lobby: Organizational Innovation and the Rise of Interest Group Politics in the United States, 1890-1925. In giving the award, the committee noted that this work combines meticulous historical investigation with strong, inventive sociological theorizing. It examines how it happened that during the Progressive Era groups which felt that the political parties didn’t serve their interests developed both the public legitimacy and the organizational capacity to act politically on what they defined as their own group’s interests. It follows the successes and failures of three groups (organized labor, farmers, and women) as they sought political power, assessing their national impact and comparing their experiences.

While the book deserves to be acclaimed by political, comparative/historical, and other non-organizational sociologists, its central concerns are organizations and organizing, as it looks at the processes by which new organizations arise and at how these organizations shape people’s sense of identity and efficacy, experiment with new structures and tactics, and struggle to cope with changing opportunities. Clemens’ work contributes to institutional theory, provides a great deal of historical detail, and helps us see how some things we take for granted about how the world works (for example, that citizens with shared political interests will feel free to act collectively to promote those interests) were in fact 20th century innovations, accomplished by canny organizational actors.

CHECK OUT OUR WEB SITE:
http://www.northpark.edu/acad/soc/owo/

James A. Thompson Award to Michelle Budig

The 1998 James A. Thompson Award Committee (comprised of Holly J. McManus of Vanderbilt as chair, Patricia McManus at Indiana, Brian Uzzi at Northwestern, and John Walsh at the University of Illinois, Chicago) has awarded the 1998 award to Michelle J. Budig of the University of Arizona for her paper, "Male Tokens in Female Dominated Occupations: Are They Riding a Glass Escalator?"

In making the award, the committee commented that using Kanter’s tokenism theory, Acker’s/Williams’ theory of gendered organizations, and expectation states theory, the paper investigates the effect of token status on men’s and women’s pay, both cross-sectionally and longitudinally. It finds that while men are advantaged in terms of pay at any single point in time in all sex composition categories, over time, token males’ wages grow more slowly than women’s wages in female dominated occupations.

SSSP Labor Studies Awards to Erica Schoenberger and Ruth Milkman

Peter Meiksins reports that the Labor Studies Division of SSSP gave the 1998 Distinguished Publication Award to Erica Schoenberger for her book, The Cultural Crisis of the Firm. In so doing, they cited its innovative analysis of corporate inability to respond to new forms of competition. Arguing that corporate inertia is not the result of lack of information, but that corporate social organization and culture create obstacles to change, the work challenges orthodox views of corporate culture, capitalist competition, and globalization.

Along a similar track, the division also awarded an honorable mention to Ruth Milkman for her work, Farewell to the Factory, calling it an elegant and exemplary case study of the reorganization of the American automobile industry. It shows that many displaced auto workers have few regrets about leaving the factory, in spite of losing high-paying jobs, while those who remain are actively interested in participatory forms of work, but find that the very managers who tout such initiatives are the greatest obstacles to implementation.

Call for OOW Involvement

You will notice in this newsletter that the names of people involved in section activities are frequently the “usual suspects,” i.e. they are people who have been involved in section activities in the past. We welcome the involvement of additional people. I encourage members to contact me if you’re interested in serving on a committee, and/or Katharine Donato, Nominations Committee Chair, if you’re interested in serving on Council.

Paula England, University of Arizona (england @ u.arizona.edu)
**Calls for Award Nominations**

**Max Weber Award**

The Max Weber Award is for an outstanding article or book (in alternating years) published over the past three years on topics of organizations, occupations, or work. The 1999 award will be for a published article, and the deadline is March 1, 1999. Authors or Section members may nominate papers. To nominate, send 3 copies of the article, 3 copies of a brief justification of your nomination, and nominee contact information (including e-mail) to Ronald Breiger (committee chair), Visiting Professor, Department of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-9430. (805-893-2768; e-mail: breiger@sscf.ucsb.edu)

**James A. Thompson Award**

The James A. Thompson Award is given for an outstanding graduate student paper (published or unpublished) on topics of organizations, occupations, or work, written in the three years prior to the award. The winner receives $300 for travel to a professional meeting and serves as a representative to the Section Council that year. The nomination deadline is March 31, 1999. Authors or Section members may nominate papers. To nominate, send 3 copies of your nominee's paper, 3 copies of a brief (1-page) justification of your nomination, and nominee contact information (including e-mail) to Joseph Galaskiewicz (committee chair), Department of Sociology, Social Sciences Building, University of Minnesota, 267 19th Avenue S, Minneapolis, MN 55455 (612-624-7548).

**SSSP Labor Studies Distinguished Publication Award**

The Labor Studies Division of SSSP also announces the competition for the 1999 Braverman Award. The award recognizes an outstanding graduate student paper that builds on the legacy of the late Harry Braverman. The award consists of a $200 cash prize and recognition at the SSSP Banquet, held in conjunction with the annual meetings.

Submission Information: Please send 3 copies of submissions by March 1, 1999 to Heidi Gottfried, Chair of the Braverman Award Committee, Purdue University, 614 Eberwhite, Ann Arbor, MI 48103. (e-mail: davidfl@concentric.net)

**Call for ASA Section Papers**

The following sessions are being organized under the OOW banner for the 1999 ASA meetings in Chicago.

**Session 1**
Title: Race, Gender, and Other Labor Market Inequalities
Organizer: Joan Hermsen
Address: Dept. of Sociology, U. of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211
Phone: 573-884-1420
E-mail: socjmh@showme.missouri.edu

**Session 2**
Title: Self-employment and Business Ownership: The Critical Link Between Organizations and Careers
Organizer: Howard E. Aldrich
Address: Department of Sociology, CB#3210, U. North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3210
Phone: 919-962-5044
E-mail: howard_aldrich@unc.edu
Session 3
Title: Failure, Accident, and Mistake in Organizations and Professions
Organizer: Lee Clarke
Address: Department of Sociology, Rutgers University, 54 Joyce Kilmer Ave., Piscataway, NJ 08854-0845
Phone: 732-445-5741
E-mail: lclarke@rci.rutgers.edu

Session 4 (Joint with the Section on Sociology of Law.)
Title: Law and Inequalities of Race, Class, and Gender
Organizer: William Bielby
Address: Department of Sociology, University of California, Ellison Hall, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-9430
Phone: 805-893-3228
Fax: 805-893-3324
E-mail: bielbyw@sscf.ucsb.edu

Session 5
Title: Special Session
Note: This session will have invited papers.

Session 6
Roundtables on Organizations, Occupations, and Work
Organizer: Richard Arum
Address: Department of Sociology, U. of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721
Phone: 520-621-3480
Fax: 520-621-9875
E-mail: arum@u.arizona.edu

Session 7 (Joint with Sex and Gender Section)
Title: Job Constraints on Family Life
Organizer: Jennifer Glass
Address: Department of Sociology, W140 Seashore Hall, Univ. of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242
Phone: 319-335-3745
E-mail: jglass@blue.weeg.uiowa.edu

Session 8 (Joint with Science, Knowledge, & Tech Section)
Title: Organizations, Work and Technical Knowledge
Organizer: Kelly Moore
Address: Department of Sociology, Barnard College, Columbia University, 3009 Broadway, New York, NY 10027-6598
Phone: 212-854-3039
E-mail: km104@columbia.edu

Special Session
Title: A Conversation With Sociologists in Business Schools
Organizer: Nicole Biggart
Note: This is an invited panel.

Calls for Non-ASA Papers

SSSP Labor Studies Division
The following sessions are being organized for the 1999 SSSP meetings in Chicago.

Session I. Issues in Working Time
Organizer: Valerie Carter
Address: Bureau of Labor Education, 5713 Chadbourne Hall, University of Maine, Orono, ME 04469-5713
E-mail: valerie@maine.edu

Session II. The Changing Conditions of Academic Work
Organizer: Fernando Gapasin
Address: UCLA Institute of Labor Relations, Box 951478, Los Angeles, California 90095-1478
E-mail: fgapasin@ucla.edu

Session III. The State of Labor Publishing
Organizer: Laurie Graham
Address: Labor Studies, Indiana University at Kokomo, Box 9003, Kokomo, Indiana 46904-9003
E-mail: lgraham@iukfsl.iuk.indiana.edu

Special Issue of Work and Occupations on "Ethnicity, Race, and Gender in the Workplace"
The increasing diversity of the workforce compels us to look at how ethnicity and gender intersect with other axes of stratification such as class in the placement, treatment, and collective life of workers. This special issue of Work and Occupations is looking for theoretical or empirical (qualitative and quantitative) articles that further our understanding of the interacting effects of ethnicity and gender on social inequality in the workplace.

Possible topics include, but are not limited to: ethnicity and gender in employment relations, organizational careers, and wage attainment; network ties, employer practices, and occupational segregation by ethnicity and gender; union organizing among race-ethnic minorities and women; employment in ethnic enclave economies; the politics and effectiveness of affirmative action and comparable worth; and legal and illegal immigration and employment issues.

(Continued on Page 9)
Completed papers should be sent by December 1, 1998 to receive full consideration, and should be sent to Jennifer L. Glass, guest editor of the special issue, at the Department of Sociology, W140 Seashore Hall, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242 (e-mail: jennifer-glass@uiowa.edu; fax: 319-335-2509).

Special Issue of Work and Occupations on “Time At Work: Implications of Changing Patterns of Time Use for the Sociology of Work”

Changes in technology, the organization of work, family structures, and life situations have altered the conditions of workplace scheduling and pacing. These changes have highlighted the importance of the measurement and markers of time for the study of the workplace, as well as the subject of time at work to negotiation, social controls, and political policy. Work and Occupations will publish a special issue devoted to the implications of changes in the meaning and patterns of time in the workplace. The editors invite scholars to submit papers focusing on issues of time in the workplace based on empirical investigation, as well as the meaning and interpretation of work time by men and women at all levels of the occupational hierarchy.

Possible topics for this special issue include the advent of the “24 hour” work day in many professional, corporate, and industrial spheres; the growth of part-time work; the use of flexible scheduling arrangements such as flextime and job sharing; changes in the meaning of concepts such as the “work week,” “full-time,” “overtime,” and “retirement” in different historical periods and social contexts; and variations in work schedules and the number of hours worked by people of different race, ethnicity, age, and gender groups. This list is intended only to be suggestive, and the editors are open to a wide variety of topics (and methods of studying these topics) related to the theme.

Short proposals and questions may be sent now to either Cynthia Fuchs Epstein (cepstein @ email.gc.cuny.edu, fax: 212-642-2420) or Arne L. Kalleberg (arne_kalleberg @ unc.edu, fax: 919-962-7568). Completed manuscripts must be sent to Cynthia Fuchs Epstein (Dept. of Sociology, Graduate Center, City University of New York, 33 West 42nd Street, NY, NY 10036) or Arne L. Kalleberg (Dept. of Sociology, Hamilton Hall, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-3210) by September 15, 1999.

Marginal Employment Papers for Research in the Sociology of Work

Papers on marginal employment are solicited for Volume 8 of Research in the Sociology of Work, JAI Press. All aspects of marginal employment will be considered, including part-time work, temporary work, inadequate pay, and irregular employment. The editor encourages empirical (both quantitative and qualitative) papers, as well as conceptual and theoretical papers and international comparative studies. Specialists in the field are also encouraged to review and synthesize their research. Policy relevant papers are also encouraged for this volume.

Please submit papers in duplicate by April 15, 1999 to Randy Hodson, Editor, Research in the Sociology of Work, Sociology Department, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210 (e-mail: r.hodson@osu.edu, telephone: 614-292-8951). Please contact the editor for further information.

Special Issue of Sociological Focus on “Work and Family Conflict: Antecedents, Implications, Remedies.”

Scholars and practitioners conducting original research related to this theme are invited to submit papers to: David J. Maume, Jr., Director, Kunz Center for the Study of Work and Family, P.O. Box 210378, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0378 (telephone: 513-556-4713; fax: 513-556-0047; e-mail: david.maume @ uc.edu). Deadline for submission is December 1, 1998.

General Call for International Sociology

International Sociology, the journal of the International Sociological Association, invites submissions on themes of social change, development and modernization, with their significant recent extensions -- globalization and world economic, political, and cultural systems -- which have gained new life with the expansion of markets, democracy, the rule of law, and human rights. A new editor, Said Amir Arjomand, is committed to the promotion of these and other significant themes, including but not limited to religious transformation, the growth of modern culture, transnational social movements, institutional reconstruction, ethnic and national conflicts, genocide, civil war, and social disintegration. He invites contributions to and readership of this journal, and may be reached at the State University of New York at Stony Brook at e-mail: sarjoman @ notes.cc.sunysb.edu.

Position Announcements

Assistant/Associate Professor
University of California at Davis

The Department of Sociology at the University of California at Davis invites application for a tenure-track position for a Sociologist of Organizations. The rank of the position is at the assistant or associate level. This is a full-time, nine-month teaching appointment to begin July 1, 1999. Since the individual hired will have substantial responsibilities to the undergraduate Organizational Studies program, we are particularly interested in advanced junior applicants, and junior and senior applicants with a proven track record.

(Continued on Page 10)
Applications should include a cover letter describing teaching and research interests, a curriculum vitae listing published or unpublished papers available for review, and the names, addresses, and phone numbers of three references. Applications received by December 1, 1998 are assured full consideration, though the position will remain open until filled. Applications should be mailed to the Chair, Organizations Recruitment Committee, Department of Sociology, University of California at Davis, Davis, CA 95616. The University of California at Davis is an Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Employer with a strong institutional commitment to diversity among its faculty and staff.

Postdoctoral Position and National Research Service Award, University of Minnesota

The University of Minnesota is pleased to announce a postdoctoral position and National Research Service Award, sponsored by the NIMH, on the psycho-social determinants of mental health and adjustment in childhood, adolescence, and the transition to adulthood. Full-time, 12-month research training will be provided for a 2-year period. This interdisciplinary program emphasizes the changing social contexts of development; early life course trajectories of mental health and behavioral adaptation; longitudinal assessment and analysis; at-risk populations; and social policy. A series of core seminars and a research apprenticeship are key program elements. Program members include core faculty members from Sociology, the Institute of Child Development, and the School of Public Health’s doctoral program in Health Services Research, Policy and Administration.

U.S. citizens or residents are eligible. The award provides an annual stipend in accordance with NRSA guidelines, tuition, fees, and medical insurance. Postdoctoral candidates who have received a Ph.D. in a social science discipline or an equivalent degree such as an M.D., public health, or nursing degree by September 1999 should provide a letter describing current research interest, a complete vita, university transcript, three letters of recommendation, and samples of written work. For consideration, send these materials to Professor Candace Kruttschnitt, Life Course Center, Dept. of Sociology, 1014 Social Sciences Bldg., 2677 19th Avenue South, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455. The deadline is January 5, 1999 for admittance in September 1999. The University of Minnesota is an equal opportunity educator/employer.

U.S. Postal Service Commission on a Safe and Secure Workplace

The National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA), a non-profit, pro-active think tank, seeks staff for an independent commission to study workplace violence. Staff will be based in Washington D.C. Ideal candidates will be talented, motivated individuals with experience and skills in statistical analysis, industrial organization and psychology, employment law, labor relations, management, violence prevention, and related fields. Positions include senior research associate (PhD/Masters with 10+ years of experience), research associate (Masters with 5+ years of experience), research assistant (Bachelors with 2+ years of experience).


Members’ Book Corner

Editor’s Note:

In the spirit of the book listings included in the ASA Footnotes, I am introducing a section of the newsletter announcing new books by and/or of interest to OOW members.

Prompted by a member’s submission, this initial list consists of that submission supplemented by several books recently sent to Contemporary Sociology for review in that journal’s section on Work, Organizations, and Markets. I thank Don Tomaskovic-Devey, Contemporary Sociology co-editor and OOW Council member, for putting an initial list together. Please note that while Don provided the list, I substantially shortened the summaries, and any errors of omission are mine alone.

I am looking for a volunteer to put this section of the newsletter together in future issues. Until another name appears here, listings should be e-mailed to the editor in the following format. We will include them on a space-available, first-come, first-served basis.


Summary: This study of fishery-dependent communities in Northern Norway and Atlantic Canada examines the implications of common market integration, privatized resource management, and small business development policies for those communities in terms of long-term sustainability and participatory democracy.


Summary: In this book, economists and scholars from other disciplines use standard economic tools to investigate the formation and evolution of normative
preferences, arguing that an adequate understanding of how an economy and society are organized and function cannot be reached without an understanding of formation and mutation of values and preferences that determine how we interact with others.


Summary: The purpose of this book is to demonstrate how prostitution takes on greater social meaning at certain times and becomes the target of public, media and state action. The author's focus is on how particular forms of the business of prostitution were produced as visible and regulatable social problems from the 1970s through the 1980s.


Summary: This book investigates the interface between the body and the machine in an ethnography of computer engineers. Drawing on interviews, observations, and personal interaction with engineers, the author seeks to understand how deeply society and machines are configured through one another.


Summary: This book studies women involved in science and engineering in a high school genetics class, an internship for prospective engineers, an environmental action group, and a nonprofit conservation agency. In these scientifically marginal situations, the authors found relatively high proportions of women who were successful at learning and using technical knowledge, advanced in roughly equal percentages to men, and generally enjoyed their work, but who also enjoyed less prestige and received lower financial compensation than their male counterparts.


Summary: This study presents the results of the first analysis of labor market data from the Samples of Anonymous Records in the 1991 British Census, drawing comparisons with research results for the USA and other Western European countries. The author identifies a new category of integrated occupations, employing men and women equally in highly qualified work; the diversification of part-time work; the emergence of a new category of marginal jobs; and the expansion of student jobs.


Summary: Based on interviews with physicists at universities across the United States, this book offers a detailed and intimate account of the worlds in which scientists work. These personal narratives reveal dreams of fame and glory, give an inside look at the details of careers in science, and examine ambition by describing how the forces driving people in their professions persist or fade over time.


Summary: This work combines scholarly essays with personal narratives, interviews, and reports, to present the perspectives of sex workers in many different countries. Viewing them as working people who should enjoy both human and workers rights, it documents their movements to resist marginalization and exploitative working conditions.


Summary: In this comparative ethnography, the author describes how women workers in Hong Kong participate in a management system characterized by "familial hegemony," while women workers in China's Guangdong province find an internal system of control and power based on a regime of "localistic despotism."


Summary: Over the course of the twentieth century the popular perception of America's giant corporations has undergone an astonishing change from condemnation to respect, even reverence. This work shows how large companies such as AT&T and U.S. Steel created their own "souls" in order to reassure consumers and politicians that their size and influence posed no threat to democracy or American values. In so doing they transformed the culture of capitalism.


Summary: This book analyzes the forces shaping and reshaping the global automobile industry. It combines scholarship about lean production in Canada, the United States, and Mexico with a new perspective about the alternatives available.


Summary: The author argues that Republicans of an earlier era developed the fundamental principles underlying modern labor policy. By examining a series of judicial rulings from 1900 to 1930, she shows that the emphasis on
establishing the procedural rights of workers usually associated with the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 actually emerged in the 1920s in Republican-formulated labor legislation.


Summary: This volume uses original research to assess the innovative capacity of voluntary organizations. It provides a conceptual framework for understanding these organizations and empirical evidence about the nature and extent of innovation. It discusses the applicability of the for-profit model of innovation to non-profit organizations and the contingent nature of voluntary organizations' relationship to their external environment.


Summary: While the deregulation of labor law in the European Union was thought to be a spur to lasting employment growth, the results of facilitating fixed-term contracts have been far from those expected. Drawing upon research and analysis, this is a discussion of how legal, sociological, and economic labor market theories contribute to an understanding of atypical employment.


Summary: Examining the lives of fifty retired African American women, four aspects of those lives — the women's processes of survival and resistance; the importance of church and education; how they came to be in the work force, and their struggles to overcome racial bias and adversity in the pre-civil rights era — are explored to show the importance of overcoming stereotypes and focusing on the potential for such women to be role models.


Summary: Designed for undergraduate courses in work or industrial sociology, this text explores the development of and life in industrial societies, encouraging students to consider important issues such as the power of organizations, the U.S. economy's shift from a manufacturing base to a service base, and the development of a world economy.


Summary: This book explores the history and nature of our dependency on other animals and its implications for human and animal health. Writing from an historical and sociological perspective, the author discusses animal domestication and the consequences of human exploitation of other animals. The account raises important questions about the increasing intensification of animal use for both animal and human health.


Summary: Contrary to widespread belief, Japan's acclaimed management strategies are neither novel nor Japanese, but are based on Scientific Management imported from the United States at the turn of the century. A "revised" Taylorism that combines mechanistic efficiency with respect for the humanity of labor has influenced not only Japanese workplaces, but also economic growth, social policy, and political authority in modern Japan.


Summary: Nonprofit organizations are becoming increasingly like private firms. The transformation is bringing a shift in financial dependence from charitable donations to commercial sales activity with little-recognized consequences. This book is a set of coordinated studies of why fund-raising for non-profits is mimicking that of private firms and what consequences it is having.

Highlights of 1998 Business Meeting

Nicole Bigart and Robert Nelson were elected Chair-Elect and Secretary-Treasurer, respectively. Also elected to OOW Council were Ray Friedman and Peter Meiksins.

The Weber and Thompson Award winners were announced, as described elsewhere in this issue. It was decided that the Thompson Award winners should participate in the OOW Council meetings in the years in which they are awarded their prizes, rather than wait for the following year to participate. The criteria for the Weber award were debated at length, but left flexible.

Steve Vallas was thanked profusely for his three years of service as editor of the OOW Newsletter. Rosemary Wright is taking over as editor, starting with the Fall 1998 issue. It was decided that whoever holds this position should automatically become chair of the publications committee and a member of OOW Council. As part of that committee, Frank Steinhart has taken over responsibility for the OOW web page.

(Continued on Page 13)
For their contributions to the 1998 program, Bill Bridges as program committee chair and Karen Miller-Loessi as membership committee chair were also especially recognized. (See Ollilainen letter below.)

As outgoing chair, Barbara Reskin presided over most of the business meeting. At the end, as is traditional, the incoming chair, Paula England, assumed office.

Graduate Student Thank-You

Editor's Note: The following letter was forwarded to the newsletter by Karen Miller-Loessi to encourage graduate students to participate and to become involved in the section. Please pass it along to your students!

August 31, 1998

Dr. Karen Miller-Loessi
Arizona State University

I just wanted to thank the OOW section for arranging the session during which senior researchers were talking about their research and you for sending letters of invitation to graduate programs about it. It was a great opportunity for graduate students to meet with scholars whose work they read and use in their own research.

I had an interesting talk with Pat Martin whose work I have been reading for years. It was exciting to learn about her recent research and also to share ideas about my own dissertation project. In the four ASA meetings that I have attended as a graduate student, this was by far the best networking session arranged by the OOW. I hope to attend another meeting like that in Chicago.

Thank you again,
Marjukka Ollilainen
Virginia Technological University

About OOW and Its Newsletter

This newsletter is published twice a year for the members of the American Sociological Association's Section on Organizations, Occupations, and Work. The Fall 1998 issue is the first prepared by OOW's incoming newsletter editor, Rosemary Wright of the Florham-Madison Campus of Fairleigh Dickinson University.
Membership Committee
    Michael Sacks, Northwestern (Chair)
    Others to be announced

Nominations Committee
    Katharine Donato, Louisiana State (Chair)
    Irene Browne, Emory
    Roberto Fernandez, Stanford

Publications Committee
    Rosemary Wright, Fairleigh Dickinson (Chair)
    Frank Steinhart, North Park
    Others to be announced

Thompson Award Committee
    Joseph Galaskiewicz, Minnesota (Chair)
    Marcia Bellas, Cincinnati
    Winifred Poster, Illinois

Weber Award Committee
    Ronald Breiger, Cornell, UCSB (Chair)
    Christine Bose, SUNY-Albany
    Mark Chaves, Arizona

Program Committee
    Paula England, Arizona (Chair)
    Richard Arum, Arizona
    Michelle Budig, Arizona
    Carmen Garcia, Arizona
    Andrew Jones, Arizona