

Organizations, Occupations, and Work

From the Chair

Strategy and Structure: Moving O.O.W. Toward Toronto '97 and Beyond

Dan Cornfield
Vanderbilt University

The successful program and high turnout at the OOW activities in New York, and the strong membership growth trends of our Section, attest not only to our intellectual vitality, but also to the hard work of our Council, committee members, and Past-Chair Paul Dimaggio, during the past year. Having received the baton from Paul, I hope to build on our momentum to enhance the influence of OOW in the discipline, as well as help the Section surpass the 1,000-person membership threshold.

(cont'd on page 6)

Also in this Issue:

Looking Again at Race in the
Workplace

William Kornblum Page 7

The Job Interview:

A Study in Terror

E. M. Beck Page 9

Servitude, Inc.

"Ben Hall" Page 12

Call for 1997 ASA Papers

Page 14

And More...

Beyond the 'Dark Side' of Flexibility

An Interview with Charles Sabel

Few American scholars have so profoundly shaped the study of work and economic institutions as has Charles Sabel, author of Work and Politics, The Second Industrial Divide (with Michael Piore), and numerous articles concerning the new regional economies and the spread of "flexible specialization" throughout the advanced capitalist world. OOW interviewed Sabel in October 1996 and asked about the salience of craft work, the "dark side" of flexibility, and the changing social structure of post-Fordist society. This interview was conducted by the newsletter editor and is the first of a series of interviews to be conducted (many by guest interviewers) for the OOW newsletter.

OOW: How did you first come to view the industrial districts of northeastern Italy as symbolizing the end of the Fordist, mass production paradigm?

Sabel: At the origin there was the usual combination of accident and curiosity. I was working on problems of the sociology of work and the organization of labor markets. Italy in the 1960s was central to any discussion of those things because of its extraordinary strike activity. In part, just out of a sense of obligation to consider the most dramatic examples that were concerned with my general theme, I got interested in Italy. When I did, the most dramatic fact I found was that the labor market unrest was part the effect, and part the cause, of a vast reorganization in the division of labor, and one that didn't seem to fit with any of the theories that I had been supposing as the initial background conditions of my work. At that point I began talking with Michael Piore, whose work had been important to my original orientation. The more we talked, the more we came to the conclusion that in fact, something was going on that was much more nearly like the inversion of the familiar pattern of mass production than an example of it. We decided to work from there.

OOW: In the book with Piore, you harken back to the 19th century industrial districts, and you envision a resurgence of the craft-based paradigm of work. Yet you never quite explain how the craft paradigm can reemerge in an era of high tech capitalism. Don't firms rely most centrally on scientific and engineering expertise, not craft knowledge?

(cont'd on page four)

O.O.W. Committees for 1996-1997

Program Committee:

Chair: Jennifer Glass

Dept. of Sociology,
University of Iowa, W 140
Seashore Hall, Iowa City IA
52245; tel. (319) 335-2502;
jglass@vaxa.weeg.uiowa.edu

Members:

- Vicki Smith, University of California-Davis, vasmith@ucdavis.edu
- David Strang, Cornell University, ds20@instruct1.cit.cornell.edu
- Terry Halliday, American Bar Foundation, t-halliday@uchicago.edu

Publications Committee:

Chair and Newsletter

Editor: Steven Vallas
School of History,
Technology, and Society,
Georgia Institute of
Technology, Atlanta, GA
30332-0345; (404) 894-
6833; steven.vallas@hts.
gatech.edu

Homepage Editor:

- Julian Dierkes, Princeton University, jdierkes@phoenix.princeton.edu

Regional Liaisons:

- Africa: Francis Doodoo, Vanderbilt University, dodoof@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu
- Asia: Jim Lincoln, University of California-Berkeley, Haas School of Business, lincoln@haas.berkeley.edu
- Australia: Bob Stern, Cornell University, until 6/97 at

Queensland University of
Technology, r.stern@
qut.edu.au

- Europe: Mette Sorensen, Boston University, sorensen@bu.edu
- Latin America: Hilquias Cavalcanti, University of Richmond, cavalcanti@urvax.urich.edu

Sectoral Liaisons:

- Deviant Behavior: Jack Martin, Survey Research Center, University of Georgia, jmartin@uga.cc.uga.edu
- Family: Toby Parcel, Ohio State University, tlp@ohstsbs.sbs.ohio-state.edu [use the dash]
- Non-Profit Organizations: Joe Galaskiewicz, University of Minnesota, galaskie@soc.umn.edu

Weber Award Committee:

Chair: Steven Brint,

Dept. of Sociology,
University of California at
Riverside, 900 University
Avenue, Riverside CA
92521-0419; University of
California-Riverside, tel.
(909) 787-2103;
brint@mail.ucr.edu

Members:

- Tom DiPrete, Duke University, tdiPRETE@soc.duke.edu
- Mary Fennell, Brown University, mary_fennell@brown.edu

Thompson Award Committee:

Chair: Patty Gwartney

University of Oregon, 1415
Kincaid St., 736 PLC
Building, Eugene, OR
97403-1291; tel. (541)
346-5002; fax: (541)
346-5026. PATTYGG@
OREGON.UOREGON.EDU

Members:

- George Gabriel, 340 Rutgers St., Rockville, MD 20850, (301) 251-7312
- David Williamson, University of North Texas, DAVIDW@scs.unt.edu

Membership Committee:

Chair: Mary Frank Fox,

School of History,
Technology, and Society,
Georgia Institute of
Technology, Atlanta, GA
30332-0345; tel. (404) 894-
1818; mf27@prism.
gatech.edu

Members:

- Helmut Anheier, Rutgers University, Hanheier@aol.com
- Ann Dill, Brown University, ann_dill@brown.edu
- Paul Hirsch, Northwestern University, Kellogg Graduate School of Management, paulhirsch@nwu.edu
- Ruth Milkman, University of California-Los Angeles, milkman@soc.ucla.edu
- Oscar Miller, Tennessee State University, millero@harpo.tnstate.edu

(cont'd on page three)

Nominations Committee:

Chair: Jeyland Mortimer
University of Minnesota, 1014 Social
Sciences Building, University of
Minnesota, 267 19th Ave. South,
Minneapolis MN 55455; tel. (612) 624-
4064; morti002@maroon.tc.umn.edu

Members:

- Ray Friedman, Vanderbilt
University, Owens Graduate School of
Management, rfriedma@ctrvax.
vanderbilt.edu
- Sydney Halpern, University of Illinois-
Chicago, shalpern@uic.edu
- Mark Mizruchi, University of Michigan,
mizruchi@umich.edu

Graduate Affairs Committee:

Chair: Beth Rubin,
Tulane University,
Department of Sociology, 220 Newcomb
Hall, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA
70118-5698; (504) 865-5820;
barubin@mailhost.tcs.tulane.edu

Members:

- Alice Oberfield Andrews,
Vanderbilt University, Owen Graduate
School of Management, andrewao@
ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu
- Nehama Babin, Assistant Director,
Office of Institutional Studies, 2119
Main Administration, University of
Maryland- College Park, College
Park, MD 20742;
nbabin@umdacc.umd.edu
- John Harkey, President, Harkey &
Associates, Inc., 2002 Richard Jones
Road, Suite 304C, P.P. Box 159025,
Nashville TN 37215

From the Editor

I think Dan Cornfield asked me to edit this publication on the assumption that I'd cause less trouble for him if I had less time in which to do it. Boy was he ever wrong. Dan's motives aside, he has placed me in a difficult position, for Lee Clarke's stint as previous editor of this publication is no easy act to follow. Undaunted, and with the help of the Publications Committee and other scholars-at-large, I hope to produce a newsletter that is equal to and reflective of the very best scholarship underway in the study of organizations, occupations, and work.

To do that, I plan to introduce some features and columns that depart with the normative routines of the refereed journals. One example --featured interviews with leading scholars-- can be found in the present issue's interview with Charles Sabel, whose work you just might know. Sabel would probably like me to mention his forthcoming book, co-edited with Jonathan Zeitlin for Cambridge University Press, entitled *Worlds of Possibilities*. I will be flexible and consent. Readers should feel free to respond, whether in writing or electronically, to this and future interviews, in the hopes that worthy scholarly exchanges might then ensue. Look for such exchanges in future issues.

Other new features will include reports on intellectual traditions and movements abroad as these bear on our respective fields, in part owing to Dan's useful idea for regional liaisons. Upcoming issues will contain a brief report on Latin American traditions in the study of work, an analysis of strategic changes in the character of German employment relations, and other featured stories. In addition to all this, I hope to make room for pieces that bring a sense of humor to issues of concern to us all. Examples can be found in this issue's transcript of a telephone exchange between a would-be slave purchaser and some sales-eager officials at a temporary help firm. Witness, too, Woody Beck's discussion of "The Job Interview: A Study in Terror," both in this issue.

Occasionally, this publication will feature articles on intellectual matters that have fallen into neglect --a condition that, Bill Kornblum reminds us, has certainly come to characterize the relation between race and work. Perhaps Bill's personal report from the field will provoke renewed interest and research on this question, which has received only sporadic attention since E. C. Hughes's classic articles so many years ago.

--Steven Vallas

Flexibility, cont'd

Sabel: Our conception of 'craft' didn't draw such a clear line between the traditional and the modern... It was founded on the idea that the distinguishing feature of craft was the reintegration of conception and execution --that individuals, as a result of their practical but also theoretical training, were sufficiently masters of tools and materials and concepts to be able to solve difficult problems autonomously, and that made them able to dispense with very elaborate explicit instructions. Therefore, firms that could rely on such persons could be more flexible in responding to volatile circumstances than firms that had to break everything down into detailed rules. And so, we placed great emphasis on craft as embodying this capacity for autonomy. Those were the considerations then, and I don't believe they were wholly unfounded. But what I think now is that this conception was wrong. It was right to conceive of what was going on as a revival or a reinvigoration of the craft tradition, but it turns out that the larger movement is not well described that way. The reason is that there turned out to be *two* ways of overcoming the division between conception and execution. One of them is the craft method. And the second method is the one pioneered by Japanese firms but no longer limited to them... This second form of reintegrating conception and execution is based on things like benchmarking, simultaneous engineering and Just-in-Time production and error detection-correction systems, etc. It's *like* the craft work that we described, in the sense that it enables firms to dispense with elaborate instructions to groups charged with actually performing the work. But it's *different* than the craft model, in that there's a kind of continuous exploration of the

possibilities of formalizing those aspects of the work and design that are necessary to perfect processes and to communicate with others. So what's involved is something that's a kind of practical knowledge that's not assimilable to anything familiar from craft.

"It would only be a peculiar kind of stubbornness that would insist that the only form of human autonomy at work is the one we know from the craft tradition."

OOW: Some people criticized the interpretation of Japan you offered in *The Second Industrial Divide*, arguing that the Japanese model represents an *extension* or even a perfection of the mass production paradigm, and thus is not truly post-Fordist. I'm thinking of people like Berggren, and Dohse, Jurgens and Malsch.

Sabel: I think we and our critics were both wrong in certain ways. *We* were wrong in assimilating the Japanese model to the craft activities in Italy and elsewhere and assuming that the Japanese system in effect achieved, by a different route, the same kind of thing. It's a mistake to think, as Piore and I did, that the two systems operated according to the same principles. You can see that's not the case when the two systems come into competition. Typically, Japanese derived systems win out in direct competition with the other systems. The reasons have to do with certain shortcomings within craft systems when innovation rates get very high, because it's simply impossible to have informal coordination of craft when

you have very intricate innovations with very short product cycles involving many steps.

But the *other* interpretation, that of our critics, who claimed that Japanese models are just an extension of Fordism, simply denies the extraordinary autonomy that work teams and project groups in the Japanese system actually enjoy. Very often, and increasingly, they approximate the effective rights of independent firms. They can often determine their own internal organization. They can determine the choice of inputs, tools, services, and engineering, and often they can choose to whom they sell their output. It's true that they also formalize what they do, but the formalization is in the service of a form of coordinated autonomy that in its way is more effective than the one associated with craft. It would only be a peculiar kind of stubbornness that would insist that the only form of human autonomy at work is the one we know from the craft tradition.

OOW: The thesis of flexible specialization has also been criticized for neglecting the problem of economic dualism. This is something that you and Piore were both writing about in your earlier work, which makes it somewhat surprising that you make so little about the problem of dualism in the contemporary setting. Isn't this an important oversight? To use Bennett Harrison's phrase, isn't there a "dark side" to flexibility which you've tended to ignore?

Sabel: Let me answer generally. I think I can speak for Michael Piore as well. We continue to be motivated in this work by the idea that work and production are central human experiences. Their organization reveals something fundamental about the justice or injustice of the society

(cont'd on page five)

Flexibility, cont'd

that embraces them. It's certainly not the case that we decided that those questions were uninteresting or that they'd been resolved by some fundamental transformation of the economy. And we certainly understood, even in *The Second Industrial Divide*, that there were many forms of flexibility that were much closer to sweating than the craft model that we described. We were at pains to show that many of these things that we were looking at actually grew out of sweating conditions --Italy being an example. But that didn't detract either from their novelty, or on the other hand, from the brutality of sweating. So what we were attempting to do is to explain that under certain conditions, wretched conditions could be part of a causal chain that led to much more satisfactory and decent ones. Of course, saying that isn't a justification of the initial brutality.

But all that said and done, there are very difficult problems that have made it hard to address the question of the justice of these arrangements directly. One of them is understanding what's part of a transitional effect and what's an intrinsic consequence of the new forms of organization itself. It's one thing to say that there are many "losers" in the transition from one form of economy to another. But it's not clear that the "losers" in the transition to the new economy are a necessary complement, the new proletariat of the new form. It would be foolish to assume that all the misery you see is just a transitional phenomenon. But it would be just as wrong to say that all the misery you see is an expression of the new system itself.

Then there's the deeper problem of trying to understand exactly what this new system is. As I suggested a moment ago, both Michael and I, in related but distinct ways, have been trying to reconceptualize what the new system is. And so, it's not just a

question of trying to distinguish transitional effects from the structural concomitants of the new system, but trying to understand more precisely what this new form of organization is, what the relation is between the increasing autonomy of the subunits and the possibilities for the exercise of power by the more powerful units against the suppliers and collaborators on whom they depend. Understanding this is very difficult. Again, that's not an excuse for not facing up to the problem, but it is a reason for not jumping to global conclusions. Now, does that mean that there is no dark side in this emergent system? Obviously, there are lots of power struggles and there are more and less vulnerable people... But I'm not sure that a lot is achieved by assuming immediately that you know the system well enough to be able to have a penetrating analysis of who really is being hurt and why. There's just so much volatility in the system that it's very difficult to see the patterns of advantage and disadvantage beyond their grossest features.

OOW: In a 1989 paper you develop the concept of "double convergence," in which small and large firms begin to manifest flexible work organization, despite their very different starting points. Do you see this happening in the contemporary US, or do you think (as some people have suggested) that large American firms are slow to shed their vertically integrated forms?

Sabel: No, I do see that in the United States. The "double convergence" idea though was an intermediate formulation, as I began to move away from the craft idea, to an clearer understanding of the structures involved, which can be found in my paper "Learning by Monitoring" [in the *Handbook of Economic Sociology*, ed. Smelser and Svedberg], where I point out that one thing that the Japanese and craft models have in common is the disaggregation of the large unit and the

federation of the small. But I believe that this is true, that it is happening. The surest sign that it's true in the United States is the explosive diffusion of work groups and work teams in firms --that is, production and design units are being broken down into small groups, and the small groups have the kind of autonomy I referred to earlier. You see this even in places where you least expect it --for example, in the automobile industry, where it's spreading very quickly. It's even beginning to reach areas like garment production, where further steps in the direction of Taylorism had been expected, and in such unlikely places as poultry plants in the Delmarva peninsula in Delaware, where, it turns out, firms are beginning to use advanced manufacturing techniques, with greater emphasis on autonomous teams. What you're seeing in the United States is that in industry after industry, there is a very large move toward team production. So I believe that even in large American manufacturing firms this is happening --even these very traditional industries are moving in the direction of greater autonomy.

OOW: Your early work used some abstract political formulations, as when you looked to "yeoman democracy" as a template for the new flexible economy. Can you describe in more concrete terms some of the features that the social and political order will need to develop if flexible specialization is to take root?

Sabel: The yeoman democracy idea grew out of the craft model. An alternative to that would have to be a form of deliberative, direct democracy that applied to politics the new kinds of problem solving techniques that have emerged in firms today. The intuition is that if it's impossible for one company to design

(cont'd on page six),

Flexibility, concluded

a motor or a car all by itself, then it's not a big surprise that it's impossible for Congress to design an omnibus health care plan, or any other form of encompassing legislation all by itself. So the question is under what conditions can you actually have decentralized design --an experimental design of responses to complex social problems-- without undermining the rights of citizenship that are meant to protect people against the caprice that unconstrained experimentalism would create. The idea is to use these new kinds of pragmatist understandings of the firm, and to look to see how that can be applied in public administration and democracy. These questions are precisely what I am writing about at this moment, in papers on Ireland and democratic experimentalism. (These papers can be found on Sabel's homepage, www.columbia.edu/~cfs11/). --Interview by Steven Vallas

Cornfield, *From the Chair*

(cont'd)

Research and practice in the OOW sociological subfield continue to touch a wide range of other subfields, social sciences, and policy domains in the U.S. and abroad. Family, culture, healthcare, race-ethnic relations, gender relations, labor and industrial relations, politics, criminal justice, human resource and engineering management, public administration, non-profit organizations, social movements, and communications are only a few of the areas which benefit from OOW sociological research and practice. Few other Sections of the American Sociological Association enjoy this central, interdisciplinary role which we play in the academy and in work organizations.

Our vitality and centrality afford us the opportunity to expand our involvement in other scholarly and practical arenas, as well as enlarge our

Section membership. To these ends, I have restructured some OOW Section committees and have staffed all of them with a diverse group of self-motivated people who, together, represent the wide range of actual and potential constituencies of the OOW Section. Let me express my gratitude to all of the committee members for agreeing to serve and ready the Section for the ASA convention in Toronto in 1997 and beyond. The complete list of 1996-97 OOW committees and committee member contact information accompany this article.

I am pleased to announce the appointment of Steven Vallas to a three-year term as OOW Newsletter Editor and Chair of the OOW Publications Committee. The OOW Section Council is grateful to the several highly qualified nominees who agreed to be considered for this position. Steve brings great enthusiasm and creativity to this position. He will work with a newly structured OOW Publications Committee to continue the fine editing and presentation which Chip Clarke, out-going Newsletter Editor, brought to the newsletter. Thank you Chip! In order to widen newsletter coverage, I have designated several world-regional and sectoral liaisons who constitute the OOW Publications Committee membership. The liaisons will gather news about important research projects in progress (with PI contact information) in their respective world regions and societal sectors and, under Steve's editorship, will report the news in the newsletter. Each liaison has extensive contact with and involvement in her or his region or sector.

I am delighted that Julian Dierkes will continue his fine editorship of the OOW home page and web site and as a member of the Publications Committee. The OOW homepage can be accessed at this internet address: www.princeton.edu/~orgocw/

The OOW Program Committee is restructured and staffed to ensure the

widest representation of high-quality OOW research in the OOW sessions of the 1997 ASA convention program. Jennifer Glass chairs this committee and will receive open submissions and roundtable submissions. Continuing our two-year, session co-sponsorship arrangement with the Sex & Gender Section, Jennifer will organize the co-sponsored session on Gendered Workplaces and Labor Markets, which is being donated by the Sex & Gender Section (under the arrangement, the OOW Section donated one of its sessions for co-sponsorship with the Sex & Gender Section at the 1996 ASA convention). This year, the three other Program Committee members are organizing sessions whose themes represent the three initials of the OOW Section name: David Strang is the organizer of the session corresponding to the first 'O'; Terry Halliday is organizing the session corresponding to the second 'O'; and Vicki Smith is organizing the W session. Papers may be submitted, as thematically appropriate, to any of the Program Committee members. Consult the accompanying list of OOW committees for the OOW thematic session titles and Program Committee member contact information.

Under the inspiration of Past-Chair Paul Dimaggio, we have created a new OOW Graduate Affairs Committee. The purpose of this committee is to help graduate students and recent Ph.D.s find employment. Beth Rubin, who is an experienced Director of Graduate Studies at Tulane, chairs this committee. The committee will provide employment search and labor-supply tips in the form of short articles in this newsletter. Each of the other committee members is uniquely situated in the profession to provide the widest array of helpful information to new jobseekers: Alice

(Cont'd on page seven)

Cornfield, *From the Chair* (cont'd)

Oberfield Andrews is a graduate management school faculty member; Nehama Babin is a salaried researcher and John Harkey is a successful entrepreneur in the healthcare publication industry. In addition to being helpful to jobseekers, the Graduate Affairs Committee is intended to make the OOW Section more attractive to graduate students and, therefore, to encourage graduate student membership in the Section. *Bring this to the attention of graduate students in your institution and encourage them to join the section.* ASA (and OOW Section) membership application forms can be downloaded from this internet address:
www.asanet.org/membership.htm

The chief membership outreach efforts of the Section will be conducted by the OOW Membership Committee, chaired by Mary Frank Fox. The committee will write membership recruitment announcements about OOW which are tailored for publication in the newsletters of other ASA sections and kindred professional associations. In order to maximize the range of other organizations which the OOW Membership Committee may contact, the committee comprises new and continuing OOW Section members who have close connections to a broad set of organizations, including the Academy of Management, ASA Medical Sociology Section, Association of Black Sociologists, Industrial Relations Research Association, and Sociologists for Women in Society. In return, we will publish the membership announcements of other organizations in the OOW newsletter.

Each of the Section's Thompson and Weber Award Committees is staffed with individuals whose expertise represents collectively the O, O, and W in our Section name. For award nomination criteria and procedures and committee contact information, consult the accompanying calls for nominations in this issue of the newsletter.

Again, I thank all of the 1996-97 OOW committee members for agreeing to serve and I look forward to an exciting year. Please share your commentary and suggestions about this strategy for the OOW Section! I can be reached as follows: Dept. of Sociology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235; (615) 322-7626; fax: (615) 322-7505; CORNFIDB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU

Looking Again at Race in Workplaces

William Kornblum

City University Graduate School

A number of years ago I was invited by a Fortune 500 Corporation based in New York City to visit its production plant in the South. The company was at that time the nation's

largest producer of audio tape cassettes, records and compact disks. My assignment was to present a series of lectures to top corporate managers about plant and community relations in the far reaches of their empire. They were proud of their new and well designed production facility but had little understanding of the changes their new facility had brought to the community and what effects such changes might have on their business.

After some weeks of field work inside the plant and in the surrounding community I felt ready to offer some preliminary observations in an executive seminar. I was not prepared for the shock my simple observations would cause. My analysis of the demographic changes in the community surrounding the plant showed that the African American and Latino populations were growing most rapidly. The white population was aging. The future of the company's labor force was in the newcomers. But the corporation had done nothing to adapt or accommodate to these changes. There were no minority women or men in mid-level management at the plant. Among the hourly employees, the minority people were most likely to be contingent workers, women and men, with the least security and lowest pay. There were many skilled minority workers in the community who were beginning to feel that they were being passed up for the plant's better jobs.

The New York executives were hurt to hear that they might be contributing to a deteriorating climate of race relations in the community. Perhaps, they reasoned, the problem was that the local plant managers were merely conforming to old Southern norms of racial preference. They asked me to look at their major industrial plant in the north. I did and found the situation not appreciably different. There were clearly patterns of racial preference in job assignments that favored white workers. I showed them that despite their professed liberal impulses on race, and the large revenues that minority recording artists were bringing into the company, they had made little or no effort to make opportunities available for minority managers in the North or the South. The executives thanked me for my frank report and assured me that they would soon be taking decisive steps to address the problem. A few months later the corporation was sold to a Japanese communications and technology giant. That was the last I heard of the situation, although I did get a few "networking" calls from displaced executives in New York.

I mention this experience because it is so commonplace. Most social scientists who do shop floor sociology and community research in industrial areas can develop many variations on the theme of persistent racial exclusion. Yet the study of race relations at work and in communities outside the workplace has in recent years been

(Cont'd on page eight)

Kornblum, Looking Again at Race (*cont'd*)

neglected even though a great deal of more demographically focused work on race and ethnicity in employment continues to show vivid patterns of racial and ethnic segmentation and segregation (Waldinger 1996). In consequence, in their review of inequality and labor processes Granovetter and Tilly conclude that "What we need now are close analyses of the strategies and struggles that create segregated job structures" (1988, p.201). Indeed, and we also need more studies of the struggles and strategies that create integrated job structures.

In *When Work Disappears*, William J. Wilson argues in favor of renewed investment in job training programs where minority women and men who have experienced long bouts of unemployment can find realistic training and actual work experiences that will prepare them to be more competitive in the urban labor market. No doubt much of the social policy focus on coming years will be on the problems of inner city communities where there will be enormous difficulties in supplying adequate work of any kind. But theories of the post-industrial society notwithstanding, manufacturing work is going on throughout the United States. We are going to see more racial and ethnic diversity in the factories, warehouses, laboratories, and office complexes of smaller cities and towns out along the Interstate highways. The children and grand children of Asian, Latino and African immigrants will be joining the growing streams of African Americans who are moving, in fits and starts and despite many obstacles, toward jobs in these communities. We will need more research about the experiences of working people in these situations of growing labor force diversity.

In his case study of emerging class solidarity in a manufacturing shop, Rick Fantasia found that the workers were diverse enough in each of their work groups that race and ethnicity did not seem to play a large role in explaining the emergence of leadership and collective action (Fantasia 1988). Bruce Williams studied black workers and black supervisors in a racially integrated manufacturing plant in suburban New Jersey, however, and reported that racial animosities were a major problem for all minority workers and a significant impediment to cooperation across the status divides. These differing examples reinforce my view that we need more research about the changing dynamics of race and ethnicity in strategically chosen workplaces and communities. In some workplaces it should be the case that the increasing racial and ethnic diversity of workers will efface simple black-white divisions, while in other cases we may see more conventional conflicts over workplace segregation. Research which allows for comparisons in workplaces that vary along these possible outcomes, and which affords the opportunity to look at workplace and community race relations within a more holistic framework, will always have special relevance

in comparison with more limited case studies of a single workplace.

In the Southern community where I did field work at the request of distant corporate executives, there was also an old steel plant which hired white and black workers, and a number of chicken processing plants which hired mainly African Americans at extremely low pay and under poor working conditions. The town had a branch of the state university which employed mainly white residents of the local community, plus numerous retail and office employers who varied in their tendency to segregate or integrate their workplaces. The town's leaders had lobbied mightily to win the Northern plant. They promised a union free environment and offered enormous savings in land, energy, and local taxes. But their successful efforts were also changing the community dramatically. The town was becoming more cosmopolitan. Voters changed it from a "dry town" to a decidedly wet one within three years after the new plant opened. There was much grumbling among the more conservative and older residents of the community. Racial change was accompanied by much cultural change although it was not altogether clear to me how these were causally related.

I wished I could have spent time in the chicken plants with the workers in more traditional wood products and agricultural occupations. My ethnographic opportunities were limited. I did see in this experience, however, that there are a great many gaps in our knowledge of the changing manufacturing scene in the United States. Opportunities abound, especially in the South and the West, for a new generation of industrial community studies. I hope some young scholars will take on the challenge of producing the new versions of *Yankee City* or *Middletown* [or *Blue Collar Community* --ed.] But to succeed they will have to keep issues of race and ethnicity high on their agenda of concerns.

Notes

Fantasia, Rick. *Cultures of Solidarity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988)

Granovetter, Mark and Tilly, Charles. "Inequality and Labor Processes." pps. 175-221 in Smelser, Neil J. (ed.)

Handbook of Sociology (Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications, 1988)

Waldinger, Roger. *Still The Promised City* (Cambridge, MA.:Harvard University Press, 1996)

Williams, Bruce B. *Black Workers in a White Suburb* (New Brunswick New Jersey: Rutgers University Press

Wilson, William J. *When Work Disappears* (NY: Knopf).

From the Graduate Affairs Committee

There is that old, somewhat annoying cliché that "them's that can't do teach." The Graduate Affairs Committee, brainchild of Paul DiMaggio and Dan Cornfield, is charged with facilitating the employment of new PhD's "in ways that do not duplicate those of the ASA" (to quote Dan). That is, in the aid of graduate student placement, to use, explore, exploit and plunder the networks of which we are all part, and about which many of us teach. In so doing, we'll demonstrate the inherent flaw in the cliché with which I began. More importantly, we'll make better use of our collective resources on behalf of our scholarly progeny.

The other members of the Committee --Alice Oberfield Andrews of Vanderbilt University, Nehama Babin of the University of Maryland, and John Harkey, President of Harkey and Associates, Inc.-- bring diverse sorts of expertise, insight, and network connections to the task. I have been Tulane DGS for two years, Alice is in a school of Management, Nehama works as a full-time salaried researcher and John is an entrepreneur. The variety of settings in which we work brings a wide range of resources to the graduate placement process. Over the next year each of us will be offering ideas, information and employment search advice through this newsletter, serving graduate students launching themselves into this very rough job market. I invite all members of the OOW section to write (or e-mail) me with any ideas, information, or suggestions you have about graduate student placement.

To that effect, the first contribution has come from Woody Beck. He has gracefully allowed me to pass on an edited version of his advice to graduate students on their first interview. Below is the first installment, "Before the interview" and "The first encounter." Next installment: "The talk," "Interviewing with students and administrators" and "Drinks and Dinner," "After the interview."

Beth A. Rubin
Tulane University

The Job Interview: A Study in Terror

E.M. Beck
University of Georgia

So, you've got an interview. Terrific! This means you've zapped 50 or more other applicants. Your target school's

recruitment committee has decided that you appear to be one of the best qualified for their position. Now they want to see you in person, to examine you for warts, to see if you have any gross and disgusting personal habits. You're under their collective microscope, being scrutinized like a trapped bug. But don't panic just yet.

It's important to realize that they're *expecting* their good judgment to be verified in the interview. They have chosen *you*, and they're expecting a winner--give them one. Most candidates come to the interview with a score of 100 and as the interview progresses they lose points. After all the candidates have been scrutinized, he or she with the fewest negative points wins. Hence I've formulated the following:

The First Principle of Who's Hired

The candidate about whom the faculty possesses *the least negative information* is most likely to be hired. Given this principle:

1.a. Strategy of Active Self-Defense:

It is critical to minimize the opportunity to blurt out something profoundly dumb. Every minute they're answering your questions is a minute that you aren't answering their questions, thus minimizing your opportunity to gobble your foot. We academics have fairly elevated opinions of our abilities, and vigorously avoid any data that might invalidate these self-images. This observation has let to:

The Second Principle of Who's Hired

Given the First Principle, the candidate who *least threatens the self-images of existing faculty* is the most likely to be hired. Thus,

2.a. Strategy of Modest Competency:

Always act as if you have something to learn from each and every person you meet.

All departments have unfulfilled needs. The vacancy is an explicit manifestation of those, but it is also a manifestation of other, unadvertised wants. Thus:

Third Principle of Who's Hired

Given the First and Second principles, the candidate who best fulfills the department's *latent needs* is the most likely to be hired, all other things being equal. The appropriate strategy during the interview is, then:

3.a. Strategy of Bounded Versatility. Never say you can't do something until you fail at it.

Keeping these three principles and their

(cont'd on page ten)

Beck, Study in Terror

corresponding strategies in mind, there are some things to do in preparation for the interview.

Before the Interview

After you've been invited for the interview, ask the department chair/head (you *do* know the difference, don't you?) to send copies of the faculty's vita and/or a copy of the department's annual report and outlines of both the graduate and undergraduate programs. Study these carefully! You will impress the department chair with your professionalism and you'll know who's active, who's "deadwood," the specializations and background of said active and deadwood; they'll be pleased, I guarantee.

Before leaving for the interview, jot on a 3 x 5 card the names of the faculty and their areas of teaching and research interest, and any other pertinent data. *Keep this card with you at all times; it's your trusty friend.* If you need help during the interview, excuse yourself to the privacy of the restroom, review your card, and take 4 deep breaths--it really does help.

So before leaving for the interview you should:

- Know the name of the department head/chair, and head of the graduate program, if applicable.
- Know whether the department is a headship or chairship.
- Know if the department offers advanced degrees and which ones.
- Know the names and specializations of the faculty (on your trusty 3 x 5 card, of course).
- Know what plans have been made for travel, lodging, etc.

The First Encounter

The typical interview runs something like this. You arrive by plane or car in the university town on, say, Sunday night. You may or may not be met by the chair of the department or a department representative. If you are being met, *the interview has begun*. "Be prepared" is good advice, even if you were never a scout.

The "official" interviewing session may start at breakfast the next morning. For God's sake, don't be late! If you are met for breakfast, this is *not* the time for heavy questioning--but don't forget that you are always "on stage", even in seemingly casual situations.

Interviewing with the Department Chair

After breakfast you'll meet with the department chair for about an hour. This is the time to ask about the department, its past and especially its future. Where do

you see the department headed in the next five years? How actively does the university administration support the department? Are the library holdings adequate? How about computer facilities? What do you think of the undergraduates? Graduate students? These are all legitimate, even mandatory questions.

Teaching

You'll also discuss teaching. Of course, the chair will want to know about the courses you'd like to teach. You need to balance your preferences with the department needs so this is a good time to find out how much discretion you'll have in course selecting. Mention "intro," like it or not along with what you'd really like to teach since you'll likely teach it, like it or not. If the department has an advanced degree program, show interest in it but **don't ignore the undergraduate program!** It's the "bread-and-butter" of most departments.

If you are asked to teach Complex Organizations, but your specialty is the Sociology of 14th Century Illuminated Manuscripts and you wouldn't know a complex organization if you tripped over it [*Unlikely for any of our students, Beth Rubin notes.*] What do you do? Answer? Remember the *Third Principle of Who's Hired*, and the concept of *Bounded Versatility*. Then, find out as much as possible about teaching assistants, textbook selection etc. Now is the time to find out--not after you've accepted the offer and arrived on campus!

Interviewing with Individual Faculty Members

Then comes the endless parade of interviews with individual faculty members. This phase is tedious and exhausting because you'll be asked and have to answer the same questions repeatedly, "Tell me about your dissertation," "What courses would you like to teach?," "What is your future research?" Have an answer for each.

RULE: Never assume that the person with whom you're talking has read your vitae.

To break the monotony, and put yourself in the very best light, punctuate each interview with *your* questions. Remember, you ask questions so that (a) you won't have to answer questions and (b) to determine if the person will be a reasonable colleague!

(cont'd on page eleven)

Beck, Study in Terror

Legitimate questions here: What do you see as the major challenges facing the department? Where is it headed? Is this a good place to get your work done? Are the library holdings adequate? How about computer facilities? What do you think of the undergraduates? Graduate students?

RULE: Also ask each and every person some questions about the department even if you've heard the same thing over and over. *Not asking about the department is invariably interpreted as lack of serious interest on your part. This mistake could cost you the offer; I've seen it happen.*

If you are being asked questions that seem tangential and unrelated to your professional competency, you're being interviewed by a moron (most departments have at least one). But fear not, such twits are childishly simple to handle, as long as you keep your cool. Just reverse the situation at the earliest possible time. Most persons, especially featherbrains, love to talk about themselves..once you've succeeded in getting it started, just sit back and try to appear interested. (You know, put on the "gee whiz, I'm-Really-Interested-In-What-You-Are-Saying" gaze that got you through so many graduate seminars).

After spending the morning with your potential colleagues, you'll have to go to lunch with a small group of faculty and maybe some students. Don't let your guard down at these "social" events; the interview continues; only the setting changes. At lunch *do not drink any alcohol* despite what others do. You'll need your wits about you for your talk.

Next time: "The talk."

Visit OOW's WebSite
at
[www.princeton.edu/
~orgocwk](http://www.princeton.edu/~orgocwk)

Call for Nominations for the Weber Award

The Weber Award is for an outstanding article or book (in alternating years) published over the past three years. The 1997 Award will be for an article and the nomination deadline is 31 January 1997. Authors can nominate themselves or section members can do the nominating. To nominate, send three copies of the nominee's article, three copies of a justification of your nomination, and nominee contact information (including the nominee's e-mail address, if available) to the committee chair. Committee chair: Steven Brint, Department of Sociology, University of California at Riverside, 900 University Avenue, Riverside CA 92521-0419; tel. (909) 787-2103; brint@mail.ucr.edu Committee members: Tom DiPrete, Duke University; tdiprete@soc.duke.edu; and Mary Fennell, Brown University; mary_fennell@brown.edu

Call for Nominations for the Thompson Award

The James A. Thompson Award is given for an outstanding graduate student paper written in the three years prior to the award. The winner gets \$300 for travel to a professional meeting and serves as a representative to the Section Council that year. The nomination deadline is 31 March 1997. As with the Weber Award, authors can nominate themselves or section members can do the nominating. To nominate, send three copies of the nominee's article, three copies of a justification of your nomination, and nominee contact information (including the nominee's e-mail address, if available) to the committee chair. Committee chair: Patty Gwartney, Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, 1415 Kincaid Street, Eugene OR 97403-1291; tel. (541) 346-5002; pattygg@oregon.uoregon.edu; George Gabriel, Rockville MD, (301) 251-7312; David Williamson, University of North Texas; davidw@scs.unt.edu

Servitude, Inc.

From the transcript of a telephone call made to a Madison, Wisconsin, temporary-employment agency by "Bill Hall," a writer posing as a potential employer. Hall called various temp agencies to illustrate the "slave-trading" nature of the temp business. This transcript is reprinted by permission of the The Onion, a weekly magazine devoted to political satire. The Onion welcomes subscription inquiries; they can be reached at (608) 256-1372, or at www.theonion.com

BILL HALL: I'm looking for some slaves for my business. Do you think you could help me out?

JOYCE: Okay, we would be able to get laborers for you. They'd probably go with you on a temp-to-hire basis.

BILL: What are the state laws regarding treatment of these types of employees?

JOYCE: They'd be our employees if they're temping for us. I'm not sure about the legalities of how much they can lift or anything like that

BILL: I was thinking more about punishment.

JOYCE: I'm not sure what you mean.

BILL: Well, let's say one of them ran away and I had to punish him. What would the state laws be regarding how far I could go?

JOYCE: You mean just firing them?

BILL: Firing them is all I could do?

JOYCE: You might be better off explaining this to somebody in our temporary department. Helen is available. One moment.

HELEN: Hello, this is Helen.

BILL: I want to buy about five or ten people. Healthy males. How much would that cost?

HELEN: Well, first we would bill you, including a service fee for providing these people; then we'd take care of taxes, unemployment, and workers' comp.

BILL: Is there a way I could just pay you outright and not have to deal with that stuff?

HELEN: Well, then that would be a permanent placement. Let's say you wanted a worker. We'd scan candidates, maybe arrange interviews - however you wanted to do it.

BILL: Like an auction.

HELEN: Pardon?

BILL: Well, I'd have several to choose from, right?

HELEN: Right. And when you decided on a candidate, then there would be a one-time fee.

BILL: So after I pay the fee, who owns them - you or me?

HELEN: You. If you pay the fee, then they're yours, and we have nothing more to do with them.

BILL: That's great.

HELEN: Let me send you to someone in that department who can help you.

JEANNIE: This is Jeannie. How may I help you?

BILL: Hi, I need five or ten strong males on a permanent basis.

JEANNIE: Okay. Can you tell me what you were looking at paying those people?

BILL: Well, I was hoping to pay about five or ten thousand apiece.

JEANNIE: Per year?

BILL: No, total.

JEANNIE: Are you saying an annual salary?

BILL: No, I mean I give you five or ten thousand dollars, and those people are mine.

JEANNIE: *(pauses)* How many hours are you talking about?

BILL: Well, no specific hours. I was thinking they'd be on call. You know, live right on the property.

(cont'd on page thirteen)

Servitude, cont'd

JEANNIE: Well, let me explain to you how we do this. If you want people to come out on a permanent basis, we can find them for you and send them out. They will work for about three months. We will charge you a bill rate, and we will pay their salary. After three months if you decide you want those people, then they would be yours at no fee.

BILL: Sounds like a good arrangement.

JEANNIE: What we would do is charge you a percent of their annual salary. But if you're talking about that many people, we can probably do something more for you.

BILL: You mean some kind of bargain rate?

JEANNIE: Yes. And we're extremely flexible with that.

BILL: Sounds great.

JEANNIE: The only problem I'm seeing is that there could be a workers' compensation issue here. Because we do have certain rules regarding what our people can and cannot do.

BILL: Like what?

JEANNIE: We don't allow them to go over eight feet high. And we don't allow them to go so many feet down, but I can't remember exactly what that is.

BILL: So you're saying no digging and no roofing?

JEANNIE: Right. Things that go

over eight feet.

BILL: Well, that limits me. I was hoping to have all-purpose people that I could have do pretty much anything I told them.

JEANNIE: Well, if you come in and hire those people right away as an immediate replacement, then that is not an issue.

BILL: Excellent. So those people, those temporary people, they're not slaves?

JEANNIE: That's right. We cannot have those people out doing things that are not safe, what we call meeting our safety qualifications. If somebody gets hurt on our payroll, we're liable for workers' compensation.

BILL: Then I think I'll go for those permanent ones you described before. I think they're everything I want.

JEANNIE: Okay, let me get your name and address, and we'll see what we can do for you...

1996 Thompson Award Won by Kracman of Princeton University

The Thompson Award for 1996 has been won by Kimberly Kracman, a graduate student at Princeton, for her study "Common Sense versus Good Taste: The Construction of the Commercial and Fine Art Professions, 1917-1929." Kracman's paper sets out to explain a seeming paradox: practitioners and patrons of the

arts, who appeared to attack the distinctions on which their status as cultural authorities was based. Kracman notes that in the early days of professionalization, when the boundary between fine art and popular culture was presumably established, museum patrons, staff members and art educators did not uphold that distinction, as many theories would suggest, but instead called for it to be dismantled. Similarly, those professionals responsible for the mass production of "popular culture" also argued for this status distinction to be erased. Why this convergence? Using content analysis to explore the discourse of commercial and fine art patrons, Kracman uncovers a tension between the two drives of legitimation and exclusion, determined by the forces of cultural capital creation and the process of professionalization.

The Thompson Award Committee (composed of Diane Vaughn of Boston College, Miguel Guilarte of the University of Michigan, and Ann Miner of the University of Wisconsin) was impressed by the high number of strong submissions for this year's award, and elected to name three additional papers as worthy of honorable mention. These three papers and their authors are:

"The Impact of Environmental Factors on Factionalism and Schism in Social Movement Organizations." Deborah Balser, Department of Organizational Behavior, Cornell University;

"From 'Swinging High' to 'Rocking Out': Clarification of Style and the Creation of Identity in the World of Drumming."

(cont'd on page fourteen)

Thompson Award, cont'd

Geoffrey Curran, Department of Sociology, Rutgers University;
"Between Objectivity and Moral Vision: How Evangelical and Catholic Journalists Manage the Boundaries between Professional and Religious Worlds." John Schamlzbauer, Dept. Of Sociology, Princeton University.

Call for OOW Office Nominations

The OOW Nominations Committee encourages section members to consider making nominations for the office of Chair-Elect of the Section, and for two openings on the Section Council as well. Please send your nominations, along with a brief justification in support of each nominee, to Professor Jeylan Mortimer, Chair of the OOW Nominations Committee at the following address: Life Course Center, 1014 Social Sciences Building, University of Minnesota, 267 19th Avenue South, Minneapolis MN 55455. Fax: (612) 624-7020; Voice: (612) 624-4064; morti002@maroon.tc.umn.edu

Teaching Economic Sociology

The Teaching Resources Center of the ASA has just published *Economic Sociology: Syllabi and Instructional Materials*. The set is \$11.50 for ASA members and \$15.50 for non-members (including shipping inside the USA). The stock number is 358.E96. To order, send a check to: ASA Teaching Resources Center, 1722 N Street N.W., Washington D.C. 20036.

Call for Papers: 1997 ASA Meetings in Toronto

The Program Committee of the ASA Section on Organizations, Occupations, and Work, chaired by Jennifer Glass, is pleased to issue this call for papers for the sessions which will be sponsored by the Section at the August 1997 ASA annual meetings in Toronto. Session themes and organizers are listed below. Inquiries and paper submissions may be made to any of the session organizers. Submission deadlines and procedures will be announced by the ASA.

Gendered Workplaces and Labor Markets

(co-sponsored with the Sex & Gender section)
Jennifer Glass, Department of Sociology, University of Iowa, W 140 Seashore Hall, Iowa City, IA 52245; tel.: (319) 335-2502; fax: (319) 335-2509; jglass@vaxa.weeg.uiowa.edu

New Forms of Work and Employment Relations

Vicki Smith, Department of Sociology, University of California-Davis, 1282 Social Sciences Building, Davis, CA 95616; tel.: (916) 752-6170; fax: (916) 752-0783; vasmith@ucdavis.edu

Organizational Innovation and Change

David Strang, Department of Sociology, Cornell University, 314 Uris Hall, Ithaca, NY 14853; tel.: (607) 255-0024; fax: (607) 255-8473; ds20@instruct1.cit.cornell.edu

Professions in a Corporate Economy

Terry Halliday, American Bar Foundation, 750 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, IL 60611; tel.: (312) 988-6593; fax: (312) 988-6579; t-halliday@uchicago.edu

Roundtables and Open Submissions: Jennifer Glass (see above address)

Calls for Papers

Work and Occupations invites you to submit your manuscripts for peer review and possible publication. Now in its 23rd volume, WO is a scholarly, sociological quarterly that publishes original research articles in the sociology of work, employment, labor, occupations and professions. Consult the latest issue of WO for manuscript formatting and submission instructions. Send three copies of your paper to: Daniel B. Cornfield, Editor, Work and Occupations, Box 1811, Station B, Department of Sociology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235. Direct inquiries to the Editor at Cornfidb@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu

Opening in Organizational Sociology

The Department of Sociology at the University of Kansas invites applications for a full-time, tenure track Assistant Professor in organizational sociology, to begin on August 18, 1997, contingent upon budgetary approval. Applicants must have a Ph.D. in sociology and research and teaching interests in the culture, structure, or processes of organizations in such areas as family, gender, politics, economy, education, medicine and psychiatry, law and criminal justice, culture, and/or race and ethnicity. Strong preference will be given candidates who can teach an introductory graduate statistics course and/or a large course in introductory sociology. Each applicant should submit a letter outlining his or her research agenda and teaching interests and philosophy, vita, letters of reference, samples of written or published work, teaching syllabi, and course evaluations, if possible, to Joey Sprague, Chair of the Search Committee, Department of Sociology, University of Kansas, Lawrence KS 66045. Review of applications will begin on November 1, 1996. The University of Kansas is an Equal Opportunity/ Affirmative Action Employer; women and minorities are especially encouraged to apply.

Pre- and Post-Doctoral Fellowships

The University of Minnesota wishes to invite applications for one postdoctoral and three predoctoral fellowships in policy-related areas involving the transition to adulthood, adolescent work experience and mental health, and several other areas involving social and psychological adjustment in the early life course. Applicants should Contact Jeylan Mortimer, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis MN 55455 by January 15, 1997 for admission in September 1997.

The Society for the Study of Social

Problems meetings in Toronto will include a session devoted to "Flexible Firms, Restructuring Economies." Theoretical and/or empirical papers that link the macro-structural economic context to micro-level work organization, and that generally contribute to the current debate on flexible work and staffing practices, should be submitted to the session Organizer: Steven Vallas, School of History, Technology, and Society, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta GA 30332-0345; steven.vallas@hts.gatech.edu

Anselm Strauss Remembered

A memorial honoring the life and work of Anselm Strauss, Professor Emeritus at the University of California, San Francisco, who died in San Francisco September 5 at 79 will be held at the ASA meetings in Toronto on Monday, August 11 at 6:30 p.m. Room to be announced. The memorial will be sponsored by ASA sections on Medical Sociology, Social Psychology, Occupations, Organizations and Work and the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction. All are welcome and encouraged to attend.

Aside from significant contributions to symbolic interaction theory, qualitative methods, medical sociology and social psychology, Professor Strauss' long and productive career also produced major insights on work and social organization which led to new views of work in hospitals and their organization. From this body of research he derived the influential concept of the "negotiated order". His inquiries with colleagues in sociology and nursing in the areas of occupations and professions ranged from considerations of professional scientists, emergent specialization in professions and sociological insights into the labor involved in care of the chronically ill both for family members and professional care givers. He leaves a rich intellectual and personal legacy and will not be forgotten.

Call for Nominations

The Labor Studies Division of the Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP) is seeking nominations for its "1997 Labor Studies Award for Distinguished Publication, SSSP," which will be given to an article published in 1995 or 1996. Articles eligible for nomination must be published in refereed journals or appear in edited collections of original work. Authors (first authors in the case of multi-authored works) must hold faculty rank at the time of publication. 1997 is the inaugural year for this award.

"Labor studies" is a broadly defined area encompassing work, the labor process, critical organization studies, the employment relationship, labor markets, industrial relations, stratification and work, race, gender, and class and work, and the labor movement. Nominators must be members of the Labor Studies Division of the Society for the Study of Social Problems (if not a member, please contact Tom Hood, Executive Officer, University of Tennessee, 906 McClung Tower,

Knoxville, TN 37996-0490 (tomhood@utk.edu) for membership information). Authors of nominated research do not have to be members of the division or of the SSSP. Nominators must provide a full bibliographic citation of the nominated work as well as a written rationale as to why the nominated work is worthy of the Labor Studies Division's recognition. Please send nominations to Vicki Smith, Chair, Labor Studies Division, Department of Sociology, University of California, Davis, Davis, CA 95616 (vasmith@ucdavis.edu). All nominations must be received by February 28th, 1997. Late nominations cannot be guaranteed consideration.

The 1997 Award Committee will be chaired by Tom Steiger, Indiana State University. Other members include Patricia Martin, Florida State University; Dan Clawson, University of Massachusetts, Amherst; Ruth Milkman, University of California, Los Angeles, and Michael Burawoy, University of California, Berkeley.

**American Sociological
Association
1722 N Street NW
Washington DC 20036**

<p>Non-Profit Organization U.S. Postage Paid Washington DC Permit No. 504</p>
--