Message from the Chair
Heather Haveman

It is an honour to serve as chair of the OOW section – one of the largest, most vibrant, and most intellectually central sections in the ASA. In beautiful bilingual Montréal (“the largest English-speaking French city in the world”), we had an amazing number of paper submissions, far more than our allotted paper sessions and roundtables could accommodate. Thanks to last year’s organizers: Kim Weeden and Roberto Fernandez (open-topic paper sessions); Christabel Rogalin, Dennis Heinrich, Ana Campos and Amit Kapoor (roundtables); Mary-Blair Loy (joint session with Sociology of the Family section); and Kevin Leicht (author-meets-critics session with New York Times reporter Louis Uichitelle, author of The Disposable American). Together, you created a wonderfully coherent, yet diverse, program.

In Montréal, we had a great turnout of over 45 people for our session’s great innovation, a professional development workshop for junior faculty members and senior doctoral students. This was held on Thursday, August 10th, the day before the start of the main conference. Panelists included Kevin Leicht, Mary Fennell, Arne Kalleberg, Beth Rubin, Steve Vallas, Michael Wallace, and me. This informative event culminated in a great OOW-sponsored dinner that the organizer, the energetic Kevin Leicht, managed to arrange for a bargain-basement price – proving that although there may be no such thing as a free lunch, a skillful negotiator can provide champagne-quality dinner and drinks on a beer budget.

For the 2007 meetings in New York, the BIG Apple, we have a projected 6.5 sessions to
accommodate presentations, because we have topped the 1,000-person threshold. As of the end of October, the section has 1,046 members. The section’s superb website, managed by our web guru, Frank Steinhart, lists all the organizers (http://www.northpark.edu/sociology/oow/). Following the “grounded conference” system initiated by my distinguished predecessor, Kevin Leicht, open-topic paper sessions will be organized by Mark Mizruchi and Phil Cohen. Together, they will sort out whatever papers you dream up, expertly slotting them into sessions that span the full range of our section’s interests, from the most macroscopic studies of interorganizational communities to the most microscopic studies of individual workers. Roundtables on a similarly wide array of topics will be ably organized by Lisa Catanzarite and Chris Marquis. Last but certainly not least, Erin Kelly will organize a session on “Emerging Issues in Family and Work,” that OOW will sponsor jointly with the Sociology of the Family Section.

We have three great committees that are considering nominations for the sections three prizes:

1) The Max Weber prize for the best book (committee: Cathy Zimmer, chair; Jerry Karabel; Jeff Sallaz),
2) The W. Richard Scott prize for the best article (committee: Brian Uzzi, chair; Matt Huffman; Kate Stovel), and
3) The James D. Thompson prize for the best paper by a graduate student (committee: Mauro Guillén, chair; Jake Rosenfield; Elizabeth Popp-Berman).

Last year’s award winners have graciously agreed to serve on these committees, so I have faith in their judgments. Information on how to nominate a book or paper for these awards is on our section’s web page (http://www.northpark.edu/sociology/oow/).

The University of Oregon’s Work in Progress editorial collective – Ann Shirley, Roxanne Gerbrandt, Nick Lougee, and Jeff Gunn – with their stalwart faculty advisor, Patricia Gwartney, are doing a superb job of creating the newsletter, as they have for the past two years. In addition to the most recent newsletter, you can find an archive of newsletters going back a full decade on the section’s website (http://www.northpark.edu/sociology/oow/).

Let me conclude by thanking the council members for 2006-07 for their work this year and next: Jennifer Glass, Chair Elect; Kevin Leicht, Past Chair; Maria Charles, Secretary/Treasurer; and Council Members Michael Wallace, Cathy Zimmer, Kim Weeden, Mary Blair-Loy, Erin Kelly, and Phil Cohen. And a final extra-loud kudo to Frank Steinhart in recognition of his gracious and never-failing service to the section as guru of the section’s website. He has been doing this for eight years now, and deserves our (virtual – but heartfelt) applause.

Heather A. Haveman
Section Chair,
Columbia University
and University of California, Berkeley

---

Keep our community strong by renewing your OOW section membership. It’s easy and it takes only a few seconds. Just go to the ASA’s website (http://www.asanet.org/page.ww?section= Join+or+Renew&name=Join) and renew your ASA membership, then renew your membership in the OOW section, and any other sections.
NOTES FROM OOW’S FIRST
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR
by Nicholas Lougee

For the first time ever, OOW offered its members a Professional Development Seminar on August 10, 2006 at the American Sociological Association annual meeting. Below are notes taken by Nick Lougee, a University of Oregon doctoral student.

THE JOB MARKET IN SOCIOLOGY
- Define yourself as broadly as you can in your cover letter and *curriculum vitae* (c.v.).
- Short list comprises about 20 people or less, from 200-300 applicants.
- Do not fear rejection – it is going to happen no matter what. Remember: You only need one job.

What if I do not have any peer-reviewed publications? Should I only apply to lower ranked schools than my PhD-granting institution?
Consider taking a post-doc position.
- Gets you new mentorship.
- Gives you another year or two to publish and improve your c.v. If you do not publish, however, it looks really bad, for if you cannot publish without teaching and administrative responsibilities, you will not be able to when you do have them.

Three tiers to consider in teaching vs. research institutions:
- Tier 1 (top 25-30): Smaller teaching load
- Tier 2: More teaching
- Tier 3: All teaching
- Few publications may move you down a tier.
- Be realistic about job prospects – get a reality check from your mentor.
- However, do not limit yourself – try for the long shot.
- Be a member of the search committee in your own department.

- Attend all possible job talks, brownbags, visiting professors’ colloquia, etc.

Avoid these early career killers:
- Obtaining all degrees from the same institution (BA, MA, and PhD).
- Staying in graduate school too long (eight years or longer).
- Becoming an academic nomad, i.e., two or more years in temporary positions. Find a post-doc position instead.

At what stage of the dissertation should I be when I go on the job market?
It is more important these days to be pretty much done by the time you are on the market.

Is there an ‘inside person’ problem when you could be competing against other junior faculty within the department?
Not so much, because most job postings at this level are genuine.

Networking is important, but not all-important.
Use it if you can, but mostly it is behind the scenes – they will call faculty at your school to see what type of candidate you are.

What should be the length of one’s c.v.?
Length is irrelevant. Being accurate and exhaustive is more important.
- A padded c.v. is bad
- Book reviews go under ‘book reviews,’ not publications
- Peer reviews go under ‘service.’
- Identify people you have worked for in T.A. and R.A. positions.
- Name dropping beyond your specialty area is not bad.
- A teaching statement is crucial (pedagogy, philosophy), in addition to evidence of your teaching record.
- A research statement is crucial. What have you done, where are you going, and where do you see yourself in five years? Describe your research trajectory
How many different letters of recommendation?  
Should each one be tailored to each job?  
The number is irrelevant. Your letter writers usually just write one. You can ask them to tailor it a bit, e.g., to emphasize something in particular, especially if the institution is looking for something specific. However, do not expect a mentor to write multiple letters on your behalf.

The Job Interview Process  
- Do your research – know the institution you are applying to – check the department website.  
- Early on, when people call you for interviews, delay the process if you can (it is a bit of a game). It gives you choices and allows you to synchronize opportunities.  
- Department politics – learn about it, but there is usually very little you can do about it. Try not to take sides.  
- Get an itinerary.  
- Interview – ask them about their research – let them talk – they love it!

The Job Talk  
This is the presentation of the self – very collectively important to the department.  
- People who do not want to put in the effort will only go to the job talk.  
- Your first presentation should not be at the interview. Practice your job talk, preferably in front of your whole department. This gets more variance in questions asked of you than your committee can provide.  
- Anticipate questions, prepare answers.

Getting Money for Your Research  
(Beth Rubin, Former Program Director, National Science Foundation)  
NSF is open to all topics, all methods (unless your dependent variable is health-related, in which case you should consult the NIH).  

Send a paragraph – do not call or visit. Email gets answered and is more effective.  
Send ideas to Jacqueline Meszaros directly (P.O.I.O.C.).  
NSF likes sociology, but we should all send in proposals to expand the overall role of the NSF in funding sociology.  
Funding opportunities exist in the NSF and are increasing.  
Econometric models are popular, but organizational approaches are gaining popularity – watch the website.  
Follow directions explicitly – it is an electronic system, so if it is bad, program officer won’t even see it.  
First summary page is the best indicator of whether or not it will get funded.  
No clear question means no money (might be reviewed, but it will not get money).  
Be very careful with the verbs that you choose, particularly the first one.  
- understand, describe, explore = no $ (too premature)  
- analyze = good; theoretically grounded, empirically testable questions only  
Send proposal to multiple sections. It increases your chances of success (absolutely cannot decrease them).  
Contact the program officer often – as many times as your ego can handle. Keep trying; make the adjustments that the reviewers suggest. Speak directly about your addressing these concerns (e.g. “in a previous selection reviewers mentioned…” and then address it.)  
Never turn down the opportunity to review an NSF proposal or other type of grant proposal. Qualitative proposals – must explain exactly where and how you are going to gain access to your data.  
You must get your degree before applying for an NSF grant - NSF does not fund individuals – it funds institutions, and only U.S. institutions.
The OOW Reception was held Friday evening, August 11, 2006. Awards were presented while participants indulged in delicious food and drink. Although competition from the nearby Sociology of Religion section kept presenters from using the microphone, OOW members adapted by getting up close and personal during the awards ceremony.

**Jake Rosenfeld** (left), a Princeton University graduate students, received OOW’s 2006 James D. Thompson Award for his paper entitled “Desperate Measures: Strikes and Wages in Post-Accord America,” which appeared in Social Forces 85: 235-65. Using previously unavailable U.S. strike data over two decades in the post-PATCO era of labor-management relations, he found that the longstanding association between strike intensity and higher average wages (i.e., lower inequality) no longer holds – not even in high union density industries and regions.

Elizabeth Popp Berman, a University of California-Berkeley graduate student, received an honorable mention for “Before the Professional Project: Success and Failure at Creating an Organizational Representative for English Doctors,” which appeared in Theory and Society 35: 157-91. Berman examined competing organizations’ attempts to represent the emergent medical profession in England in the early 1800s, specifically how an outsider organization successfully avoided hits and cooptation to become, eventually, the British Medical Association.

**Ryon Lancaster** (below) and **Brian Uzzi** (not shown) received OOW’s 2006 W. Richard Scott Award for Distinguished Scholarship for their article “Embeddedness and Price Formation in the Large Law Firm Market.” American Sociological Review 69: 319-44. They examined the social foundations of prices using in-depth interviews with corporate lawyers and archival data on law firms’ actual prices charged to clients.

OOO’s 2006 Max Weber Award went to **Jerome Karabel** (below), Professor, University of California, Berkeley, for The Chosen: The Hidden History of Admission and Exclusion at Harvard, Yale, and Princeton (Houghton Mifflin Press, 2005). The award committee – comprising Maria Charles (chair), David Grusky, and Hayagreeva Rao – described the book as “extraordinary …. Drawing upon more than two decades of historical research at the archives of the Big Three Ivy League universities – Harvard, Yale, and Princeton – The Chosen provides a rich and highly engaging account of changing admissions policies between 1900 and 2005, including the rise of ‘character-based’
admissions, the role of intercollegiate sports, systematic quotas on admission of intellectuals, decisions to admit blacks and women, and shifting understandings of affirmative action. The resulting narrative ... illuminates the power relationships and symbolic struggles that have shaped admissions policy at these elite institutions over the past hundred years. The Chosen also provides a lens for examining ... anti-Semitism, racism, market competition, and ... the civil rights movement. Karabel demonstrates ... how changing definitions of merit have been used by administration officials at the Big Three to advance specific organizational goals – most notably to remain attractive to members of the privileged class and to preserve institutional status in the highly stratified system of American higher education. ...

NOTES FROM KARABEL’S “AUTHOR MEETS THE CRITICS” SESSION AT THE ASA MEETING, 2006

by Roxanne Gerbrandt

Karabel’s award-winning The Chosen provided the grist for a jam-packed “Author Meets Critic” session on Sunday afternoon at the 2006 ASA Annual Meeting. The critics were Caroline Hodges Persell, Mitchell L. Stevens, and Paul W. Kingston. The session was organized by David E. Lavin.

The critics began with light-hearted complaints about the book’s length. This brought chuckles from the audience, especially those schlepping the titanic 711-page hardbound tome to and fro, thinking to themselves, “I hope this is worth it.” Gauged by the audience reactions, yes, the book is well worth the time, attention, and muscle strain.

The panel’s critics were exceptionally complementary of Karabel’s work. They did not, however, leave the author completely off the hook when it came to clarifying some of his assertions and arguments in The Chosen.

Mitchell Stevens commented upon how much of the text was reserved for the investigation and developing profiles the Big Three’s institutional leaders. Karabel did not give the same depth of biographical character to the students chosen and excluded. He responded saying that he deliberately focused the book on the colleges’ gatekeepers, rather than those “chosen” into the institutions. He explained his intention to examine the relationship between merit and power, particularly organizational leaders’ role in protecting institutional interests. Investigating their decision-making patterns reveals what the organizations protect. The power they exercise is arbitrary, but not random.

Caroline Hodges Persell asked for clarification on properties of merit. Additionally, she wondered what would have to change in order to structure greater equality. Karabel admitted that he was deeply ambivalent the concept of meritocracy. On one hand, he said, the idea of merit is better than ascription. On the other, he expressed concern that our dominant understanding of merit legitimates inequality by the cultural notion that everyone has an “equal chance.” Too many observers do not acknowledge the real differences between equal opportunity and equality of condition.

Karabel also talked about the climate of anti-intellectualism – a larger social trend also evident in the Big Three. The data clearly indicate that the colleges do not select students for their brilliance. Rather, they choose students to preserve institutional interests and status. He also noted that the selection processes are increasingly globalized, transforming these colleges into a training ground for the international elite.

Where does this leave smart American kids from the lower rungs of the socio-economic ladder? That conversation spilled into convention center hallways and into Montréal’s restaurants and streets. At least some conversations considered Karabel’s subtle and sobering message: Praxis in various collective forms altered systems of inequality in the Big Three in the past. The author inspired the audience to think about praxis for the future.
**SIX BOOK REVIEWS**


**Reviewer**: Brandon Olszewski, University of Oregon, bolszews@uoregon.edu.

In “Reorganizing the Rust Belt,” Lopez examines how social-movement style union organizing can invigorate service-sector locals, and how grassroots mobilization can help locals win victories. Through participation as an SEIU organizing intern, interviewing, and archival research, Lopez documents how locals succeeded in three predicaments: two campaigns by health care workers to win a certification election, a multi-site campaign against regional privatization of care facilities, and a two-year battle fought against a large, union-busting nursing corporation.

The success of these efforts largely hinged on a local’s ability to mobilize rank-and-file members to take an active position regarding their struggle. This was accomplished by talking with members about their concerns and working through latent antiunion beliefs. By actively organizing their constituency and framing their struggles in terms of social justice, not simply as union issues, locals effectively rallied the support of rank-and-file members and community partners in efforts to win an election at a care facility, beat back efforts at privatization, and maintained gains won in earlier contract negotiations despite vicious and illegal union-busting activities.

Lopez concludes that, although prevailing traditions of business unionism discourage an active rank-and-file constituency, movement-style unionism can succeed more than traditional organizing approaches in strengthening today’s unions. He also concludes that “attempts to turn organized labor from an ossified relic into a vital social movement” (p. 215) can promote a participatory model of union representation.

His study of Pennsylvanian SEIU locals uncovers organizational secrets to success:
1) A grassroots orientation and being rank-and-file intensive,
2) promoting diverse forms of collective action and protest,
3) building community coalitions, and
4) framing union battles as political and social justice issues.

These conclusions are promising because they suggest that successful unions are not anonymous bureaucracies, but instead promote understanding and activism about the power of labor versus the power of capital.


**Reviewer**: Nathan Dean Erickson, University of Oregon, nericks2@uoregon.edu.

Sheba Mariam George deserves credit for exploring new avenues for gender and migration literature. The title of her book, *When Women Come First: Gender and Transnational Migration*, gets right to the point. The author explores the reproduction of
gender in migration processes, but from the point of view of women who migrate before their families and their male counterparts. Specifically, she explores female nurses’ mass migration from southwestern India’s Kerala region to the United States. New intersections of class and status emerge when immigrant nurses provide middle-class incomes for their families, yet are often confined to a secondary status, both as immigrants and women.

George centers her analysis on Keralite cultural institutions, particularly the Indian Orthodox Syrian Church. Found in both India and the U.S., the church not only provides a link for cultural and financial resources between the two countries, it also carries with it traditional caste and gender hierarchies. Naturally, these traditions strongly influence patriarchal gender relationships at work, within households, and in the larger Keralite community, despite the nurses’ proven independence. George does an excellent job weaving these relationships into one coherent point: Gender is dynamic and is reproduced in a way that reflects the local setting’s cultural and economic terrain.

It is clear from the start that this book represents a personal project as much as an academic one. George was ten years old when her mother migrated to the U.S. as a nurse from Bangalore, India. George stayed behind with her father and brothers, reuniting with her mother two years later. Her familiarity with the setting offers personal insight often lacking in most research. In addition, her thorough ethnographic methodology lacks no effort in sociological and scientific rigor. Overall, this book is a pleasant read. I would recommend it for any course on immigration, gender, or qualitative research methods.


**Reviewer:** Ann Shirley, University of Oregon, ashriley@uoregon.edu.

**Fighting for Time** is a collection of articles focusing on time and work. It contains three main themes: effects on family life, time and organizations, and gender. While any chapter could interest an OOW member, I focus on those that pertain most to occupations, and work.

After an introduction by the editors, Jacobs and Gerson present an historical examination of how work time has increased over the last century. Presser describes how extended working hours pressures families. Fenwick and Tausig delve into the specific consideration of working night shifts and weekends, including family issues and stress-related health problems (primarily for those who did not choose their schedule).

Bluedorn and Ferris explore the concept of “temporal depth” in organizations, i.e., the focus on long-range growth rather than turning profits each quarter or year. They examine past as well as future temporal depth and how temporal depth relates to performance. A very interesting chapter by Stewart uses role theory to explain how bicycle messengers motivate themselves to perform, despite few job benefits and high risk of injury.

Sharone examines employers’ methods of motivating employees to work harder and for longer hours than required. At the engineering firm he studied, quarterly bell-curve style evaluations (which measure only how an individual worker...
compares to the other workers) foster a competitive environment that drives workers to perform. Collinson and Collinson’s chapter concerns gender and time management at work, specifically how women and men respond to pressures to put in extra work, either by working more intensely or by putting in longer hours.

Levin studies gender dynamics in the stock market’s trading pit. Traders’ days fluctuate from extremely busy, high-stress periods (work) to dull, eventless periods (play). He observes how gender’s meaning fluctuates between invisible and highly visible, depending on whether the traders were in a work cycle or a play cycle.

Blair-Loy’s chapter is another book highlight. Her study of women in executive positions in the finance industry examines how belief that the company will reward hard work and dedication drives these women to work long hours and to sacrifice other areas of their lives. Throughout their careers, some remained loyal to the ideology while others’ experiences caused them to reject it or become ambivalent about it.

Epstein examines women and men who break norms of gender roles and professions. Men involved in caring for their children receive different treatment depending on when they perform these tasks. They are generally applauded on weekends but regarded with suspicion on weekdays. Both women and men wanting to take advantage of the Family and Medical Leave Act must negotiate unofficial pressures to put work ahead of all other obligations, although interesting and distinct gender differences arise in how they handle these issues.

Overall, I think many OOW members will find a few chapters helpful and interesting. They cover a wide array of topics on issues in the Sociology of Time, as well as some interesting studies in Work and Organizations. I was a bit disappointed because the title implied a more critical look at the phenomenon of increasing time spent at work. I also would have expected a section on workers’ efforts to guard their free time. But reading this volume was certainly well worth my time.


Political Power and Corporate Control is a masterful treatment of the complex interplay between a nation’s political development and the governance styles employed in its corporations. Our era has seen Enron and a dozen other mega-corporations implode. In the ensuing criminal trials, we have heard testimony about $6,000 shower curtains and multimillion dollar birthday parties. More significant, however, may be the fact that U.S. public firms granted fully 10 percent of their value to senior managers through stock options in a recent ten-year period. Understandably, investors now seek protections from corporate managers gone wild.

Even so, there is no easy way to carve out corporate governance from the political systems from which the corporations have sprung. Gourevitch and Shinn argue that a nation’s corporate governance practices directly express its citizens’ economic preferences and political institutions, although these practices may change with major social changes or with changes across work systems, such as improved communications technology or new production processes.

The authors also consider whether governance is converging toward a best practice model or
diverging toward specific national models. They conclude that most national governance systems now fall into either the “corporatist compromise” or “transparency” models. Either way allows considerable opportunity to fall back into an Enron-producing managerism.

The book addresses the tension between “owner control” and “labor power” in considering minority shareholder protection. After considering two traditional class conflict models, the authors outline ways in which cross-class coalitions of workers and managers can influence corporate governance and, hence, minority shareholder protections. In one model, workers and managers “join inside blockholders to resist the pressures of external investors for transparency.” In another more novel model workers ally with external investors to fight against managers and blockholders.

The book, although dense, is readable. Its arguments, although extended and complex, are straightforward. Its case study format is effective. It accomplishes its mission to approach governance through a mix of “moral with practical concerns,” and it seems destined to be a standard in the field.

Reviewer: Roxanne Gerbrandt, University of Oregon, rox@uoregon.edu.

The Chosen traces the history of admissions in the “Big Three” – Harvard, Princeton, and Yale – encompassing the years 1900 to 2005. Written for both a professional and popular audience, the author’s findings counter most Americans’ belief that people in the U.S. have an equal opportunity to get ahead. By placing the theoretical elements in the footnotes and using pictures instead of graphs, the narrative draws the reader into the world of gatekeepers who use their position to shape access to elite higher education and to preserve the status of their institutions and clientele.

Karabel examines admission practices, as well as social conditions that shaped those practices. In so doing, he unearths the underlying selection and exclusion system. The Chosen guides the reader on an historical journey through the Big Three’s organizational practices. Contrary to official rhetoric, the organizational mission has been to maintain the institutions’ legitimacy while serving the elite’s needs, thereby justifying their privileged status. The colleges then serve as a certifying agency, validating their authorized clientele.

Karabel leans heavily on social reproduction theory, most notably Pierre Bourdieu’s works. He does not, however, explicitly utilize theory in the text. Greater development of the concepts of cultural and social capital would have contextualized the numerous pages dedicated to the various Ivy League social clubs. Such conceptual development would assist readers not familiar with the theoretical framework in understanding why social clubs are more important than intellectual cultivation in these coveted places of higher learning, where “the gentleman’s C” is acceptable for the social hierarchy’s noblesse. Academic criteria take a back seat to “approved character” and perceived capacity to occupy leadership positions in business and government. As Yale’s former chair of Admissions said, “If high academic ability were the only criterion, we would have to eliminate quite a few future presidents of the country…”

One of the author’s most important contributions is to expose these institutions’ organizational strategies for maintaining survival
and legitimacy. *The Chosen* presents a clear message that elite universities do not alter their definition of merit out of a sense of sympathy for the excluded. Rather than conscience, powerful social movements motivated them to change their organizational structures. Karabel explains how materialism and culture work in concert and persuasively argues that we must understand both in order to expand our dialogue regarding access and merit. This book is a “must” for all scholars of organizations, inequality, education, and social movements.


**Reviewer:** Nicholas Lougee, University of Oregon, vidiot@gmail.com.

Stephen P. Rice offers a refreshing conception of class formation around the discourse of technology in the antebellum period in his book “Minding the Machine: Languages of Class in Early Industrial America.” The innovation of industrial production during this period involved a radical restructuring of society. Transportation of goods and people across vast distances burgeoned during this period, as it was facilitated by increasingly ubiquitous railroads and steamships. Additionally, the increase in factory production and industrial work that this involved helped shape the character of labor identities. This transformation in the mode of production prompted a debate on the effects of mechanization in the productive process. Would the advent of machinery free workers from toil by supplanting menial labor, or would the production and maintenance of the machinery necessitate new forms of inherently degrading labor? Would this new labor dynamic work to equalize the divisions in labor, or would it more likely reproduce and even widen the divisions between rich and poor?

Rice explores this issue through the lenses of various labor movements at the time, such as the Manual Labor School Movement and the Mechanics’ Institute Movement, as well as through the perspectives of popular physiologists and those concerned about the seemingly irresolvable problem of steam boiler explosions.

Rice discusses the formation of class authority by the new middle class as a mitigation of class conflict. This mitigation occurred because the focus on the technological aspects of class relations confined the debate to less contested grounds. He applies the metaphors of “head and hand,” “mind and body” and “human and machine” to the concept of managers and workers, to demonstrate the way in which the interests of wage workers were simultaneously fused with and subordinated to the interests of the owners of the means of production. This reproduced a strong middle class and decreased class conflict.

Rice’s interpretation is an eloquent historical narrative that innovatively examines the discursive foundations of class consciousness in antebellum America. However, his pejorative slant on class conflict seems astructural at times, and even minimizes the importance of class conflict on labor relations. His lack of citation of other key labor scholars (such as Baran, Sweezy and Braverman, and Wallerstein) further suggests this bias. Although the book is well written and intriguing, Rice would benefit by consulting more directly the body of literature within political economy.

The *Work in Progress* editorial collective bids adieu to two founding members: Leontina Hormel, now Assistant Professor at University of Idaho, and Joel Schoening, who is completing his dissertation and entering the job market. Best wishes and congratulations!
Recent and Forthcoming Books


Is “community” in America in decline? If so, does this mean that charitable giving in the United States is also in decline? This innovative and original work offers new insights into this important issue.

Analyzing workplace charity in different cities across the United States, Contesting Communities shows that while traditional notions of community might be in decline, new types and visions of community have emerged. Barman traces how these different “communities” take the form of organizational competition between the United Way and new alternative fundraisers over workplace contributions.

Deftly blending sociological theory of organizations with archival research, interviews with nonprofit leaders, and original survey data, Contesting Communities ultimately shows that the meaning of community occurs almost incidentally to the wishes of those who give and the needs of those who receive.

Emily Barman is Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Boston University.


Rocked by a flurry of high-profile sex discrimination lawsuits in the 1990s, Wall Street was supposed to have cleaned up its act. It hasn’t. Selling Women Short is a powerful new indictment of how America’s financial capital has swept enduring discriminatory practices under the rug.

Selling Women Short reveals subtle structural discrimination that occurs when managers’, coworkers’, and clients’ unconscious biases influence performance evaluations, work distribution, and pay. In their own words, Wall Street workers describe how factors such as the preference to associate with those of the same gender contribute to systematic inequality.

This book reveals how the very systems that Wall Street established ostensibly to combat discrimination actually promote inequality. Roth closes with frank advice on how to tackle the problems, from introducing more tangible performance criteria to curbing gender-stereotyped client entertaining activities. Above all, firms could stop pretending that market forces lead to fair and unbiased outcomes. They don’t.

Louise Marie Roth is Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Arizona.


The rise of women’s small business ownership has received a great deal of attention in North America and industrialized countries around the world. In Female Enterprise in the New Economy, Hughes examines types of work entrepreneurial women pursue, satisfaction they derive from their work, and economic risks and rewards they face. Tackling a range of issues and theoretical assumptions, this book will interest a wide audience in sociology, public policy, organizational studies, and entrepreneurship studies.

Karen Hughes is Associate Professor, School of Business and Faculty of Arts, University of Alberta.


Several articles in this volume examine the role of organization in the politics of globalization and the political responses to globalization.
**ANNOUNCEMENTS (CONTINUED)**

**Recent and Forthcoming Books**


Martin uses an organizational sociology lens to question why society's representatives continue to commit a “second assault” on rape victims as they go about their jobs nearly 30 years after feminist activists documented this as wrong and developed policies to remedy it. The book’s answer: Their organizations require it.

Martin analyzes how three different types of organizations respond to rape victims: (1) Hospitals and medical personnel who conduct the forensic rape exam; (2) criminal justice organizations, including police, prosecutors, and judges; and (3) rape crisis centers and their staffs.

Rather than examining what she labels rape work in isolation, or as part of a social movement, Martin situates it in its organizational context. She defines “rape work” as labor involved in responding to a victim’s charge of rape, pursuing and punishing rapists, and educating society to prevent rape-takes.

The book also compares communities on their “political discourse” about rape and links political activities to organizational and community conditions. It includes chapters on the influence of gender and emotions on the practices and meanings involved in rape work. Martin concludes with suggestions for organizational and systemic reforms to reduce the harm done by rape workers who are, primarily, “just doing their jobs.”


This volume explores the changing nature of community in modern corporations. Community within and between firms – the fabric of trust so essential to contemporary business – has long been based on loyalty. Three decades of economic turbulence, downsizing and restructuring has largely destroyed this loyalty. Yet community is more important than ever in an increasingly complex, knowledge-intensive economy. This volume’s thesis is that a new form of community is slowly emerging – one more flexible and wider in scope than the community of loyalty, and that transcends the limitations of both traditional Gemeinschaft and modern Gesellschaft. We call this form “collaborative community.”


This book is based on a 5-year, 5-city ethnographic research project funded by the Annie E. Casey Foundation. The authors draw from, and aim to extend, theory from a strand of economic sociology as it pertains to economic mobility for low-income families. Their conclusions point to the need for both academics and policymakers to find a new approach to problems of poverty and social mobility.

The authors are happy to consult about the book’s possible relevance for courses. Reviewers note its relevance to courses in sociology, urban studies, education, labor studies, women’s studies, social welfare, and more. Contact Rehner Iversen (riversen@sp2.upenn.edu) for more information.

ANNOUNCEMENTS (CONTINUED)

Recent and Forthcoming Articles


Building on Hirschman’s classic exit, voice, and loyalty thesis, this research demonstrates how workers’ loyalty affects how they approach workplace problems. It compares workplace dispute resolution strategies (exit, voice, and toleration) in matched pairs of conventional and worker-owned cooperative organizations operating in three industries – coal mining, taxicab driving, and organic food distribution.

I find that workers with greater loyalty more often embrace “voice” as a way to address their problems. Although the “exit” patterns do not mirror the classic “exit-voice” framework, the data support Hirschman’s broader thesis, incorporating emotional involvement and entry/exit costs.


This research explores workers’ solidarity and shared culture in the cab driving industry, using theories of distributive and relational justice.

Cab driving culture involves high worker solidarity, with drivers relying on each other for assistance, working together in the face of conflict, and imposing various forms of social control when the cab-driving community’s norms are violated.

This article operationalizes actions such as “street justice,” through which both individual cab drivers and the group promote their occupational culture’s main goals: justice and safety.

New Program Announcement

MIT Sloan’s Economic Sociology (ESP) is a new PhD concentration aimed at training scholars who conduct leading-edge research that applies sociological tools and concepts to gain a deeper understanding of organizations and the economy. The program reflects the confluence of two trends that have gained increasing salience over the past 20 years:

1. the increasing demand in business schools for faculty with sociological training; and
2. the rapid growth of economic sociology as a sub discipline of sociology.

Each of these trends represents the growing recognition that the sociological conception of the economy sheds unique light on economic processes. And yet the increasing demand for economic sociology has not been met with a corresponding increase in supply. ESP is designed to help fill this gap.

ESP places heavy emphasis on research. While students gain experience in the classroom and graduates should be ready to teach in various programs, the faculty believe that the primary goal of PhD training is to acquaint the students with the processes by which great social science research is conducted.

The substantive research focus is on general mechanisms of social organization. While we believe that all researchers must have a deep understanding of the specific contexts that we study, our primary reason for studying a particular case (i.e., an organization or industry) is to use it as a “strategic research site” for understanding social mechanisms and processes that are present in various forms in many different contexts.

The ESP is catholic with regard to method. We believe that qualitative research (i.e., fieldwork, case studies, ethnography); quantitative research (e.g., surveys, archival databases, social network analysis) and modeling (e.g., systems dynamics, game theory, agent-based models) are each quite useful depending on one’s research objective.

ESP’s co-directors are Roberto Fernandez and Ezra Zuckerman. For more information, visit: http://mitsloan.mit.edu/phd/ar-esp.php
Calls for Papers

**Human Relations**

Special issue on “Workers, Risk and the New Economy”

The editors are soliciting papers on workers and risk. Topics might include:

- low-wage workers and economic insecurity
- migrant workers
- insecurity the management and negotiation of risk
- gendered and racialized experiences of risk
- dangerous technologies and the negotiation of risk
- risk and opportunity
- changes in risk over time
- the role of institutions in regulating risk
- international comparative studies of risk.

Other topics and all methodological approaches are welcome.

Papers will ideally address the antecedents, nature, and consequences of an aspect of risk. Ideally, they will also discuss how risk is new in its extent or its nature. Submissions must be based on original material not under consideration by any other journal or outlet.

The deadline for submissions is **13 July 2007**. Authors will be notified by the end of August 2007 about the status of their papers. The special issue is intended for publication in mid-2008.

Please submit papers online via [www.humanrelationsjournal.org](http://www.humanrelationsjournal.org) and direct questions to Alice Gilbertson at editorial@humanrelationsjournal.org or to any of the editors: Paul Edwards (P.K.Edwards@Warwick.ac.uk), Monder Ram, (Mram@dmu.ac.uk), or Vicki Smith (vasmith@ucdavis.edu).

**Social Forces**

Special Issue on “Age Discrimination”

*Social Forces* seeks papers for a special section on the sociology of age discrimination. Original papers are invited for consideration that address age discrimination and related phenomena across the life course and in a range of social contexts, including the area of work and employment. Papers might focus on the social processes, institutions and structures that cause or constitute age discrimination, or on social psychological and other consequences of age discrimination. Age discrimination is behavior and hence can be distinguished from ageist attitudes, but papers that analyze the relationship between ageist attitudes and age discrimination will be welcome. We are interested in papers dealing with age discrimination the USA but also in societies other than the United States, and papers that analyze the intersection of age discrimination and other forms of discrimination based on gender, race and class. Papers that make a theoretical contribution in this area will be particularly welcomed, as will empirical papers based on any sound methodological approach.

The special section will be edited by Victor W. Marshall, Department of Sociology, UNC at Chapel Hill and Director of the UNC Institute on Aging. Papers will be reviewed by the section editor, the Social Forces editor and at least one blind reviewer.

The deadline for submitting papers is **March 1, 2007**. Manuscripts should be limited to 5,000-9,000 words including references and endnotes and should be e-mailed as a Microsoft Word attachment to Social_Forces@unc.edu. Any tables or figures must be editable in Microsoft Word or Excel. Do not use any automatic formatting feature. Submission fees for this section are waived. It is essential that you note that the submission is for the special section on age discrimination.

Direct inquiries about the review process or a particular manuscript to Victor Marshall at victor_marshall@unc.edu or (919) 843-8067.
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Organizations, Occupations, and Work Section, American Sociological Association 2007 Annual Meeting

The 102nd meeting of the American Sociological Association will take place on August 11-14th, 2007 in New York City. The topic for this year’s meeting will be: “Is Another World Possible? Sociological Perspectives on Contemporary Politics.” A full description of this year’s convention theme can be read here: http://www.asanet.org/page.ww?section=Future+Meetings&name=AM+2007+Theme+Statement.

Send your papers to the appropriate OOW Session Organizers listed below:

Open-Topic Paper Sessions on Organizations, Occupations, and Work.
Co-organizers:
- Phil Cohen (pnc@unc.edu), University of North Carolina
- Mark Mizruchi (mizruchi@umich.edu), University of Michigan

Open-Topic Roundtables on Organizations, Occupations, and Work.
Co-organizers:
- Lisa Catanzarite (lcatanzarite@wsu.edu), Washington State University
- Chris Marquis (cmarquis@hbs.edu), Harvard University

Joint session with Sociology of the Family Section on “Emerging Issues in Family and Work.”
Organizer:
- Erin Kelly (elkelly@atlas.socsci.umn.edu), University of Minnesota.

Direct questions to the section chair: Professor Heather A. Haveman, hah15@columbia.edu, 212-854-4424.

Work, Employment, and Society Conference 2007

The WES conference will be held September 12-14, 2007 in Aberdeen, Scotland. Its organizing theme is: “Beyond these shores: Sinking or swimming in the globalised new economy?”

We invite papers based upon this theme and addressed to the following streams:
- The global and mobile workforce in the new economy
- Resisting the tide – alternatives to neoliberalism and local responses
- (Dis)Organised labour in the post-industrial economy
- Identity, regulation and resistance
- Home/work boundaries and barriers
- Erosion of public and private identities in the new economy
- Organisational restructuring and its implications for work
- New technology and work
- Work in old and new sectors of the economy: where’s the difference?
- New work – same old barriers for women?
- Health, safety and welfare in the new globalised economy

Using the submission form available at http://www.abdn.ac.uk/wes2007, submit abstracts for presentations by February 1, 2007 via email attachment to wes2007@abdn.ac.uk. Abstracts will be refereed and contributors will be notified as to whether their abstract has been accepted by March 1, 2007. The conference website offers further information about abstract submissions, the conference, plenary speakers, the venue and the city: http://www.abdn.ac.uk/wes2007.

Selected papers from the conference will be invited for inclusion in a special edition of the Work, Employment & Society Journal.

The WES 2007 Organizing Committee comprises Lyn Batchelor, John Bone, Jeff Hyman, and Chris Kollmeyer.