Message from the Chair
Kevin T. Leicht

Dear OOW members and supporters:

Our program for ASA is shaping up nicely! Our program committee has assembled a first rate program for the first two days of the meeting. The award committees are busy picking the best book, best research paper, and best graduate student paper from a dizzying array of excellent alternatives. Submission to our sessions and nominations for our awards are at or near record levels. Many thanks to all of you who submitted papers and nominated your colleagues for our awards!

Regarding the program, I can tell you that there will be not one but two (knock wood!) author-meets-critic sessions at ASA this year, both sponsored by OOW. In addition to featuring the Weber Award Winning book, we’re making arrangements for an author-meets-critic session on Louis Uchitelle’s recent book, The Disposable American: Layoffs and Their Consequences. This should be an especially exiting addition to our program.

On a procedural note, our section currently has 921 members. While this number is good and healthy, we would make Heather Haveman’s job more interesting (and future program committee’s job less vexing) if we could get our membership over 1,000 members - we’re only 69 members away. A 1,000 member OOW session would entitle us to another session at the 2007 ASA meetings. So, as I and my predecessors have done through the listserve and other venues, sign people up, especially your graduate students!

Like our last newsletter, I have two comments to make, but these will be (mercifully) brief.
The recent controversy over immigration reform presents new and interesting research opportunities for OOW members to engage in public sociology. At some point in the next year or two, we’re going to be presented with a tremendous opportunity for a natural experiment as a new system of dealing with border security and moving immigrants into the U.S. labor market will be in place. The type of system we end up with is (as of this writing) all over the map, but change seems to be coming. Will we, as sociologists interested in work and labor markets, be ready?

My second observation is less charitable. The end of the semester is approaching at Iowa and at colleges and universities throughout North America. There is a growing problem on our college campuses, and it is especially prevalent on state-supported college campuses. The problem is simple to state but much more complex to analyze. Everybody with a pulse and $7,000-$10,000 in college loans thinks they’re entitled to a college diploma regardless of what they know, think, do, say, write, or compute. Our students have been told that a college diploma is a ticket to membership in the middle class and the upper middle class. So, “since they’re middle class,” it is our job as college professors to hand over the sheepskin to certify their status in the club. As one parent screamed to me over the phone several years ago, “my son can do college level work because he ain’t no lowlife!!” Per James Rosenbaum we’ve decided that “college is for everybody” regardless of work ethic, intellectual curiosity, background, brains, or talent. Our administrators (90 percent of whom never teach undergraduate classes except to handpicked sets of honors students) act as if this problem doesn’t exist. And (wouldn’t you know it?) just as members of the white middle class decide that college diplomas automatically accrue to their children in their 20’s, our universities decide that every white student that can’t do college level work has a learning disability, or they’re depressed, or they suffer from an anxiety disorder! (This is only a slight exaggeration...). African American and Hispanic kids (who have a right to be intimidated by an environment that tells them that any white person they meet regardless of any skills they actually have is college material) are either “just dumb” or “lack the appropriate background.” How convenient!

The questions this relatively recent entitlement mindset creates for those who study labor markets and work are profound. Let’s get the political harangue over with first – who came up with the screwy idea that everybody belongs in college? More abstractly, how do we expect students to deal with an increasingly fragmented labor market for their talents and skills if (a) we don’t care if they have any talents or skills, (b) they don’t care if they have any talents or skills, and (c) we’ve turned college into a therapeutic experience for most students that shields them from any direct consequences of not learning anything?

Best wishes for the remainder of your academic year! As you can probably tell, summertime can’t come too fast for me...

Kevin T. Leicht,
Section Chair,
The University of Iowa
Interview with Rick Fantasia
by Ann Shirley

Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Ann Shirley: Tell me about why you and Kim Voss decided to write this book. How did you end up working together?

Rick Fantasia: For a number of years I had been in contact with Pierre Bourdieu, whose work I’ve greatly admired, and in 1997 I wrote him a letter proposing an article on some of the important changes that were underway at the AFL-CIO. He decided to publish the letter in one of his journals, as is, and asked me to consider extending it into a book for his widely-read and well-regarded “Raisons d’Agir” book series. I was thrilled and honored by the offer and dedicated myself to trying to clear enough space in my work calendar to be able to do it. I had been thinking for awhile about the forms through which the American model of neo-liberalism had been introduced in France and I had just written a short piece on a strike at the United Parcel Service for *Le Monde Diplomatique*, in which I kept realizing just how different the field of battle for unions is in the U.S., compared to France.

About a year later, at the ASA meeting in San Francisco, Kim Voss and I were talking about various aspects of our work. Although I hadn’t originally intended to work with a co-author on this, after explaining what I had in mind for the project and listening to her reactions, her enthusiasm, and her suggestions for it, it seemed completely fitting to ask her to join me in the effort. Kim is a terrific scholar and a good friend and it was a thoroughly positive experience to have worked with her on this.

So, it was a book that we wrote in English, intended for immediate translation into French, as a way of explaining the social logic of American unionism to French (and European) readers. Even before the French edition appeared we got in touch with the University of California Press about publishing a slightly enlarged English edition that appeared in 2004 under the title *Hard Work: Remaking the American Labor Movement*.

AS: Was the end result of the project what you had expected?

RF: I think that Kim and I learned a lot writing this book together, at least I did, and partly it was because it forced me to figure out what I really think about certain developments in the labor movement. We also had some great, hard discussions along the way (and not a few good arguments) that we tended to stay with until we were certain that we had reached a strong level of agreement. This was true of small things, like the wording of a particular phrase, and bigger things, like our judgment about the importance of a certain historical process or the efficacy of a specific kind of labor practice. This is to say that the end product is definitely not the same book that either of us would have written alone, but it is a book that is probably sharper analytically for having been the product of a collaboration.

AS: What impact do you hope this book has on the general public, on the labor movement, or on academia?

RF: I think if ours were a book that could have a really strong impact on the general public that we’d be in a very different society than the one that we’re in, but we have been told by colleagues at various universities around the country that their students have tended to like the book very much and that it has generated lots of good classroom discussion in their courses on labor. In France, the book actually did receive a fair amount of attention in various mainstream media outlets (though the “mainstream” in France operates along an ideological axis that is tilted much more leftward than ours in the U.S.).

We’ve also been generally quite happy about the reception that the book has gotten among
trade unionists. Last year Kim made a presentation to an SEIU local in Seattle where she heard lots of praise about the book from union members who had already read it, and where it sold a number of copies. And when the French edition appeared I gave a talk to leaders of the French teacher’s federation and went to Montreal to address militants from the Quebec Federation of Labour and leaders of the Montreal Central Labour Council. It seemed that a fair number of those I met had read the book and not a few expressed surprise (and gratification) that American sociologists would take such a critical stance with respect to American corporate practices. They obviously don’t read much U.S. sociology.

AS: What research are you working on now?

RF: I’m back working on a project that has been over 12 years in the making. It’s a book examining the complex and contradictory impact of American fast food on the field of gastronomy in France and is (tentatively) entitled, *The Magic of Americanism: French Gastronomy in the Age of Neo-Liberalism*. I’m pushing hard to have a complete draft of the manuscript by August (2006!).

Once I’ve finally completed the French gastronomy book, I’ll be gearing up to do a study of the practices of social class in the U.S. that will be part of a collective (and collaborative) local ethnography project that I’m intending to mount, along with a number of colleagues in the Western Massachusetts area. It is a project that will be modeled after Bourdieu’s collective research effort that was published as “The Weight of the World”, and will be launched in a year-long research workshop that will be run out of the Kahn Liberal Arts Institute, a research institute at Smith College where I currently serve as Director. In this role I normally facilitate collaborative and interdisciplinary research for my colleagues, and in this case I want to facilitate my own research as well.

AS: I see from your biography that you did a variety of things before becoming a professor. What made you decide to enter academia?

RF: I am not someone who was bred to be an academic, and in fact my early years of schooling were pretty brutalizing experiences that turned me against the entire regime of organized education. Indeed, I actually graduated near the very bottom of my high school class. However, after a couple of years of community college; and through a federal program designed to help those from “disadvantaged” backgrounds complete their college degrees and prepare for teaching in “disadvantaged” communities (the original Teacher Corps program); followed by several years as an itinerant organizer and a worker (in a paper mill, in a hospital, in a steel foundry, etc.) I was unintentionally prepared for a career as a sociologist well before I knew that that was something I could actually do.

In a certain sense, I never really decided to enter academia so much as I struggled with the belief that academia could enter me! I therefore proceeded, hesitatingly, with great trepidation, along the academic career path. At the earliest stage I would only “take graduate courses”, but I wouldn’t dare commit myself to a Ph.D. program (and the fear of failing) until I could demonstrate to myself that I could do it; and later, I wouldn’t fully commit to a career as an academic until I demonstrated to myself that I could successfully go through a Ph.D. program. I think that this may be the way it happens for many academics, and especially those who struggle with the kinds of limitations that accompany a badly-suited social background. In my case I guess it helps explain why I was so strongly pre-disposed to appreciate the author of *Distinction*, the analyst of symbolic violence.

AS: I enjoyed talking to you. Thank you for answering my questions.

RF: Thank you for listening.
BOOK REVIEWS

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

“Hard Work” is an excellent discussion of the current state of the labor movement in America. Authors Fantasia and Voss focus on examining the political and social climate in which the labor movement operates today, through analysis of its history. It is positive yet realistic, giving many examples of the success of social movement unionism but never forgetting the challenges unions face. The book ends with speculations on the direction the movement will take in the near future.

They provide an important sociologically-based analysis of different aspects of unionism, which is much needed in an area of research that seems largely dominated by other disciplines. Aspects of the business model that some unions follow, such as the lack of personal contact and high levels of bureaucratization, are examined with a sociological perspective. The effect on the worker is always the focus.

The authors begin the book by highlighting the importance of labor unions, pointing out that the benefits American union members receive due to their membership are benefits available to all citizens in most European countries. Another point is that consumer rights in the United States have expanded at the expense of labor rights. Convenience and variety of options are absurdly high. The focus on the consumer makes it difficult to talk about labor, because it is out of the realm of the average person’s consciousness.

Next, they demonstrate the political processes that dilute the power of labor unions by documenting and analyzing some significant events in labor history. The Taft-Hartley Act, for example, restructured the union movement towards a business model where the unions offered services in exchange for money, rather than an inclusive, critical social movement.

Particularly shocking to this reviewer was a letter reprinted from Ronald Reagan to the president of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization (PATCO) in 1980 in which Reagan promised to “take whatever steps are necessary” to improve their working conditions on many different measures. On the adjacent page, the authors report that in 1981, Reagan responded to a PATCO strike by ordering that all 11,345 strikers be fired immediately and their union be decertified.

A more encouraging example was the 1937 General Motors strike in Flint, Michigan, where neither the governor of Michigan nor president Roosevelt helped the massive company break the strike in spite of the fact that four out of every five Flint residents was a GM employee. Without government intervention, the company ended up changing its policy and negotiating a good contract for the union.

The fourth chapter was the best part of the book for me. It explains in detail the characteristics of social movement unionism: a focus on solidarity and social justice, awareness of power structure, innovation in organizing and bargaining tactics, and the view of the labor movement as a dialectic process of which both successes and failures are a part. They give a couple of examples of difficult battles won by labor in Los Angeles and Las Vegas. In both of these cities, union activists succeeded by thoroughly researching their opponents and vigorously organizing groups previously thought impossible to organize, such as immigrants in high turnover service jobs.

Fantasia and Voss did an excellent job placing the labor movement in an historical context and explaining modern changes to the movement. I think this would work especially well in an undergraduate course on sociology of work or social movements, though more advanced scholars will also enjoy this book.

Reviewer: by Joel Schoening, University of Oregon, jol@uoregon.edu

Some readers may find John Perkins’ Confessions of an Economic Hit Man a strange choice for inclusion in this publication. It is not peer reviewed, nor is it born from the halls of the Ivory Tower. It has no charts, tables or methodological appendices. Its central aim is not a single organization, nor is it a scientifically sampled collection of representative agencies. None of this, in the mind of this reader, takes away from its excellence as an organizational ethnography. Much of John Perkins’ life was spent in service to an organization of economic power (he calls it “the corporatocracy”) that creates the context for a great deal of United States foreign policy.

Perkins is a gifted writer and a talented observer. These skills obviously served him in his career as an economist, and now serve him in his mission to expose the secluded world of international financial analysis to the light of day. The result is a book that offers a vivid picture of what the world looks like from inside the minds of those who are at the helm some of the world’s largest engineering corporations as well as the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and the World Trade Organization. The record of his life and experiences is intermixed with insights that are stunning both in their capacity to reveal the workings of international power, and their ability to reveal how one relatively average and thoughtful person finds himself making decisions that will change the fate of millions, in most cases for the worse.

Over the course of his short and meteoric career in international economics, Perkins details how his willingness to cooperate with the corporatocracy, not his skills as an economist or the accuracy of his forecasts, was the basis for most of his promotions. Cooperation, in fact, is what his employers wanted most, and their success in attaining it from employees like the author, has meant that positions like his flourish in every major international corporation. In his mind, these men and women, once a handful and now an army, are the imperializers of today’s world, making deals with third world elites to ensure that they stay rich, that their workers stay poor, and that most of the money flows through governments and back into the hands of the first world corporations.

As an organizational ethnographer myself, I have sometimes daydreamed about what it would be like to sit on the boards of directors of the world’s largest corporations, chit chat with the worlds economic elite over coffee between meetings, and observe the inner workings of corporate power. I would want to uncover the unwritten codes of ethics and the handshake deals that, on my most cynical days, I believe is where the only true power is in our country.

Reading Confessions of an Economic Hit Man, by John Perkins, is probably the closest most of us will ever come to experiencing these corridors of power.

As such, this book will interest anyone curious about elite channels of power, and is written in a manner that would make an interesting supplement to any course dealing with issues political economy, globalization, social inequality, or elite deviance.
Processes of Legitimation: The University of Phoenix and Its Institutional Environment

By Martin D Hughes
University of Arizona

Specifically, this dissertation explains the rise of the for-profit university in the United States. Generally, it explains the legitimation of a new (form of) organization in an institutional environment.

In this dissertation I demonstrate that organizational legitimation is a process whereby a key audience serving as an institutional gatekeeper cognitively comprehends an applicant as a member of an existing category in the audience’s classification system. When this process is problematic or contested, it consists of active negotiations between the audience and the applicant (and sometimes third parties) over how to apply or interpret the rules of classification.

Using a case-study framework I selected seven cases from the history of the leading for-profit university, the University of Phoenix. These cases represented episodes of successful legitimation by the three key gatekeeping audiences in the postsecondary education environment. I assembled the documentary record for each of these cases and supplemented them with informant interviews. With this evidence I compiled a narrative for each episode which I then analyzed using comparative and historical methods.

I found that audiences’ classification systems varied according to their category configurations and their classification rules, and that these variations may affect how legitimation proceeds. I further found that audiences and applicants draw from their own tool kits of unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral strategies. Finally, I found that legitimation may proceed according to one of several different temporal models.


By Jeffrey E. Rosenthal
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Control over work is a central concept in the sociology of work literature. Individual control over work, also referred to as job autonomy, entails that workers exercise choice and discretion over both substantive and procedural aspects of their jobs ranging from freedom at work to ability to schedule work. We can better comprehend differences in job autonomy by examining how both structural (occupational, organizational and authority relations) and demographic (gender, race, age, experience, education and family) forces can influence individual control over the substantive content and procedural terms of work.


The drive for flexibility has had implications for workers’ job autonomy. While there has been an increase in some measures of control over terms of work, such as deciding breaks, flexibility for family or personal reasons has remained steady and even declined for men over the past thirty years. This comes as a result of increased pressures on male managers to put long hours in at work, and a general intensification and extension of effort and time within the workplace for all workers.
Between Industry and Labor Market: Examining the Impact of the Spatial Agglomeration of Firms and Industries on Wages in the U.S.

By Andrew S. Fullerton
University of Connecticut

The importance of place for the study of firms and workers seems paradoxical in an era of globalization. However, firms continue to co-locate in industrial and urban clusters due to the advantages of spatial proximity. Several recent studies within the new economic geography tradition show that the spatial agglomeration of employment in a local labor market (both industry-specific and overall) benefits both firms and workers in terms of better firm performance and higher wages (due to increased productivity).

In this dissertation, I develop an alternative theoretical perspective (based on the notions of bargaining power and social closure) that goes beyond existing theories in order to explain why the spatial agglomeration of firms within a local industry (i.e., industrial agglomeration) and a local labor market (i.e., urban agglomeration) leads to higher wages for workers.

I draw from several different theoretical perspectives (in addition to the new economic geography) in order to develop this bargaining power perspective, which includes new structuralism, organizational ecology, and the new economic sociology.

Using data from the 1990 PUMS-L, I employ a 3-level hierarchical linear model (HLM) in order to test hypotheses regarding the effects of industrial and urban agglomeration on average wages as well as group-based wage inequality (e.g., skill level, race, and sex). I conclude with suggestions for future research on the effects of place and space on workers’ economic rewards in the U.S.
Who Should Deliver Social Services?
Investigating Legitimacy of Public, Faith-Based, Nonprofit, and For-Profit Organizations

By Stacy Scherr
Indiana University

Who should deliver social services? The federal government relies primarily on states and counties to provide services, delivered through a variety of arrangements between public, nonprofit, and for-profit organizations. Sometimes the public sector provides services directly to clients, but increasingly, the public sector contracts with the nonprofit and for-profit sectors. In addition, there is a growing interest in funding faith-based organizations to deliver services, despite the tenet of separation of church and state. Thus, investigating the relationships between organizational sectors regarding preferences and practices for service delivery offers the opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of how and why organizations are considered legitimate. This dissertation examines organizational leaders’ perceptions of the cognitive and sociopolitical legitimacy of the four sectors for delivering various social services. Using a state survey of over 800 public administrators, faith-based directors, nonprofit and for-profit executives, I investigate how organizational form, size, age, embeddedness, income source, and community size influence legitimacy.

The results clearly show that organizational form matters. First, leaders make distinctions about the sectors. The public and nonprofit sectors are viewed as equally legitimate, the faith-based sector less so, and the for-profit sector the least legitimate. Second, organizational leaders tend to think more highly of their own sector, and, think others prefer their sector. For-profit leaders are the exception, as they tend to negatively evaluate organizations in their own sector, as well as organizations in other sectors. The influence of referral patterns is also important. The more referrals their organization gives, the more likely it is that leaders consider other sectors legitimate. The more referrals their organization receives, the less likely it is that leaders consider other sectors legitimate. Open-ended responses reveal that different underlying processes influence whether a sector is legitimate or illegitimate. Leaders who consider a sector illegitimate are apt to cite sector characteristics such as cost or religious concerns. However, leaders who consider a sector legitimate are likely to mention how client needs are served by that sector. The concept of oppositional isomorphism is developed to explain the paradox of novelty versus conformity to cultural expectations in creating organizational legitimacy.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Recent and Forthcoming Books


Recent and Forthcoming Books


_Organizations Evolving._ By Howard E. Aldrich and Martin Ruef. Sage Publications. 2006. 344 pp. The revised edition of this book includes sections on organizational forms, community evolution, and methods for studying organizations at multiple levels. Some features of the revised edition include review questions & exercises for use in courses on organizations, a methodological appendix that assesses common research methods, and lengthy case studies in many chapters that illustrate key concepts and principles.


By most accounts the economic vigor of the United States is unprecedented. Despite this collective wealth, the American middle class is struggling to live the American dream. In this timely and provocative new book, Leicht and Fitzgerald argue that middle class prosperity is an illusion. Indeed, there are many similarities between the modern American middle class, peasants in historically feudal societies, and sharecroppers in historically agrarian societies. Not satisfied with simply describing the plight of the middle class, the authors offer a multi-level recommendation designed to encourage an active response to the development of the modern postindustrial peasant.


How do we imagine the worst that can happen? What happens when our leaders fail to imagine worst cases? Why is disaster sometimes good for society? Why should we doing more worst case thinking? These are the central questions that I answer in _Worst Cases_.

The usual view about danger and catastrophe is that it’s irrational to worry about low probability events: airplane crashes and nuclear power meltdowns are good examples. That’s probabilistic thinking and in modern times it is equated with reason itself.

Worst case thinking differs. It emphasizes consequences over probabilities. What if terrorists commandeer four airplanes simultaneously? What happens if the power-grid goes down for six months? How many might die if a chemical plant explodes?

Conceptions of “the worst” permit exploration of how culture and society shape the imagination. Designations of the worst involve both prospective and retrospective viewpoints. As such they tell us about people’s orientations toward the past and the future, as well as toward self, others, and society. Disasters, even worst cases, are normal parts of life. They are prosaic. The rules that govern social life in non-disastrous situations are reproduced in disastrous ones, because disasters are not special. We can lead safer and more interesting lives by coming to grips with living and dying in a worst case world. [http://www.worstcases.com](http://www.worstcases.com).

Next year Lee Clarke will be the Anschutz Distinguished Fellow in American Studies, at Princeton University.
Recent and Forthcoming Books


Moen and Roehling draw on research on work, retirement, career paths, gender, policy, inequality, and families to show that taken-for-granted beliefs about and policies and practices shaping the social organization of paid work and occupational paths are out of date in contemporary society. They chronicle the changing meaning of career in a workplace where companies export jobs, shed labor agreements, restructure, and even move offshore to stay competitive in the global economy, exploding the myth that commitment, seniority, and family relationships built around a breadwinner/homemaker model are the path to a successful (or at least sustainable) career and comfortable (or at least sustainable) retirement.

They show the career mystique -- the cultural contradictions of jobs that require employees to invest all their time, energy, and commitment to moving up seniority or job ladders that increasingly lead nowhere -- is a false myth, standing in the way of creating new, alternative workplace and career flexibilities and safety nets. Moen and Roehling argue that to create sustainable scenarios for employees and their families requires “only” imagination and the will to change. The first step is accepting that the social organization of workdays, work weeks, work years, and work lives is not immutable. These are social inventions that can and should be reinvented.


The book uses institutional and network theories to refute mainstream economic accounts of the New Economy corporate scandals. It explains how it was that so much of corporate America came to resemble a “field of schemes” by focusing on the nested set of rules that mattered in three industries: energy trading, telecommunications, and dot-coms.

Free-market ideology and policies at the national level set the tone. While Wall Street wrapped itself in star-spangled packaging and celebrated its purported “democratization,” in the real halls of democracy congressional allies of business gutted protections for ordinary investors.

In the regulatory vacuum that resulted, business professionals who were supposed to watch corporations instead promoted New Economy doctrines and worked with executives to vouch for firms as New Economy contenders. Ringleaders in the inner circles that actually committed fraud made their own rules, which they enforced through a mix of bribery and bullying.

The book concludes that systemic problems of corporate governance remain. Reformers have not dealt with problems that a network economy poses for governance, nor have they repudiated the blind faith in markets and the soft corruption of Congress by business interests.

---

**Advanced Graduate Students and Recent Ph.D.s:**

*Work in Progress* wants to profile your dissertation in its column “Dissertation Abstracts.” Please send a descriptive blurb of no more than 400 words oow@uoregon.edu for the Fall 2006 issue.
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This volume offers cutting edge research on the character and implications of workplace participation. Written by some of the leading scholars in the sociology of workplace transformation and alternative organizations, the chapters examine various outcomes, causes, and consequences related to participation programs and worker democracy today.

Topics include ways in which participation schemes are socially constructed and negotiated; the meanings that workers attach to opportunities for involvement in the workplace; practice, participation, and consent in alternative organizations such as cooperatives and collectives; and theoretical treatments that call for new ways of thinking about workplace participation. Methodologically pluralist and concerned less with specific productivity effects of worker participation, this volume highlights the social structural, social constructionist, and meta theoretical dimensions of worker participation and democratic organizations in the twenty-first century.

Table of Contents
Introduction (V. Smith).

Part I: Worker Participation in Contemporary Corporate Workplaces

A Theorizing Teamwork under Contemporary Capitalism. (S.P. Vallas).
The Effect of Participative Work Systems on Employee Earnings. (M.J. Handel).
Selective Participation: Controlling Workers’ Input at General Motors. (J.S. Rothstein).

Part II: Recent Trends in Cooperatives

Democracy at Work within the Market: Reconsidering the Potential. (G. Cheney).
Cooperative Entrepreneurialism: Reconciling Democratic Values with Business Demands at a Worker-Owned Firm. (J. Schoening).

Part III: Mediating Worker Participation: The Labor Movement and the State

ANNOUNCEMENTS (CONTINUED)

Recent and Forthcoming Books


This unflinching examination of the obstacles to economic mobility for low-income families exposes the ugly reality that lies beneath the shining surface of the American Dream. In fact, nearly 25% of employed adults have difficulty supporting their families today. In eye-opening interviews, 25 workers and nearly a thousand people who are linked to them - children, teachers, job trainers, and employers - tell wrenching stories about “trying to get ahead.” Spanning five cities over five years, this study convincingly demonstrates that prevailing ideas about opportunity, merit, and “bootstraps” are outdated. Some workers who believe the myths end up destroying their health and families in the process of trying to “move up.”

Jobs Aren’t Enough demonstrates that the social institutions of family, education, labor market, and policy all intersect to influence, and inhibit, employment mobility. It proposes a new mobility paradigm grounded in cooperation and collaboration across social institutions, along with revitalization of the “public will.”


Satanic Mills or Silicon Islands? challenges the myth of globalization’s homogenizing power, arguing that the uniqueness of place is becoming more, not less important. McKay documents how multinational firms secure worker control and consent by reaching beyond the high-tech factory and into local labor markets. He traces the rise of a new breed of privatized export processing zones, revealing the state’s, in these cases, the Philippines, revamped role in the wider politics of global production. Finally, McKay gives voice to women workers, as they find meaning, identity, and agency on and beyond the “new” shop floor.

This book weaves three strands in global studies: Southeast Asia as a key site of global production, the organization of work in advanced electronics, and working-class conditions. Drawing on the author’s rich analysis of four multinational electronics firms, from their boardrooms to boarding houses, Satanic Mills or Silicon Islands? makes a unique contribution to the study of work, labor, and high-tech production.

Recent and Forthcoming Articles


Dual labor market theory asserts that the U.S. labor market is sharply divided between good jobs and bad jobs, and that mobility between these two market segments is severely restricted. The new labor market segmentation thesis argues that, as the practice of allocating workers to inferior jobs on the basis of race and sex declines, employers turn to nonstandard work arrangements and immigrants to supply labor for low-wage jobs.

This article presents a new method for measuring labor market dualism and identifying labor market segments. This method allows us to examine workers’ distribution across segments over the life course and to estimate the effects of nonstandard work and citizenship status on creating and placing workers into bad jobs.

This research presents three major findings. First, since the early 1970s, dualism in the U.S. labor market increased substantially. Second, most workers who begin their careers in secondary (bad) jobs eventually leave this labor market for better jobs. After young adulthood, most of the workforce is roughly divided between primary (good) intermediary (mediocre) jobs. Finally, multivariate results support the new segmentation hypothesis. Combined, nonstandard work and citizenship now play a greater direct role in allocating workers to secondary and intermediary jobs than race or sex.
Recent and Forthcoming Articles


Computer mediated communication (CMC) permeates organizations. The internet and internal intranets link managers, professionals, and even many line workers. These communication media provide speed, flexibility and the ability to append germane documents, pictures and audio. Yet there is more assertion than evidence about how CMC actually affects work relations and organizations. Have applications such as listserves, email, and instant messaging (IM) fostered new forms of organization that are less bounded than traditional bureaucratic hierarchies? Our interviews, survey and observations at “KME”, a high tech organization show that despite great email/IM connectivity, people work within the organizational imperatives of their department. They use email, IM and face-to-face communications in concert, depending on the information to be shared, the need for a textual record, and their desires to avoid interruptions and to avoid being observed in communication.

Awards

Harland Prechel (Texas A&M University) and Theresa Morris (Trinity College) are in the second year of their research on “The Extent and Underlying Cause(s) of Corporate Malfeasance in U.S. Corporations.” This research is funded by the National Science Foundation (#SES-0351496).

Barry Wellman and Dean Behrens (NetLab, Sociology, University of Toronto) received research grants totaling C$405,000 to study “Connected Lives Managing Social Capital On and Off the Internet in Urban and Rural Canada.” Funders: Microsoft Research, Nortel Networks, BCE, Bell University Laboratories, Intel Research Council, and the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Barry Wellman and Wenhong Chen received a research grant of $49,000 to study “The Information Economy and Transnational Entrepreneurship Linking Canada and China: Knowledge Dissemination” from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

Transitions

Stacy Scherr was recently hired as a Research Associate at University of Cincinnati Institute for Policy Research. Her doctorate is in Sociology from Indiana University, with a minor in Public Affairs and Public Policy. Her research interests include organizations, focusing on the nonprofit sector, sociology of work, education, and media.

Joan E Manley has relocated to Fort Myers, FL where she is Assistant Professor and Sociology Program Leader at Florida Gulf Coast University. Her current research focuses on the “front lines” of the weight loss and fitness industries, providing a look at the work of personal trainers and weight loss counselors. jmanley@fgcu.edu
Calls for Papers

Announcing a New Quarterly Format for *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* for Spring 2006.

This year marks a transition for *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* (RSSM) as it seeks to expand its focus and readership by moving from an annual serial to a quarterly journal format under the sponsorship of Elsevier. This transition is the culmination of several years of work by former editors of the journal and board members of the RC28, the Research Committee on Social Stratification and Mobility of the International Sociological Association (ISA). Please join us by reading and contributing to this exciting endeavor.

Under the editorship of Kevin T. Leicht, University of Iowa, USA, *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* is dedicated to publishing the highest quality, most innovative research on issues of social inequality from a broad diversity of theoretical and methodological perspectives. The journal is also dedicated to cutting edge summaries of prior research and fruitful exchanges that will stimulate future research on issues of social inequality. *Visit the website below for a listing of forthcoming RSSM articles.*

**Article submission:** Electronic submissions are preferred (visit the website below for more details), but mailed submissions are accepted by sending three copies of your manuscript to:

Kevin T. Leicht, Editor, RSSM
Department of Sociology
140 Seashore Hall West
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa 52242-1401

For complete manuscript submission and subscription details visit: [www.elsevier.com/locate/rssm](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/rssm)

*Online access* - RSSM will be available online via ScienceDirect, the world’s leading provider of research information. Authors publishing in RSSM benefit from greatly enhanced visibility and readership for their work. Reduced rate online subscriptions are available to members of the RC28. Contact the society or visit the website above for more details.

**Notice**

ISA Research Committee 28 on Social Stratification and Mobility (RC28). Any social scientist can apply for membership in ISA’s RC28. Address applications to the RC28 Board, c/o Tom DiPrete, Department of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, USA.

*Research in Political Sociology* is accepting manuscripts for Volume 16. This volume will focus on “Politics, Neoliberalism, and Market Fundamentalism.” The primary objective of Research in Political Sociology is to publish high quality, theoretical informed empirical research in areas that advance the understanding of politics in society. Manuscripts submitted for Volume 16 can focus on issues such as organizations and markets, organizational change, work transformations, business policy, and related topics. The deadline for submission of manuscripts for Volume 16 is August 30, 2006. Four copies of the manuscripts should be submitted to:

Harland Prechel
Department of Sociology
4351 Academic Building
Texas A&M University
College Station, TX 77843-4351