

Organizations, Occupations, and Work

From the Program Chair

By Barbara Reskin
1998 Chair, OOW program

OOW's big news is that our membership has surpassed the 1,000-member mark, making us the second largest section in ASA and qualifying us for an additional session at the 1998 annual meetings in San Francisco. What is particularly satisfying about this growth to social scientists is that it exemplifies what many of us aspire to achieve in our work. OOW's policy for attracting new members (*cherchez les* graduate students) stemmed from a statistical analysis of the determinants of section growth that Paul DiMaggio conducted in 1995-96 when he chaired OOW. Paul found that graduate student membership was significantly associated with section growth. So he and Dan Cornfield, our past chair, set out to recruit graduate students to OOW.

During his term as chair, Dan formed a

(Continued on Page 2)

Gender, Opportunity, & Scholarship:

An Interview with Cynthia Fuchs Epstein

Cynthia Fuchs Epstein is one of the pioneering figures in the study of gender, work, and the professions. From her first book, Woman's Place, to more recent books such as Deceptive Distinctions, Epstein has inspired a generation of social scientists and feminist scholars concerned with opportunity structures and the cultural responses they provoke. In this interview, OOW pursues issues that helped to shape Epstein's intellectual trajectory, both at Columbia and before, and inquires into her current work on the rise of part-time employment within the legal profession.

OOW: Can we begin with a biographical note on your beginning of your intellectual work? What was it like to try to problematize gender inequality at the outset of your career, in a period in which positivism and functionalism were as yet unchallenged, and the profession accorded virtually no room to critical studies of gender? You must have faced an enormous struggle to gain legitimacy for your research.

CFE: My early inquiry into gender inequality was posed as a case in point of the ways in which mechanisms of exclusion work, and I was never discouraged from exploring it in graduate school. It is important to understand that the guiding frameworks at Columbia were not "Parsonian," or "functionalist," but were formulated by Merton and Lazarsfeld as a "sociological vision." We thought about Merton's "functional paradigm," which is no more than a set of basic questions regarding multiple consequences of social structures and ideologies. I worked mainly with Robert Merton and

William Goode who were interested in (among other things) constraints on social change. In part, Merton and Goode were interested in the ways in which individuals were confronted by contradictory norms coming from their various statuses.

As a leading sociologist of the family, Goode's research included work on women's relative power in various family systems. He alerted his friend and neighbor Betty Friedan to the deficiencies of sociological interpretation based on the Parsonian approach that led to her analysis in the *Feminine Mystique*.

He introduced me to Friedan and I worked with her in 1966 in the founding of NOW in New York. In 1971 Goode and I coedited a book, *The Other Half: Roads to Women's Equality* that included "the Redstocking Manifesto;" so you see, he was a feminist.

Merton, on a different theoretical level, oriented sociology students to the multiple and also the negative consequences of various social forms, not only their "positive" consequences. He noted how people's expectations about normalcy were linked to their observations of frequently seen status combinations (such as man and banker; and woman and secretary), and how their expectations became norms that acted as a constraint on change. Merton's conceptual framework was important to my analysis because it alerted me to the institutionalization process. I saw how even without intent to discriminate, social patterns (and structures) perpetuated bias.

(Continued on Page 3)

Also in this issue:

Robert Reich: What the U.P.S. Strike Delivered	Page 5
Graham Sewell on Workplace Surveillance	Page 6
Toby Parcel on Dual Labor Markets in Academia	Page 7
From Factory to Informality: Report of a Conference in Sao Paulo	Page 12
Race, Work & Substance Abuse: A Five-Year Study	Page 14
Calls for Papers and Other Announcements	Page 16

From the Program Chair

(Continued from Page 1)

new committee on graduate affairs, chaired by Beth Rubin of Tulane, which was responsible for publishing Woody Beck's job market advice for graduate students in our newsletter. (If you missed this, I think it is still on our web page at www.princeton.edu/~orgocwkw.) Dan also appointed an energetic and effective membership committee chaired by Mary Frank Fox that published promotional pieces about OOW in the newsletters and list-servers of related organizations such as the Industrial Relations Research Association, the Association of Black Sociologists, SWS, and ASA's Sociology of Medicine and Sex and Gender Sections. The membership committee also organized a well-publicized and well-attended session on publishing at the annual meetings in Toronto.

The upshot of these and other efforts was a 10-percent jump in graduate student membership and an overall increase of 8 percent in section membership during the 1996-97 year, compared to 5 percent the previous year. (See related story, p. 11.)

Although the extra session at the annual meetings will mean that four or five more sociologists interested in occupations, organizations, and work can present papers at next year's meeting, I think the real benefit of this successful membership drive has been in its means and not its

end. The strategies that OOW used to increase membership helped us to be a more member-friendly section. Although there are no concrete organizational

inducements for additional growth (we're in ASA's top bracket as far as number of sessions we're entitled to at the annual meetings), I hope to maintain and even expand Dan's innovations because they intrinsically benefit OOW

section members and scholars. In order to make us an even-more-member-friendly (pun intended) section, we will take maximum advantage of our once-a-year opportunity for in-person contacts by including one or two additional events at the annual meetings that will facilitate contacts between graduate students and faculty members of OOW. One of these will occur in the hour before the business meeting and will use roundtables to allow junior OOW members to meet senior people in their specialty areas or people with expertise in a particular data set or research method. Look for more particulars in the spring newsletter. A ground swell of support from the back of

the room at the business meeting favored another opportunity for informal interaction in the form of a tour of the Napa Valley wineries which would

survey the consequences of different work organizations on product quality. For this event to come off, we need a California volunteer to act as organizer. (Volunteers, contact me.)

I am trying to provide more opportunities for graduate student involvement in OOW's activities.

I have appointed four graduate students to committees. Under OOW's present rules, the winner of the James Thompson Award

serves for one year as a member of council. In effect, this means attending the council's breakfast meeting at the annual meetings for the year after receiving the award. As an interim change, I plan to invite next year's winner to the Council meeting before the award is presented as well as the following year's meeting. This means that the graduate student representative will attend two meetings and—should we continue this system—that each council meeting will have two graduate student reps, one new and one a veteran. I also plan to propose to Council and the Business Meeting at the San Francisco

(Continued on Page 15)

"The strategies that OOW used to increase membership helped us to be a more member-friendly section."

About OOW and Its Newsletter

This newsletter is published under the auspices of the American Sociological Association's Section on Organizations, Occupations, and Work. The Section is guided by its Council, whose members for the 1997-98 academic year are listed in this newsletter.

Newsletter Editor: Steven Vallas, Georgia Institute of Technology.

The OOW newsletter strives to incorporate intellectual and professionally-relevant materials from all quarters of the section, and beyond.

Submissions to the OOW Newsletter (and homepage) are strongly encouraged. Please send any section-relevant news, articles, announcements, or letters of opinion intended for the newsletter in electronic form to the Editor at the address listed below. Email (or DOS-readable disk) is fine. Articles should be 1,000 to 1,750 words, and other items should be shorter. Realize that space requirements compel me to edit what you send. Letters and articles informing readers about intellectual or political events of relevance to the section are particularly

encouraged. Material intended for the homepage can be sent to the Homepage Editor, the tireless and ever-patient Julian Dierkes, whose particulars are also listed below. Feel free to visit the OOW homepage, at www.princeton.edu/~orgocwkw

OOW 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: Frank Steinhart, N. Park University, fsteinha@gumby.npcts.edu

Regional Liaisons: Francis Doodoo, Vanderbilt University (Africa); Jim Lincoln, University of California-Berkeley (Asia); Hilquias Cavalcanti, University of Richmond (Latin America)

Sectoral Liaisons: Jack Martin, University of Georgia (Deviant Behavior); Toby Parcel, Ohio State University (Family); Non-Profit organizations liaison (currently unfilled)

Gender, Opportunity, & Scholarship

(Continued from Page 1)

His concepts of opportunity structure, sociological ambivalence and the self-fulfilling prophecy were also building blocks to the analysis of gender issues.

There were some other social scientists whose work influenced my thinking on the dynamics of women's exclusion. I think of Everett Hughes, whose important article on "the contradictions and dilemmas of status" used a woman engineer and black doctor as

his illustrations; and Mirra Komarovsky's path-breaking book, *Women in the Modern World*, and Alice Rossi's *Inequality Between the Sexes*. I name these influences not only to acknowledge my intellectual debts, but to point out how frequently we fail to note important intellectual contributions that preceded us, especially those that may have fallen out of fashion.

My first book, *Woman's Place: Options and Limits in Professional Careers*, had been written initially as a report to the Institute for Life Insurance, the source of a small grant to study changing roles of women. I gave a paper based on one chapter at an ASA meeting (first refused and later accepted) which excited the interest of Grant Barnes, the noted social science editor of the University of California Press. He identified that manuscript as a book that might come to be of interest—and it became one of the first social science analyses of the constraints on women to move into decision-making and prestigious work, identifying women's exclusion from networks, their problems with mentoring, and the stereotypes that prevented their contributions from being acknowledged. Surprisingly, this book is still in print and through the years has sold 46,000 copies.

"[F]requently we fail to note important intellectual contributions that preceded us, especially those that may have fallen out of fashion."

OOW: You actually began your career at the University of Chicago's Law School, but then elected to embark on a sociological journey. What were gender expectations like at Chicago when you entered law school? Did your experiences there shape your subsequent intellectual work?

CFE: I went to the University of Chicago Law School because Heinz Eulau, a political scientist and my mentor at Antioch College (now at Stanford University), helped provide a scholarship there. Like other women of my generation I had no clear career goals (except to do "good works") and no clear idea about what further education I ought to have. I had no aspiration to be a lawyer but thought Chicago would be social-science oriented. Yet I found legal reasoning to be far from a social science vision of the basis of human behavior. People usually view "support groups" as positive influences, but it turned out that the people I gravitated to and formed a study group with all had a negative view of law school and the "Professor Kingsfield" manner

of some of the law professors. The other woman and two of the men also dropped out, and the only survivor stayed because it provided exemption from army service at the time. Although I did not face sexism, despite being one of six women in the school, I did know it would be hard to find employment afterward (a very realistic perception). But the experience made me interested in lawyers and the legal profession, and gave me insights that were useful in my studies years later.

OOW: From the very beginning, in *Woman's Place*, you assigned culture a central place in your analysis. I know you

were criticized for this. But now, with the growing emphasis on cultural analysis in so many different fields, you might feel tempted to say that you told us so. Is there not a certain irony here? And are you pleased with the way culture has been approached of late?

CFE: I was always interested in the contradictions between stereotypes and the empirical world, and how people's conceptions and ideas about women (and other categories of people) might have little to do with their actual behavior or attributes. Nevertheless I was initially a strong believer in the impact of social structure on people's behavior. From the beginning I failed to see why Parsons separated culture from structure since they seemed to be clearly interrelated. I suggested this in *Woman's Place*. But it took central stage in *Deceptive Distinctions* as I wrote about the impact of stereotypes and bias, the influence of paradigms in society, in science, and even among some schools of feminism, that affected the ways in which they perceived women's and men's behavior. Of course, I also explored this more illustratively in *Women in Law*.

"I disagreed with the Thorne-Stacey interpretation when it came out because it was my observation that the reverse was true."

OOW: Ten years ago, Judith Stacey and Barrie Thorne wrote about the "missing feminist revolution" in sociology, compared to other academic fields. Do you feel their argument still applies to our field? In other words, has gender remained a peripheral issue in the study of the professions, for example, or has mainstream thinking on this terrain in fact incorporated feminist insights about gender inequality?

CFE: I disagreed with the Thorne-Stacey interpretation when it came out because it was my observation that the reverse was true. I believe that sociologists actually set the groundwork for the analysis of women's disadvantage that became embedded in the profession. Then a steady

(Continued on Page 4)

Gender, Opportunity, & Scholarship

(Continued from Page 3)

and accelerating amount of research mounted which became part of the basic analysis of behavior. Sex immediately became a mandatory variable to be explained (sometimes inappropriately and irresponsibly, but that is another story). Feminist historians contributed a great deal of knowledge about the "missing woman" in history but didn't revolutionize historical thought in their discipline until quite late; and other scholars in the humanities made more of a splash but did not actually change perspectives in their disciplines for decades.

OOW: So the sociology of professions has taken gender seriously as a category of analysis?

CFE: It has been uneven. Some of the most important lines of analysis continue to ignore the importance of gender in the study of such professions as medicine, law, or management. A continuing problem is that any work on

women (or "men" qua "men") is regarded as "gender studies" and thus not of universal interest. Or, scholars refer to a sentimentalized "feminist" perspective which has no empirical referent. Unfortunately this is only one example of the ghettoization that occurs in sociology.

OOW: Some sociologists of work have explored the ways in which subordinate groups or classes inadvertently contribute to their own subordinate position. This theme exists in the work of Michael Burawoy, for example, and Paul Willis, but also Sallie Westwood and Rosabeth Kanter. In what ways have you found that women — even professionally educated employees — manifest such tendencies? Put differently, in what respects have women's actions implicitly helped reproduce established patterns of gender inequality?

CFE: I have always thought that a basic question for sociology was why people participated in their own disadvantage, and early in my work I was interested in the ways in which women's secondary gains and acceptance of stereotypes put limits on opportunity. In *Women in Law* I reported on women's denial of discrimination and acceptance of their allocation to legal ghettos because they accepted the view that women would not like or be good at courtroom conflict and would never be interested in corporate law. In

my study of glass ceilings in large corporate firms (*Fordham Law Review*, 1995), I found many women who were excellent litigators and corporate lawyers who nevertheless claimed that women measured success differently from men and had different personality styles as well. I recall in particular one ruthless high-powered woman litigator who suggested that women's different hormones accounted for their lack of

ambition and gentle nature, while behaviorally pressing for further advancement herself and described by others in her firm as a "shark." When women claim that competitive behavior makes them seem "like men," they are delegitimizing their own ambition.

OOW: Much of your recent work on the legal profession has focused on the growth of part-time employment among lawyers. Tell us how this research fits into the larger study of the professions and the phenomenon of part-time work as well.

CFE: My latest research is on part-time work in law (with Carroll Seron, Robert Saute and Bonnie Oglensky) and explores the possibility of institutional responses to

the work-family dilemma, an old problem given new attention. Our findings moved us beyond the narrow issue of part-time

work to the entire issue of time norms defining professional work (the professions as greedy institutions); the way in which deviation from time expectations becomes a gender issue; the stigmatization of legitimate time alternatives and how time becomes a proxy for other attributes of lawyers.

The way we conceptualize this research makes it relevant to most

high-demand occupations and, of course, moves it beyond a "woman's issue" to an issue of social control in employment. Further, the mechanisms we identify have consequence not only for "voluntary" decisions but for those forced to take on part-time positions. Even "voluntary" decisions to work part-time, because they are typically women's options, come out of the social pressures for women to level their aspirations in the face of escalating motherhood norms.

Having written about women, work and the professions now for three decades, I see on the one hand, enormous advances and an interest in gender issues that is integral to the field. I am still disturbed by ongoing stereotypes. But much of our work has had influence far beyond the borders of the university. A combination of research and activism has defined my career as it has for a number of other feminist social scientists.

Without our work I do not think we would have had the progress of women moving into the professions, into male-labeled occupations and jobs. But I also see some conceptual and behavioral slippage. A subject for another interview.

"I have always thought that a basic question for sociology was why people participated in their own disadvantage...."

"A continuing problem is that any work on women (or 'men' qua 'men') is regarded as 'gender studies' and thus not of universal interest."

"When women claim that competitive behavior makes them seem 'like men,' they are delegitimizing their own ambition."

Sky and Ground: What the U.P.S. Strike Delivered

By Robert Reich, Brandeis University

Much has been written on the UPS strike; the initial optimism inspired by the Teamsters victory has waned amidst the legal difficulties faced by Teamster president Ron Carey. In this essay, political economist Robert Reich emphasizes an ecological aspect of the strike not elsewhere noticed. His notion of "sky" and "ground" workers nicely captures the dualism that has proliferated in recent years.

In an age when commerce is increasingly digitized, moving invisibly through the ether in fractions of a second, the brown-uniformed men and women of the United Parcel Service are a quaint reminder of an earthier time. The sight of one of their loam-colored vans brings the pleasant sensation that something tangible is about to arrive. These days, though, work on the ground doesn't pay very well. Most of the U.P.S. workers who went on strike this summer earned around ten dollars an hour and worked less than forty hours a week. In the end, they got their raise. But what about the rest of America's groundworkers?

If work can be categorized by altitude, groundworkers are the lower caste. They include not only the people who deliver packages but also others at street level—cashiers, fast-food cooks, waitresses, cabdrivers, janitors, security guards, hospital orderlies, retail clerks, and parking-lot attendants — and some who work farther down, such as miners and subway workers, and a few who, like loggers and farm laborers, work directly on the soil. All have been losing ground, so to speak, for a generation, and not even the economic expansion that began in 1991 has given them much of a boost. Over the last five years, for example, U.P.S.'s profits have doubled—to comfortably more than a billion dollars last year. But the starting pay for part-time drivers hadn't budged for fifteen years. That's how it's been for most groundworkers. Since 1979, while the real incomes of the wealthiest five per cent of Americans have grown by nearly a fifth, the incomes of the bottom sixty per cent have gone nowhere. When inflation is figured in, the average hourly wage of twelve dollars and fourteen cents is actually lower than it was in 1989.

By contrast, skyworkers — management consultants, investment bankers, computer moguls, corporate lawyers, top executives (including those at U.P.S.), even some magazine editors — have been doing better and better. They spend their days high off the ground in glass-and-steel towers, send their work products across high-speed digital skyways, live where street sounds don't intrude on the fresh air and the nice views, and shop at upscale specialty and department stores like Nordstrom and Bloomingdale's, while groundworkers get grime on their hands and dust in their lungs, live closer to the noises and smells, and shop at down scale chains like Wal-Mart. (Midair retailers, like

J.C. Penney and Macy's, are struggling to find customers.) The two altitudes, ground and sky, divide the new service economy even more sharply than blue and white collars divided the old manufacturing economy. There are some moderate-flying technical and professional workers in between, but their numbers don't nearly make up for the loss of manufacturing jobs.

The altitudes are diverging. Skyworkers are in ever greater demand in the global-digital economy, selling their ideas and doing deals through the air, and that helps explain why their "compensation packages" (packages neither delivered by nor, needless to say, received by U.P.S. drivers) have risen sky-high. Skyworkers also own shares of stock that have soared above the stratosphere. (Since 1985, U.P.S. stock has more than quadrupled.) Groundworkers seldom own stock, and a growing share of their work can be done by computers — by automated teller machines, digital gas pumps, and computerized tollbooths, for example. Much of the rest doesn't require a lot of skill, and that helps explain why there's a surplus of groundworkers. It is still possible for someone to rise or fall, but the distances are now so large that it's rare for a groundworker to rise far enough to take off into the sky or a skyworker to fall far enough to hit the ground, at least in one generation.

The outcome at U.P.S. looks like a victory for ground forces. But there are reasons to be cautious before assuming that it can be a model for other unions in other settings. The Teamsters union had certain unique advantages. Some were of its own making, such as careful preparation and political sure-footedness. But U.P.S. is privately held, and so has more leeway to raise hourly wages than if it were a publicly held company, worried about investment

dollars' taking electronic flight if short-term profits aren't maximized. At U.P.S. the gap between sky and ground is a little smaller than it is at most other large service companies: U.P.S.'s chief executive started out as a driver, and almost all its shares are owned by current and former managers who in many instances were once hourly employees. Also, the pickup-and-delivery business itself is less vulnerable to the new world of electronic

commerce than many other service businesses are. (You can order everything from steaks to shorts over the Internet without the help of a salesperson or a cashier, but a human being still has to deliver the goods.) The Teamsters' biggest advantage, perhaps, was timing: unemployment is very low (not as low as the official numbers make it out to be, but lower than it has been for many years), so for U.P.S. to replace striking workers would have been difficult, had it chosen to do so. This low level of unemployment, of course, will not last forever.

(Continued on Page 8)

"If work can be categorized by altitude, groundworkers are the lower caste."

"Skyworkers are in ever greater demand in the global-digital economy Groundworkers seldom own stock, and a growing share of their work can be done by computers"

'Dogging the Snoops':**Can We Turn the Tables On Workplace Surveillance?****By Graham Sewell***The Department of Management & Industrial Relations, The University of Melbourne, Australia
(g.sewell@ecomfac.unimelb.edu.au)*

"Are there loose in our modern world forces that threaten to annihilate everybody's privacy? ... Individually the new social controls we are seeing are cloaked in reasonableness ... [but] they are producing pressures that intrude upon most of us where we live, work, shop, go to school or seek solitude. Millions of Americans are living in an atmosphere in which peering electronic eyes, undercover agents, lie detectors, hidden tape recorders, bureaucratic investigators and outrageously intrusive questionnaires are becoming commonplace, if only suspected facts of life."

In recent years surveillance has become one of the hottest topics in social theory yet this introductory quote is not taken from some obscure scholarly monograph but from Vance Packard's popular book, *The Naked Society*, first published in 1964. Early on Packard captured a pessimistic mood that still pervades much of the work on the role of surveillance in contemporary society. Authors such as James Rule, Gary Marx, Anthony Giddens, Oscar Gandy, Mark Poster and David Lyon have provided us with dystopian visions of the way in which surveillance has gradually joined bureaucracy as the principal modes of rationalization and control in contemporary life. Importantly, these authors identify the workplace as one of the sites where surveillance is now at its most intense.

Critical studies are emerging which demonstrate that the heightened levels of scrutiny and monitoring evident in today's workplace today play an important role in transforming the nature of work. In this vein, my own research has been concerned with how the experience of working in teams — a common feature of contemporary organizations — may

actually be at odds with the rhetoric of increased 'empowerment' or 'autonomy' currently to be found in much populist management theory. Here surveillance and teamwork together are implicated in the intensification of effort and the development of ever more stressful working conditions. In this light we can legitimately pose the question — what are the undesirable effects of workplace monitoring and how might they be countered?

"[B]y taking control of the apparatus of surveillance ... workers are able to use the information it generates to turn the spotlight back onto their managers...."

Of course, surveillance of one sort or another is a well-established feature of workplace control and supervision and any number of interesting historical examples can be identified. Here are just a few that I find particularly striking:

- The early Victorian philanthropist, Robert Owen, better known today for his role in the factory reform movement, was instrumental in introducing now familiar forms of supervision and monitoring to his Scottish mill in an attempt to ensure the obedience of his workers.
- In retail, the introduction of the mechanical cash register kept track of transactions while the bell allowed the storekeeper to observe each time the money drawer was being opened. Pricing all goods with the ubiquitous '... and 99 cents' tacked on the end made it more likely that the drawer would have to be opened whenever cash was handled as the customer waited to receive the penny change.
- Even truck drivers on the open highway were not immune from managerial scrutiny as the log books and wheel hubs meters were introduced to record time on the road and distance traveled.

The history of work is full of many other instances where managers have tried to ensure obedience, enhance control and increase subordination through the introduction of new surveillance technologies. Of greater interest to me, however, is the ways in which these technologies have been subverted or simply ignored. Nevertheless, our recent preoccupation with surveillance has focused on the emergence of electronic

forms of monitoring that appear to be more efficient in collecting data concerning human behavior and performance in the workplace. Moreover, they also seem to be more unobtrusive in their operation and, perhaps, more difficult to resist in traditional ways.

In work situations where individuals are afforded little autonomy and discretion in the conception and execution of their tasks, monitoring and supervision is primarily concerned with obedience — i.e. ensuring that work complies with managerially defined norms. However, under conditions of teamwork where individuals are now expected to use their own skills, experience and ingenuity to exceed minimum targets in the pursuit of 'continuous improvement', surveillance also reveals those who have made process innovations so they might be subject to a closer scrutiny by management. Of course, this has always gone on as managers have sought to appropriate and rationalize their subordinates' intimate knowledge of the work process. The managerial ideal here would be to normalize everybody's performance, not around the lowest common denominator, nor even some average level, but around the performance of the most outstanding individual. In this sense, new forms of surveillance take on an extended role. Now they are not only singling out 'poor' workers for sanction, they also drawing attention to 'good' workers whose activities should then set the standard for everyone else. Under

(Continued on Page 8)

Dual Labor Markets in Academia: A Cross-Disciplinary Conversation

By **Toby L. Parcel**, *Ohio State University*
(tlp@ohstsbs.sbs.ohio-state.edu)

Do part-time, temporary and adjunct faculty constitute a reserve labor pool that is itself exploited and also undercuts the well being of regular faculty? Alternatively, is regular tenure-track faculty complicit in the academic system that has seen the recent growth of part-time, temporary and adjunct faculty working at low pay and with few benefits? What are the chances of upward mobility from the secondary labor market of part-time faculty status to the primary labor market of tenure-track faculty? These and related issues formed the focus of a unique conference of academics held in Washington, D.C., September 26-28, 1997. The conference was sponsored by a number of learned societies including The American Historical Association, the American Mathematical Society, the American Philosophical Association, the American Political Science Association, the American Sociological Association, the Modern Language Association, the National Council of Teachers of English, and the Organization of American Historians. Other sponsoring organizations included the American Association of University Professors, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Council of Graduate Schools. Representatives from these groups met to discuss these issues and to reach consensus regarding the nature of the phenomenon involving part-time/temporary/adjunct faculty, the contributions of these colleagues, the problems inherent in this form of work organization, and an action agenda.

I attended as a representative of the American Sociological Association along with Caroline H. Persell, NYU; Phyllis H. Raabe, University of New Orleans; Nancy E. Sacks, Holyoke Community College; and Robert L. Hampton, University of Maryland. Carla Howery and Robert Spalter-Roth represented ASA. Attendees were from various disciplines and from institutions of different sizes. Given the strong growth in student enrollment and an associated increase in part-time/adjunct faculty employed in community and two-year colleges, it was important that colleagues from these institutions be present. One of the challenges inherent in this diversity was the very different experience colleagues in different disciplines, institutions and states have had regarding how part-time or temporary academic teaching is organized and experienced.

A number of representatives were also authors of papers that conference attendees studied ahead of time. Some of these authors also made presentations at plenary sessions raising and informing key issues. We discussed the nature and extent of the part-time/adjunct phenomenon, and confronted disciplinary differences in the extent of part-time teaching and its recent growth. For example, sociology's use of part-time teaching and temporary (non-tenure track) but full-time teaching has grown noticeably in recent years, while use of part-time teachers in some humanities disciplines has been high for much longer. A second plenary confronted the issue of how use of part time/adjuncts influenced the quality of education for undergraduates. A consensus emerged that while in many cases the quality of

teaching of these faculty was high, they typically had no access to support for development (research grants, sabbaticals), so the quality of their longer-term contributions could be questioned. Also, some argued that if hiring of part-time teachers was accompanied by decreases in sufficient numbers of tenure-track faculty, governance matters (e.g., curriculum) fell upon a few, relative to the magnitude of what needed to be managed.

Conference attendees also spent significant time in "breakout" groups to develop a document that would represent group consensus. A section on "shared understandings" focused on the nature and extent of part-time, adjunct and temporary faculty in undergraduate teaching; a second section identified benefits to institutions from such employment, primarily in terms of flexibility, apparent cost savings, and freeing of full-time faculty for more advanced instruction and research. A third section identified key disadvantages: low pay, limited benefits, lack of job security, and lack of staff support were disadvantages for the teachers. Lack of long-term involvement threatening coherence of the undergraduate offerings was a disadvantage for institutions. The large "reserve labor pool" was, some argued, undercutting salaries of regular faculty and threatening their tenure prospects. The document also identified good practices for institutions to adopt including granting these faculty equitable salaries, appropriate space, supplies, programs of professional development and advancement, and access to crucial fringe benefits including health insurance. The action agenda called for disciplinary associations to formulate statements of good practices to be transmitted to governmental bodies concerned with higher education, and for regular faculty to take leadership in promoting good practices within their own institutions. The conference and action agenda also acknowledged the possibility that unionization could operate to negotiate improved practices. For example, unions of faculty in California have already negotiated for the improvement of some elements of part-time/adjunct and temporary employment.

An underlying theme and frustration was, of course, who would pay for these improvement. If the solution is to hire more tenure-track faculty so there can be upward mobility between the two labor markets, are taxpayers and parents prepared to pay for this? If the solution is to maintain a two-tiered work force, but improve conditions in the bottom tier, who will pay for that? Community colleges have low costs because they rely on cheap part-time faculty labor; increased post-secondary enrollment is disproportionately in this sector. There is no evidence that this trend will reverse. Should tenure-track faculty sacrifice any of their access to grants, leaves, etc., so that these benefits can be more widely shared? Is not a root cause of this problem over supply of Ph.D.s relative to job prospects in respective fields and subfields? No one attending the conference would argue that solutions would come easily. Still, the conference represented an important step towards collective definition of the problems and prospects, which is surely a precursor of any constructive change in these labor arrangements.

Sky and Ground: What the U.P.S. Strike Delivered

(Continued from Page 5)

Even so, the U.P.S. settlement has a broader meaning. For the most part, groundworkers are not unionized, and the dwindling few who have been on the defensive ever since Ronald Reagan fired the air-traffic controllers (who watched the sky from the ground). At mid-century, when America's economy revolved around manufacturing, more than a third of the workforce belonged to a union. When autoworkers, steelworkers, or chemical workers struck, or even threatened to strike, they won ever larger shares of the economy's postwar bounty. The public supported them, and unionized blue-collar workers became the nation's middle class. Today, scarcely a tenth of the private-sector workforce is unionized, and there has been scant public support for unions.

About the only way groundworkers are going to gain ground is if they organize and hang tough, and about the only way America's labor unions are going to grow is if they organize groundworkers. Organizing is hard work. The laws protecting the right to join a union are laughably weak, and some private employers find it cost-effective to flout them by arbitrarily firing workers who start talking union: the remote possibility of being ordered to pay a small fine sometime in the future is more than worth the benefit of keeping

employees powerless to bargain. Even when the laws are obeyed, they provide ample opportunities for years-long delays, and such delays are usually fatal to organizing efforts. Under these circumstances, ironically, labor has a hidden advantage, and that

"About the only way groundworkers are going to gain ground is if they organize and hang tough, and about the only way America's labor unions are going to grow is if they organize groundworkers."

is its own past lassitude: the union movement has hardly anywhere to go but up. And now, under the new and more vigorous leadership at the A.F.L.-C.I.O. (and at Teamsters headquarters, where the union president Ron Carey, faces a court-ordered battle to retain his post), up is exactly where labor seems poised to go. Most of the tens of millions of groundworkers in giant hospitals, hotel chains, supermarket chains, discount stores, and fast-food chains haven't really considered joining a union. For them, the outcome at U.P.S. must glow like a big neon sign by the side of the road,

advertising something brand-new: the possibility that groundworkers might rise upward by rising up.

Reprinted by permission; copyright 1997, The New Yorker Magazine, Inc. All rights reserved.

Can We Turn the Tables on Workplace Surveillance?

(Continued from Page 6)

these conditions, if 'empowering' workers or giving them 'autonomy' is only about enabling people, either wittingly or unwittingly, to intensify their own effort or that of their colleagues then workers themselves have become a part of management's 'watchful eye.'

It seems implicit in many contemporary studies of the nature of surveillance in the workplace — especially those influenced by the work of

"Perhaps more importantly though, we can press surveillance into the service of the less powerful."

Michel Foucault — that it creates an inescapable web of control that serves the interests of the powerful. I would initially counter such a 'discourse of despair' by pointing to the exaggerated claims of

surveillance to maintain a constant and complete watch on everyone — there are still many dark spots in the gaze of the electronic eye. Perhaps more importantly though, we can press surveillance into the service of the less powerful. I agree with David Lyon that, in adopting an entirely pessimistic viewpoint, we can often forget the genuinely beneficial aspects of surveillance. Taking this point further, I advocate that, where possible, we should turn the tables on the watchers. Although there are many other instances where 'reverse surveillance' has been used to counter domination, the most familiar example of this in recent years has to be the video recording of the Rodney

King assault. In the workplace I think we can learn from the impact of this important event by adopting a modified version of what the British researcher, David Collinson, calls 'resistance through

persistence'. Here persistence would involve supporting subordinates' demands for real involvement in workplace decisions by extracting information and monitoring management practices in order to challenge the reasonableness of demands for 'continuous improvement'. Of course, erecting countervailing systems of effective surveillance is fraught with practical and technological problems. Nevertheless, two other British researchers, Alan McKinlay and Phil Taylor, have shown that workers can establish a limited but, nonetheless, genuine degree of autonomy, not only by determining their own work tasks but also setting the limits to the evaluation of their own performance. It may seem ironic but, by taking control of the apparatus of surveillance by controlling performance monitoring in this way, workers are able to use the information it generates to turn the spotlight back onto their managers and ask — "... so what have you done for us lately?"



In Brief



Back by popular demand is the book compendium originally convened by Chip Clarke. With homage to Chip, what follows is a brief annotated listing of OOW-relevant books published in 1996 and 1997. The list does not pretend to be exhaustive or objective. Feel free to send suggestions and comments to the editor.

Arlie Russell Hochschild, *The Time Bind: When Work Becomes Home and Home Becomes Work*. New York: Metropolitan Books. Explosive analysis of the cultural inversions that are endemic among parents within absorptive occupations.

Erica Schoenberger, *Cultural Crisis of the Firm*. Blackwell, 1997. Very interesting analysis of the bearing of culture on managerial strategies. Flawed, but has fascinating material on the formulation of managerial strategy at Lockheed and Xerox.

James Paul Gee, Glynda Hull and Colin Lanksheer, *The New Work Order*. Westview 1997. Interesting effort to analyze the new managerial discourse under "fast capitalism." Develops a useful case study of an American corporation as well. Critical view of "flexibility" that is well worth reading.

Margaret M. Pearson, *China's New Business Elite*. Univ of California, 1997. Qualitative analysis of private-sector entrepreneurs in China. Pearson argues that contrary to Western opinion, the rising commercial classes are not at the forefront of democratization, but instead augur a new form of state-society relations in China — a hybrid of socialist corporatism and clientelism.

Stanley Aronowitz and Jonathan Culter, eds. *Post-Work: The Wages of Cybernation*. Routledge, 1997. Builds on Aronowitz's prior efforts to analyze the massive restructuring of paid employment that technology imposes on the economic institutions of advanced capitalism.

Ruth Milkman, *Farewell to the Factory: Autoworkers in the late Twentieth Century*. California, 1997. Milkman traces the consequences of the layoffs that hit

autoworkers formerly employed at GM's Linden plant in New Jersey. More than another "impact" study, Milkman's book explores the dilemmas industrial workers face in an historical context and culture that seems determined to leave them behind.

Arne Kalleberg, David Knoke, Peter Marsden and Joe L. Spaeth.

***Organizations in America: Analyzing their Structures and Human Resource Practices*.** Sage, 1996. The value of the National Organizations Survey is here amply displayed. Carefully analyzes a wide range of substantive issues bearing on organizational structure and change, internal labor markets, and the employment relationship.

Andrea Tone, *The Business of Benevolence: Industrial Paternalism in Progressive America*. Cornell, 1997. Stunning historical analysis of paternalistic factory regimes, showing the ways in which paternalism enabled employers to "manage" their image in the public mind. Broadens labor history out in ways that are amenable to institutionalist theory and research. Recommended.

Jane Broadbent, Michael Dietrich and Jennifer Roberts, *The End of the Professions? The Restructuring of Professional Work*. Routledge, 1997. Critical discussion of the debates over professional restructuring, arguing for careful analysis of both continuity and change.

Melissa Hardy, Lawrence Hazelrigg, and Jill Quadagno, *Ending a Career in the Auto Industry: "30 and Out"*. Plenum, 1996. Comprehensive analysis of management strategies for labor attrition and the logic of workers' responses. Read alongside Milkman.

Elizabeth Higginbotham and Mary Romero, eds. *Women and Work: Exploring Race, Ethnicity, and Class*. Sage, 1997. This collection explores how race, ethnicity, and social class have shaped the work lives of women — not only their structural position within firms and the economy, but also their ability to control their work environments. Nicely

draws out the multiple linkages between race and gender inequality.

David Wellman, *The Union Makes Us Strong: Radical Unionism on the San Francisco Waterfront*. Cambridge, 1997. Brings together theories of work processes, union organization, class analysis and cultural representation. New in paperback.

Sarah Stage and Virginia B. Vincenti, eds., *Rethinking Home Economics: Women and the History of a Profession*. Cornell, 1997. Documents the historical development of the home economics movement, showing the ways in which gender ideologies shaped the field's standing in the wider society.

Kyeyoung Park, *The Korean American Dream: Immigrants and Small Business in New York City*. Cornell, 1997. Korean immigrants to the US establish their own small businesses at a rate exceeding that of immigrants from any other nation. Park examines this process in Queens, New York, tracing the linkage between Korean cultural identity and commercial practices.

Charles Sabel and Jonathan Zeitlin, eds., *World of Possibilities: Flexibility and Mass Production in Western Industrialization*. Cambridge, 1997. Comprehensive collection of papers by scholars in various disciplines, interpreting the interplay between flexible and mass production modes of work from the 18th century to the present. Some papers seem a bit dated, reflecting perhaps the volume's lengthy gestation period. Excellent introduction by Sabel and Zeitlin.

Leslie Margolin, *Under the Cover of Kindness: The Invention of Social Work*. University Press of Virginia, 1997. Critical investigation of social work, showing how the rise of this occupation legitimated state intrusion into the previously private space of the home.

Michael B. Arthur and Denise Rousseau. *The Boundaryless Career: A New Employment Principle for a New Organizational Era*. Oxford University

(Continued on Page 10)



In Brief



(Continued from Page 9)

Press, 1997. This book uses the concept of the "boundaryless career" to understand the contemporary restructuring of work and organizations. It also uses the word "success" a lot.

Paul Osterman, ed., *Broken Ladders: Managerial Careers in the New Economy*. Oxford University Press, 1997. This book reports on the employment security, advancement prospects, skills and wages of managers in a wide range of firms and industries. There is much useful material here.

Devon G. Pena, *The Terror of the Machine: Technology, Work, Gender, and Ecology on the U.S.-Mexico border*. CMAS Books, 1997. Workplace and community struggles among workers in the maquiladoras.

Andrea Leyshon and Nigel Thrift, *Money Space: Geographies of Monetary Transformation*. Routledge, 1997. Two geographers address the theory of money, using the spatial restructuring of global markets as their point of departure.

Deborah Figart and Peggy Kahn, *Contesting the Market: Pay Equity and the Politics of Economic Restructuring*. Wayne State University Press, 1997. Chronicles the role of the national pay equity movement, women's organizations within state institutions, and public sector unions in placing wage discrimination on the state's agenda.

Francine Blau and Ronald Ehrenberg, *Gender and Family Issues in the Workplace*. Russell Sage, 1997. Analyzes the consequences of parental leave policies for gender inequality, asking whether the extension of leave might, in conjunction with traditional gender roles, sidetrack women's careers.

Amy Wharton, *Working in America: Continuity, Conflict and Change*. Mayfield, 1997. Useful collection of the most important works in our field, including classic and contemporary statements. Excellent for undergraduates, among others.

Kathryn Edin and Laura Lein, *Making Ends Meet: How Single Mothers Survive Welfare and Low Wage Work*. Russell Sage, 1997. Influential analysis of survival strategies invoked by the working poor, whose real behaviors are rarely detected by official statistics.

Philip Scranton, *Endless Novelty: Specialty Production and American Industrialization, 1865-1925*. Princeton, 1997. Unusually broad historical analysis of flexible forms of production in several American industries and cities. Heretically enough, suggests that the emphasis on Taylorism in U.S. labor history is typically overdrawn.

Ruth Schwartz Cowan, *A Social History of American Technology*. Oxford University Press, 1997. Cowan is a leading figure in the history of technology and the author of a pathbreaking monograph, *More Work for Mother*, on the history of household technologies. Here she constructs an innovative overview of the interplay between culture and technology. A useful guide to the literature, and more.

Barbara Czarniawska, *Narrating the Organization: Dramas of Institutional Identity*. Chicago 1997. Highly innovative analysis of organizational change, focusing on public administration in Sweden but applicable to much broader realms.

Christena E. Nippert-Eng, *Home and Work: Negotiating Boundaries through Everyday Life*. Chicago, 1997. Finely textured analysis of how spatial and temporal boundaries are traversed and experienced.

Elliott A. Krause, *Death of the Guilds: Professions, States, and the Advance of Capitalism, 1930 to the Present*. Yale, 1996. Ambitious historical analysis of the changing role of the professions in the expansion of international capitalism.

Stephen R. Barley and Julian E. Orr, eds. *Between Craft and Science: Technical Work in the United States*. ILR, 1997. Interesting collection of ethnographic papers that view technical work as an occupational anomaly. Strong papers, with contributions by Randy

Hodson, Peter Whalley, Jeffrey Keefe and others. Recommended.

Martin J. Levine, *Worker Rights and Labor Standards in Asia's Four New Tigers*. Plenum, 1997. Comparative analysis of workers movements and workers' rights in Indonesia, Thailand, China and Malaysia.

John Price, *Japan Works: Power and Paradox in Postwar Industrial Relations*. ILR, 1996. In the wake of Japan's economic troubles, Price asks whether, in embracing Toyotism, we may be choosing a path Japan itself is rejecting. Moves the debate beyond the hype of lean production.

Julian E. Orr, *Talking about Machines: An Ethnography of a Modern Job*. ILR, 1996. Ethnographic study of copy machine repair technicians. Nice addition to the growing ethnographic literature on the worker/machine relation.

Grace Budrys, *When Doctors Join Unions*. ILR, 1996. Explores the contradictions of physician unionism by studying members of a San Francisco doctors' union. Interesting.

Peter F. Meiksins and Chris Smith, *Engineering Labour: Technical Workers in Comparative Perspective*. Verso, 1996. Important comparative analysis of the varied structural locations that engineering assumes. Uniquely enough, both David Noble and John Child recommend this book. I agree.

Paul Bernstein, *American Work Values: Their Origin and Development*. SUNY Press, 1997. Fine-grained historical analysis of the religious origins of the modern work ethic. Grapples with the stresses and strains imposed on the work ethic in an era of downsizing and automation.

Helena Z. Lopata and Anne Figert, eds., *Current Research on Occupations and Professions: Getting Down to Business*. JAI Press, 1996. Interesting collection of papers on occupations that are often overlooked, with particular attention to issues of race, gender and ethnicity.

Committees Announce 1997 Awards

Lounsbury Wins James D. Thompson Award

The James D. Thompson Award Committee was comprised of David Williamson of the University of North Texas, George Gabriel of Northern Virginia College, and Patricia A. Gwartney of the University of Oregon (chair). We carefully reviewed 15 papers from universities across the country.

The winning paper was "Compliance and Commitment in Institutional Theory: College and University Recycling Program Variation and Diffusion, 1970-1995," written by Michael Lounsbury, a doctoral student in the Sociology and Organization Behavior Departments of Northwestern University. His advisor is Paul Hirsch. The paper impressed the committee with its original and innovative combination of inductive and deductive reasoning and its excellent theoretical grounding. Lounsbury argues for a broader view of agency in organizational research by combining "old" and "new" institutionalism. Blending ethnographic research and event history analysis, he studied how the adoption and organization of college recycling programs varied over time by whether key players were committed activists in the environmental movement or physical plant workers who simply complied with environmental regulations. At the OOW business meeting on Saturday, August 9, 1997 at the ASA annual meeting in Toronto, Mr. Lounsbury was presented with a \$300 check and a certificate.

The committee also awarded Honorable Mentions to: David W. Allison, University of Michigan, "What is Trustworthiness Worth? The Impact of Trust Assessments on Prices in Buyer-Supplier Relations" (advisor, Mark Mizruchi), for theoretical and empirical elegance; Ana Rodriguez-Gusta, University of Notre Dame, "The Social Side of Economic Effort: A Case Study of a Women's Cooperative" (advisor, David Hachen), for originality, excellent inductive reasoning, and strong theoretical grounding; and Lisa A. Keister, Cornell University, "Chinese Business Groups and Firm Performance:

The Role of Intercompany Linkages in a Transitional Economy," for empirical strength and robust findings in application of extant theory to a new area.

Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP) Cites Stepan-Norris, Zeitlin as Award Recipients

Judith Stepan-Norris and Maurice Zeitlin won the Distinguished Publication Award from the Labor Studies Division of the Society for the Study of Social Problems. Their article, "Insurgency, Radicalism, and Democracy in America's Industrial Unions" (SOCIAL FORCES 1996) was chosen for its outstanding contribution to the field of labor research. The committee was chaired by Vicki Smith of the University of California, Davis.

Haveman, Cohen Receive Weber Award

The Weber Committee consisted of Steven Brint (chair), Thomas DiPrete, and Mary Fennell. We received 12 papers to consider, many of them outstanding. We did reach consensus on the winning paper, Heather A. Haveman and Lisa E. Cohen, "The Ecological Dynamics of Careers: The Impact of Organizational Founding, Dissolution, and Merger of Job Mobility." *American Journal of Sociology* 100 (July 1994): 104-52. In this paper, Haveman and Cohen model the effects of organizational foundings, dissolutions and mergers on the careers of managers in the California insurance industry. They find important structural effects on managers' mobility with dissolutions and mergers encouraging exits from the industry and reducing mobility chances. The paper encourages an important connection between ecological theory and stratification studies. Heather Haveman is at the Johnson School of Business at Cornell University. Lisa Cohen is at the Haas School of Business, University of California, Berkeley finishing her doctoral degree.

OOW Section Membership Shows Rapid Growth

As Barbara Reskin notes in her "From the Chair" report, OOW Section membership has surpassed the 1000-member threshold. The new membership total of 1,032 qualifies the Section for an additional session at the 1998 convention. Here, happily enough, are the details.

Section News

According to recent ASA figures, the July membership for the OOW Section jumped 7.9% between 1996 and 1997, compared

to the 4.6% increase in total July section membership over the same period.

The OOW increase is in no small way attributable to the 10% increase in OOW July STUDENT memberships between 1996 and 1997, and to the fine efforts of OOW committee and council members, including the publications, membership, and graduate affairs committees.

OOW remains firmly ensconced in its second position after the Sex & Gender Section in the ASA section membership

hierarchy. The 1996-97 rates of change in the July section memberships of the other five largest ASA sections in 1997 are below (1997 memberships in parentheses):

- Sex & Gender (1153), -1.0%
- Medical (924), +1.0%
- Culture (867), +8.6%
- Race, Gender, & Class (796), +12.9%

Race, Gender, & Class displaced from the top five Racial & Ethnic Minorities (713), which declined by 5.1%.

—Dan Cornfield, past Chair of OOW

Report on a Conference in Sao Paolo:

The World of Work: From Factory to Informality

By Anne Posthuma

University of Sao Paolo, Brazil (posthuma@usp.br)

Sao Paulo was the host of the 21st Congress of the Latin American Sociology Association (ALAS), from August 31 to September 4. For scholars of work and occupations, Workgroup 13 titled "The World of Work: From the Factory to Informality," was of particular interest. Participation in this workgroup was intense. Nearly 130 papers had been accepted (although unfortunately not all authors obtained financial support to participate in the congress), reflecting the growing interest in the sociology of work in Latin America. Presentations were

Section News

organized into nine sessions around the following themes: gender and work; skills and training; theoretical issues; globalization and economic liberalization; labor markets and precarious forms of work; restructuring, technological innovation and work organization; labor relations and unions; workplace health; and labor, culture and subjectivity.

Despite the diversity of topics addressed, most papers and discussions centered around two broad themes: the impacts of globalization and restructuring; and the changing nature of work, employment and occupations. The impact of restructuring and the broader macroeconomic processes of globalization and market liberalization have been central points of concern throughout the 1990s among Latin American scholars, and continue to constitute a major area of research and debate across the continent. Second, the changing nature of work, employment and occupations has attracted increasing attention as reforms designed to increase labor market flexibility are being introduced by government and companies. Sociologists realize that they have an important role to play by documenting and analyzing trends and social impacts of these widespread transformations, and by providing information for public debate, policy makers, trade union activities and segments of organized civil society.

Many papers were based upon traditional research methodologies, using either firm-level case studies or sectoral analyses. Papers included studies on the public sector, banking, and metal-working industries, as well as less conventional areas such as the film industry and fishing industry, with increasing attention given to the informal sector. Most papers were descriptive in character, contextualizing the micro-level processes taking place in the factory, on the shop floor, in a trade union, or within a specific sector. This wealth of empirical material makes a significant contribution toward understanding the texture of the restructuring process by recounting the experiences of workers, their subjective reactions and their various forms of organized, and individual resistance. These studies show that Latin American restructuring is not a fluid process of adapting to a new global paradigm of "best practice." Rather, it is created in heterogeneous and adapted forms across the continent, emerging from the struggles and

interaction among social, economic and political actors. While few papers attempted to outline trends at a regional level, one paper (Iranzo) provided a particularly useful summary of labor management studies across Latin America.

The session devoted to labor markets and precarious forms of work and occupations included several studies which documented the problem of urban unemployment in Buenos Aires, Rosario and Caracas in the 1990s (Azucena and Julio; Milano — see references below). These studies describe the dismantling of the Fordist institutional mechanisms for collective bargaining, the weakening of existing labor laws and the restricted scope for trade union activities, which leave workers vulnerable to unilateral decisions by companies to cut costs and downsize. These authors warn that undermining worker protection and rights to negotiation can only lead to increased social inequality and poverty in countries which are struggling to maintain new-found political stability and democratic structures.

A study of the informal sector in Rio de Janeiro presents a remarkable view of the impact of high unemployment and increasingly precarious forms of work upon youth. The lack of public policies for improving basic education and promoting employment creation lead to the emergence of a generation whose occupational trajectory starts, and remains, in the informal sector (Moreira). In the same vein, another study gives a voice to the unemployed (by sex and economic position in the household) describing their reactions to their situation, as well as the effects upon their social and family life (Merlinsky).

Quantitative studies using larger data sets were less frequent, with some noteworthy exceptions. A study of child labor in Buenos Aires traced declining real incomes and public expenditures over the past 20 years and the rising number of families living below the poverty line (now one-fourth of the population in Buenos Aires, according to World Bank data). Using this data, the author builds a picture of the socio-economic pressures on poor households and their survival strategies which lead to increased child labor (Guimenez et al).

Of particular interest was the strong participation of papers addressing gender and work. Papers from Brazil, Argentina, Mexico and Chile explored the range of experiences of women workers from the factory, to their militancy and struggle for recognition in the labor movement, to homeworking and rural work. A significant contribution was made by a paper which presented a comprehensive collection of labor codes and collective bargaining agreements related to women workers, concerning maternity leave, working conditions and workplace health. The authors note that although the Brazilian constitution prohibits discrimination in wages or hiring criteria on the basis of sex or race, only four collective bargaining contracts were

(Continued on Page 13)

The World of Work: From Factory to Informality

(Continued from Page 12)

found which included a clause regarding equal opportunities for women. Many professional categories had no clause specifying the rights of women workers. Within existing legislation, 85% of clauses are related to pregnancy and maternity, only 9% are related to condition of work, 3% to work health and 1% to equal opportunities (Sanches and Gebrim). Another paper explored changing views toward the gender aspects of Third World industrialization and analyzes the impact of restructuring upon the sexual division of labor and social construction of skills in the Argentine auto parts industry (Stobbe).

The impact of restructuring upon the private sphere was explored in terms of household strategies for survival under restructuring in Buenos Aires from 1986-1996 (Lazo and Lazo). Another study explored the economic behavior of poor women in Buenos Aires, analyzing their limited range of labor market options, in terms of their personal sphere, whether head of household, number of children, civil status and migration patterns of family members (Masseroni).

The panel "Productive Restructuring and Strategies in the World of Work," provided an opportunity to contrast Latin American and European views. Drawing upon restructuring in companies he has examined in France, Philippe Zarifian adopted an optimistic one as he described a model of work transformation where formal barriers and hierarchies are substantially reduced. He argued that the crisis of Taylorism has opened greater scope for workers to take greater direct control over their work, citing cases where management has delegated authority and invested in training and new work organization to increase workers' range of abilities, or so-called competencies. As a final note, he noted that collective bargaining should be a central forum for determining new forms of labor management and development of worker competencies.

Three presentations on the Brazilian case provided a striking counterpoint, describing the increased flexibility of employment and labor conditions, within an overall framework of labor vulnerability. First of all, Magda de Almeida Neves emphasized that the new autonomous worker is more of a challenge than a reality in Brazil, constituting a new management ideology rather than true transformation. She emphasized the rise of flexible labor contracts, the rise of part-time work and outsourcing as prime cost-cutting strategies. While this may include some highly-skilled, well-paid professionals, most workers face more precarious conditions of work. She argued that although company training and participatory programs open possibilities for workers, they also lead to a convergence between management and worker interests, which may replace the former authoritarian model of labor relations but also limiting the possibility of new unionist strategies.

The sexual division of labor and production chains was addressed by Laís Abramo, who compared current research undertaken in

Argentina, Chile and Brazil. These new studies show widespread tendencies toward sub-contracting and feminization of labor-intensive, low-paid work. Strategies for cost-reduction pass the weight of restructuring onto the weakest firms, resulting in more precarious conditions of labor down the production chain. However, she notes that the complexity of these changes makes it difficult to draw clear distinctions which were used previously, associating the modern sector with formality and more precarious forms of production and labor utilization with the informal sector.

The analysis of production (commodity) chains was also taken up by Marcia de Paula Leite, who discussed the segmentation of the labor force in the automotive industry. New investments in technology, worker training and participatory programs in the core firm were contrasted by increasingly poor conditions of work and flexible forms of labor contracts further down the production chain, involving sub-contracted work, homeworking and even child labor in coal production.

This event shows that the sociology of labor has entered a period of great vitality in Latin America, spawning various meeting forums and institutional formats. The 21st ALAS Congress is part of a continuum which was established with the first Congress of the Latin American Sociology of Labor Association (ALAST) held in Mexico City in 1993 and the second held in Águas de Lindóia (in São Paulo state) in 1996.

References

- Azucena, T. S. and Z. Julio. "Flexibilización, precariedad laboral y desocupación: el ajuste y las condiciones de desprotección social en el gran Buenos Aires 1991-1995."
- Guimenez, Sandra, et al. "El trabajo infante-juvenil en el Gran Buenos Aires: sus opacidades y transparencias: una aproximación desde técnicas multivariadas a su evolución entre 1974 y 1995."
- Iranzo, Consuelo. "Estrategias de Gestión de la Mano de Obra en América Latina." Venezuela.
- Masseroni, S. "Inserción laboral de mujeres pobres: un estudio sobre los factores condicionantes." Argentina.
- Merlinsky, M. G. "Los perfiles de la desocupación en el Gran Rosario: el desempleo como problema estructural y en la percepción de los actores."
- Milano, M. J. "La informalidad de la libertad de contratos: notas sobre flexibilización y regulación laboral." Venezuela.
- Moreira, M. "O setor informal da economia e a juventude: o caso da zona oeste do município do Rio de Janeiro."
- Sanches S. and V. L. M. Gebrim. "Negociación de cláusulas relativas al trabajo de la mujer en Brasil."
- Stobbe, Lineke. "The Gendering of Industrial Work: Women Workers in the Argentine auto part Industry."
- Lazo, A. S. and T. Lazo. "Estrategias familiares y utilización intensiva de fuerza de trabajo en una época de crisis y cambio estructural." Argentina.

Further questions about the papers cited herein may be directed to Posthuma, at the address given above.

Report on a Five-Year Study:

Race, Work, and Substance Abuse

*By Jack Martin, University of Georgia
Funded by the National Institutes of Health*

Since 1990 a group of researchers at the University of Georgia (UGA) and the Georgia Institute of Technology have been conducting a series of studies examining the influences of jobs, occupations, and workplaces on worker affect and behavioral health with a particular emphasis on patterns of maladaptive drinking among employed persons. The cornerstone of this inquiry has been a series of five telephone interview surveys with nationally representative cross sections of full-time employees, the National Employee Surveys (NES). These surveys, comprised of approximately 3,000 respondents each, have been funded by a series of (NIH) National Institutes of Health research and training grants to Drs. Paul Roman and Jack Martin at UGA, and Dr. Terry Blum at Georgia Tech.

These surveys have proven to be valuable resources for developing an understanding of work-based influences on worker behaviors on and off the job. However these studies have been deficient in at least one major regard. Due to African Americans' relatively small proportional representation in the total U.S. population, the sampling strategy underlying the ongoing NES effort has been unable to generate adequate data for developing reliable estimates of drinking patterns of African-American employees. Of course this limitation inheres in virtually all areas of sociological inquiry but is particularly distressing in studies of behavioral health. Here most conventional treatments of these behaviors, lacking adequate sample sizes, continue to treat African-Americans as an homogeneous group. African-American drinking has tended to be viewed as a characteristic response to more-or-less uniform negative social and economic experiences.

Such a perspective tends to blame African Americans for their problematic or maladaptive use of alcohol by focusing on African Americans' presumed intra-psychic deficiencies that are believed to reflect perceived their "cultural inferiority" (relative to the dominant white culture). As a result of various features labeled as social ills that have plagued the African-American community (i.e., matriarchal family structure, high rates of crime and delinquency, weak attachment to jobs, etc.), African Americans are seen as having internalized personality attributes and lifestyle orientations tolerant of drinking and drunkenness. For the most part, then, the literature has assumed that as a result of these common norms, values, and experiences, African Americans demonstrate a unity of behavior in drinking patterns.

Beyond the obvious naivete of such a view, the end result of having ignored intra-group variation among African Americans is a situation where today little reliable data exists on class, familial, religious, or regional differences in drinking patterns. This is particularly troubling since lacking such data, there has been a tendency to assume that such differences do not exist. This untested assumption of uniformity amounts to little more than a

sophisticated form of stereotyping, and underestimates the variability of behaviors among African Americans, ultimately leading to an overestimation of the contribution of race to drinking patterns. In an attempt to correct this myopia in the literature, the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech research team, along with Dr. Steven Tuch at the George Washington University, has received NIH funding for a five-year, 2.4-million dollar longitudinal study of the interactive influences of intra-psychic, workplace, socioeconomic, and larger societal factors that operate to place African-American workers at risk for maladaptive uses of alcohol. Attention is also focused on identifying protective factors and coping resources that may mitigate against problem drinking behaviors in the population of employed African Americans.

The theoretical model to be tested specifies both situational and dispositional factors that place African-American workers at risk for the development of maladaptive drinking. Situational influences center on economic, workplace, and community stressors that are related to African Americans' commonly disadvantaged positions in American society. These disadvantaged statuses are seen as the result of perceived and actual patterns of historical and contemporary race-based discrimination and segregation. Dispositional risk factors, on the other hand, reference social psychological states (i.e., depression, escapist coping strategies, feelings of powerlessness, etc.) that accumulate, in part, as an outcome of these forms of racism in American society. The model to be tested is unique in that it also posits more-or-less unique protections against the development of problem drinking patterns among African Americans, attributable to participation in the black church and to the development of racial consciousness. Thus, the model seeks to capture, within the population of African-American workers, both sources and protections that influence variation in African-American workers' problematic patterns of alcohol use.

To address this expected intra-group variation in problem drinking behaviors, the study will collect both cross-sectional and longitudinal survey data from a nationally representative sample of African-American workers (n=3,000). Since the model of problem drinking to be tested assumes that the relationships between the hypothesized risk and protective factors and drinking behaviors are dynamic, the proposed study will also utilize a panel design that incorporates an 18-month follow-up interval.

The research team for the African-American extension of the NES is comprised of Jack Martin (PI), Paul Roman (Co-PI), Steven Tuch (Co-PI), and Patrick Horan (Research Scientist). Following completion of wave one data collection in 1998, these researchers hope to co-sponsor a conference on African-American workers and entrepreneurs with Dr. Terry Blum, director of the Georgia Tech Dupree Center on Entrepreneurship, and Dr. Thomas D. Boston, director of the program on Black Entrepreneurship in the Dupree Center.

Section News

From the Program Chair

(Continued from Page 2)

meetings that we change our by-laws so that we elect two graduate student representatives to council for multi-year terms. This will provide greater student input into OOW and allow the student representatives a better chance to figure out what's going on before they are out of office.

Another effort at making OOW more user friendly involves an expansion of our web site with the move of the web site from Princeton, where Julian Dierkes has been maintaining it, to the University of Illinois at Chicago. Bill Bridges of UIC has arranged its move to UIC, and Frank Steinhart of the Sociology Department at North Park University will develop and manage the page. We hope that the new web page will include a news group where people can post questions.

A graduate student's simple request for tips in researching the effect of technology on work organization on large, ocean-going vessels led to new ideas for our web page. Chip Clarke sent this question to several colleagues on behalf of a graduate student, inspiring the idea of a question-and-answer place at our web page. (And if you have any leads, contact Chip at iclark@rutgers.edu.) Look for other innovations, too, once the site settles in at its new home.

Steve Vallas, who edits this very newsletter and chairs OOW's publications —

both conventional and electronic — committee, has a variety of other ideas of things that would make OOW's web page more useful for members. Please pass on any suggestions to him.

Steve has also restored an old-fashioned feature in this issue of the newsletters — mini book reviews of the type that appeared in the OOW newsletter that Chip Clarke edited. This feature helps all of us stay abreast of the literature.

The other big plans for the coming year involve our program for the 1998 annual meetings. The theme of the OOW program is "Gender, Race, and Other Forms of Inequality in Organizations, Occupations, and Work." Each member of the Program Committee, which Bill Bridges is chairing, will select from the submissions the papers for the session she or he organizes. These sessions—listed with organizers elsewhere—include "Organizations, Professions, and Inequality," "Causes and Consequences of Inequality within Organizations," "Race and Gender in Organizational, Occupational, and Workplace Networks," as well as a refereed roundtable session. Our cosponsored sessions also reflect the program theme. We are jointly sponsoring a session with the Section on Sex and Gender on "Equal Employment Opportunities by Gender and Race in a Time of Economic Restructuring," and

we are cosponsoring a session with the Section on Law on the topic "EEO and the Post-Civil Rights Era."

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to thank Julian Dierkes for maintaining our home page and web site: Rosemary Wright for serving as secretary pro-tem at the annual meetings; Bob Kaufman, Kimberley Kracman, and Patricia Martin, who have completed their terms on council; the people who served on committees during 1996-97; and especially the people who graciously agreed to serve on committees for this year and who are listed elsewhere in the newsletter.

And the best for last: I want to heap praise on our past chair, Dan Cornfield, for a whole slew of things: the energy and enthusiasm he brought to the section, his leaving the section \$800 in the black (half of this is from reception costs that Dan prevailed upon ASA to refund because our reception was a trifle difficult to find), and for easing my transition into the section's chairship by emailing me three copies of every OOW email message he sent during the past year.

I'll welcome your comments and suggestions. You can reach me at the Department of Sociology, Harvard University, 570 William James Hall, 33 Kirkland St., Cambridge MA 02138, 617/495-8766 (fax 617/496-5794), reskin@wjh.harvard.edu.

Academy of Management Proposes New Forum in 'Critical Management Studies'

Recently members of the Academy of Management proposed that an ongoing workshop be convened devoted to Critical Management Studies — a decided break with the sorts of analysis we associate with the Academy of Management, and a proposal that OOW members may find relevant to their own teaching and research. The proposal's tenor may be seen in the statement below.

We propose to create an ongoing Critical Management Studies (CMS) workshop that would bring together people based on a shared belief and commitment. Our shared belief is that management of the modern firm (and often of other types of organizations too) is guided by a narrow goal — profits — rather than by the interests of society as a whole, and that other goals — justice, community, human development, ecological balance — should be brought to bear on the governance of economic activity. We are

fundamentally critical of the notion that the pursuit of profit will automatically satisfy these broader goals. We believe that such a one-sided system extracts an unacceptably high social cost for whatever progress it offers. Guided by such narrow goals, the firm is a structure of domination; our shared commitment is to helping people free themselves from that domination. The CMS workshop's objective is therefore the development of critical interpretations of management — interpretations that are critical not of poor management nor of individual managers, but of the system of business and management that reproduces this one-sidedness.

The full text of the proposal is currently circulating among various intellectual networks and lists prominent organizational researcher Paul S. Adler as the contact person (padler@usc.edu). For more information, readers may contact Adler.

Calls for Papers and Other Announcements

Calls for Papers

1998 Braverman Award for Graduate Student Papers

The Labor Studies Division of the Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP) announces the competition for the 1998 Braverman Award. The award recognizes an outstanding graduate student paper that builds on the Braverman tradition of critical research in the following fields (not necessarily an exhaustive list): studies of the labor process; studies of the interaction of race, gender and class in the workplace; critical perspectives on labor market or occupational/professional transformation; corporate/structural economic change and its effect on workers, managers, race/gender/class hierarchies; stratification and culture; and sociology of business.

Please send three copies of the paper to the committee chair: Kevin Delaney, Dept. of Sociology, Temple University, Philadelphia, PA 19122. For more information, please send email to: kdelaney@astro.ocis.temple.edu. Deadline for submission is March 1, 1998. Other committee members are: Cindy Anderson, Iowa State and Marilyn Chap, UC-Santa Cruz.

Weber Award Book Submissions

The Weber Award is for an outstanding article or book (in alternating years) published over the past three years. The 1998 award will be for a book, and the nomination deadline is March 1, 1998. Authors can nominate themselves or section members can do the nominating. To nominate, send a copy of the nominee's book (if possible), three copies of a justification of your nomination, and nominee contact information (including email, if applicable) to the committee chair. This year, the Committee will be chaired by Robin Leidner, Department of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, 3718 Locust Walk, Philadelphia PA 19104-6299 (rleidner@sas.upenn.edu). Other committee members include Lee Clarke of Rutgers and Heather Havemann of Cornell University.

Thompson Award Graduate Papers

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 March 31, 1998. 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 email, if possible) to the committee chair. This year's Award Committee will be chaired by Holly McCammon of Vanderbilt University with help from John Walsh of the University of Illinois, Chicago, Patricia McManus, Indiana University, and Brian Uzzi of Northwestern's Kellogg School of Management. Direct correspondence to McCammon, Department of Sociology, Nashville TN 37235; Tel (615) 322-7626.

See Related Story, Committees Announce 1997 Awards, pg. 11

Papers on MARGINAL EMPLOYMENT are solicited for Volume 8 of RESEARCH IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF WORK, JAI Press.

All aspects of marginal employment will be considered, including part-time work, temporary work, inadequate pay, and irregular employment. The editor encourages empirical papers (both quantitative and qualitative) as well as conceptual and theoretical papers, and international comparative studies. Specialists in the field are also encouraged to review and synthesize their research. Policy relevant papers are also encouraged for this volume. Please submit papers (in duplicate) by April 15, 1999 to Randy Hodson, Editor of RESEARCH IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF WORK, Sociology Department, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210 (internet: r.hodson@osu.edu, telephone: 614-292-8951). Please contact the editor for further information.

The Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR) announces its 1998 conference, Women's Progress: Perspectives on the Past, Blueprint for the Future.

The conference will be held June 12-13, 1998 in Washington, D.C. Co-sponsored by the Women's Studies Program at the George Washington University, the conference will address women's economic and social progress. Sessions will discuss social science research on women's progress, methodological and statistical issues in measuring women's progress, public policy measures that have augmented or diminished women's status, how the issues of race and class interact with measuring women's progress, future goals for women's progress, and methods for attaining those goals. The 1998 conference will be IWPR's Fifth Women's Policy Research Conference. IWPR has conducted policy relevant research on women's lives since 1987.

To present work or experience relevant to the above topics at the conference, a proposal of not more than two pages must be postmarked by October 17, 1997 (*try anyway -ed.*). For full proposal guidelines, please contact Jill Braunstein or Megan DeBell at the Institute for Women's Policy Research, 1400 20th St. NW, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 785-5100. Requests for guidelines may also be submitted by fax (202) 833-4362 or by email to iwpr@www.iwpr.org. Or, visit <http://www.iwpr.org>.

Special Issue of WORK AND OCCUPATIONS on "Workers, Customers, and Clients: Challenges of the Service Economy for the Sociology of Work."

The rapid rise of the service sector has structured an important, but understudied social relationship — that between workers and their customers or clients. WORK AND OCCUPATIONS will publish a special issue devoted to the theoretical challenges and many social problems presented by such social relations in the

(Continued on Page 18)

Calls for Papers and Other Announcements

(Continued from page 16)

service occupations. In this issue, we will promote original, empirical (qualitative or quantitative) research on the many facets of this social relationship. Examples of the types of papers appropriate for this special issue can be found in the May 1997 issue of *WORK AND OCCUPATIONS*. Other possible topics include: the impact of managed care on the doctor-patient relationship; racial or gender discrimination by employers in hiring sales workers based on customer prejudices; emotion work and stress in the relationship between service workers and their customers; gender or racial bias expressed toward women and minority faculty in student course evaluations; the influence of worker-customer contact on the level of public sympathy for workers in a labor strike; employer use of customers as a means of workplace control. This list, however, is merely suggestive. The special issue editors are Holly J. McCammon and Larry J. Griffin, Department of Sociology, Vanderbilt University. Short paper proposals and queries may be sent now to Holly J. McCammon, Deputy Editor, *WORK AND OCCUPATIONS*, Box 1811 Station B, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235 USA; mcammhj@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu; fax: (615) 322-7505. In order to receive full consideration, complete papers must be sent to Holly McCammon by September 1, 1998.

RESEARCH IN SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND MOBILITY Announces a Special Issue on "The Future of Affirmative Action."

The editor of *RESEARCH IN SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND MOBILITY* is soliciting manuscripts for a 1998 special issue of the journal tentatively titled, "The Future of Affirmative Action." This volume will seek to assess the state of social scientific and legal knowledge on affirmative action as well as discuss the future relationship between affirmative action as well as discuss the future relationship between affirmative action and gender racial inequality in United States.

This special issue of *RESEARCH IN SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND MOBILITY* will highlight the ability of researchers to shed light on affirmative action controversies from a variety of perspectives. A sampling of questions that potential contributors could address include (but are not limited to):

- How effective has affirmative action been at promoting gender and racial equality?
- What are the advertent and inadvertent organizational consequences of affirmative action policies for business and academia?
- What legal strategies are being used to defend or undermine affirmative action, and what insights about the future can be gained from past policy history and current law?
- What are the social psychological implications of affirmative action, both for targeted beneficiaries and observers?

- If affirmative action is abandoned, what organizational and legal alternatives are there for promoting equal opportunities for under represented groups?

The deadline for papers for the special issue is April 15, 1998. three copies of your paper (and a submission fee of \$10 to cover processing cost) should be mailed to: Kevin T. Leicht, Editor, *RESEARCH IN SOCIAL STRATIFICATION AND MOBILITY*, Department of Sociology, 140 Seashore hall West, The university of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52242-1401. If you have questions about the special issue, please contact the editor through e-mail (leicht@blue.weeg.uiowa.edu) or by phone (319-335-2492).

Conference on Work, Difference and Social Change: New Perspectives on Work and Workers Two Decades after Braverman's *Labor and Monopoly Capital*.

Work, Difference and Social Change, a conference to be held at the State University of New York at Binghamton, May 8-10, 1998, will discuss the nature of work and the experience of workers in the context of political and technological change. Binghamton's *New Directions in the Labor Process* conference, held in May, 1978, focused on debates in labor process theory, debates inspired by the publication of Harry Braverman's *Labor and Monopoly Capital*. That conference helped define the research agenda of a generation. We expect this 20th Anniversary Conference to do the same. We will examine the relationship between class, gender, race, work relations and the organization of production. We will explore the challenges and possibilities which confront labor as a social movement in a global economy. Academics and activists are invited to join with Elaine Bernard, Edna Bonacich*, Michael Burawoy*, Muto Ichiyo, David Noble*, Bryan Palmer*, James Rinehart*, Richard Sharpe, Sid Shniad, David Stark*, Erik Olin Wright* and others as we bridge research and day-to-day work experience. We are pleased to announce a special panel presentation by Harry Magdoff, Paul Sweezy, and Ellen Meiksens Wood, the editors of *Monthly Review*. MR press will formally announce the publication of the 25th Anniversary edition of *Labor and Monopoly Capital*. (* *New Directions in the Labor Process* panelist.)

Conference Topics:

- Work, Work Space and Work Time
- Case Studies in the Mobility of Labor and Capital
- Gendered Labor: Linking Production, Reproduction and Households
- Race, Class and Work: Racialization in the Context of Class Struggle
- Organized Resistance and Everyday Struggles
- Environmental Justice: Ecology, Labor and Politics
- Work, Labor Process and Social Change

Call for Papers: We encourage submission of papers which explore issues of work and workplace change through the prisms

(Continued on Page 18)

Calls for Papers and Other Announcements

(Continued from Page 17)

of class, gender and race. All papers will be refereed. Accepted papers will be published in the Conference Proceedings. Please limit papers to thirty double-spaced pages. We also encourage authors to submit papers in ASCII on MS-DOS formatted diskettes. Send three copies of your paper to: Conference Committee, Department of Sociology, SUNY-Binghamton, Binghamton, NY 13902-6000 USA

Deadline for Submission: January 15, 1998

WORK AND OCCUPATIONS invites you to submit your manuscripts for peer review and possible publication. Now in its 24th volume, WO is a scholarly, sociological quarterly that publishes original, research articles in the sociology of work, employment, labor force and labor markets, and occupations and professions. Consult the latest issue of WO for manuscript formatting and submission instructions. Manuscripts will not be returned. Send three copies of your paper to: Daniel B. Cornfield, Editor, WORK AND OCCUPATIONS, Box 1811, Station B, Department of Sociology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235. Inquiries may be directed to the Editor at this internet address: CORNFIDB@CTRVAX.VANDERBILT.EDU

SHARE YOUR TEACHING MATERIALS

The American Sociological Association teaching resource, *Integrating Issues of Cultural Diversity in Courses on Work and Occupations*, will be updated in 1998. I am in search of course syllabi, class exercises and assignments, examinations, evaluation instruments, bibliographies, computer software and film reviews, or essays on pedagogical challenges and opportunities that incorporate race, ethnicity, gender, class, and sexual orientation into courses on work and occupations. Materials will be collected until January 31, 1997. For further information or to submit materials, contact Idee Winfield, Department of Sociology & Anthropology, College of Charleston, 66 George St, Charleston, SC 29424; (803) 953-4899; e-mail winfieldi@cofc.edu.

Finding Web Data Relevant to OOW

The following are some internet resources that may be of particular value for OOW researchers. Please feel free to share information of your own with the newsletter editor or website administrator, and to forward evaluations of the sites given below.

The Blackwell Guide to Sociology Resources is worth browsing, especially insofar as it lists a collection of links to European data sets.

(www.nsd.uib.no/cessda)

- Users of official statistics will no doubt want to browse the FEDSTATS website, which collects information and links to data compiled by over 70 federal departments.

(www.fedstats.gov/)

- The Bureau of Labor Statistics maintains its own website, which should prove useful to many OOW members.

(stats.bls.gov:80/datahome.htm)

See in particular the "home" of the Current Population Surveys, which provides access to useful statistical tables and reports.

(stats.bls.gov/cpshome.htm)

- Census data on women- and minority- owned businesses can be found at:

(www.census.gov/ftp/pub/econ/www/mu0200.html)

- The International Labour Office website provides easy access to ILO resources.

(www.ilo.org)

Finally, don't overlook the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR). The Consortium website boasts a useful search utility that brings up multiple data sets according to particular key words.

(www.icpsr.umich.edu)

—Steven Vallas, OOW editor

The OOW Web Site...

If you haven't visited the website lately, you're missing:

- **Hyperlinks to Sociological Organizations.** Enjoy direct contact with the Research Committees of the International Sociological Association, and the Regional Associations of the ASA.
- **Hyperlinks to Graduate Programs and Syllabi in the Sociology of Work.** See what other departments and instructors are up to in our field.
- **Job Announcements.** Put Woody Beck's advice into practice and see if it works.
- **Papers Available from Individuals.**

- **Back Issues and Articles from the OOW Newsletter.** Get access to still-useful articles on the Feminization of Sociology, the Dark Side of Organizations, and the Uses of Consultants in the Corporate World, among many others.
- **Calls for Papers & Announcements of Upcoming Conferences.**

If you have material you'd like to have posted, or an idea for a new feature, e-mail it to fsteinha@gumbynpcts.edu

Visit the OOW WebSite at:

www.princeton.edu/~orgocwk

Former OOW Program Chair Gives Advice About Submitting Papers for the ASA Meetings

Last year's program chair, Jennifer Glass, offered some sage advice on how best to submit papers to the ASA meetings. Lest that advice fall through the cracks, OOW has excerpted the following points from her notes, which originally appeared in the Spring 1997 issue of this publication.

Each year, the section chair and council solicit suggestions for sessions and select topics and organizers for the next year's ASA meetings. Our section routinely cosponsors one session with the Sex and Gender section each year, with the sections rotating responsibility for organizing the session.

Because we are the second largest section in the ASA, we are allotted five paper sessions, one of which we typically use as a roundtable session to allow more papers to be presented. In the remaining four sessions we can accept, at most, 20 papers. Every other year, we have a fifth session because the Sex and Gender section takes responsibility for our cosponsored session out of their session allotment. The following year we must use one of our four paper sessions for the session cosponsored with Sex and Gender.

What does all this mean for section scholars wishing to present their work at the meetings? First, and most importantly, it means that the section itself has less room for submissions than the regular sessions organized by the ASA Program Committee. Whether our section organizers receive five good paper submissions or fifty on any particular topic, they still have room for only five (at most). The sessions organized by the Program Committee, however, can expand in number to fit the number of quality submissions received on any particular topic.

If you are debating whether to send your paper to a section session or to a "regular" session, and if both titles seem to fit the

topic of your paper, choose the regular session organizer as your first priority. Your chance of appearing on the program instead of being forwarded to a roundtable organizer is much better if you send your paper to regular session organizers.

Second, please send as near to a completed paper as you can. This year we even had to reject a certain number of roundtable submissions because of lack of space. The first to go were those submissions that consisted of extended abstracts rather than completed papers.

Third, please write a clear, coherent abstract that helps organizers quickly spot common themes and central theoretical issues. When choosing final papers for sessions, organizers like to select papers that complement each other and whose authors would benefit from meeting each other and discussing common interests. When the number of submissions is large, the easiest way for your paper to be recognized again during this final "culling" phase is via a clear and convincing abstract that jogs the organizer's memory of the paper's contents.

Finally, please be sure to complete all information on the submission sheet, especially phone, email, and mailing addresses. You would be surprised how much last-minute shuffling takes place between organizers receiving dual submissions. If authors can be contacted quickly and easily, much of this last-minute confusion can be avoided. This minimizes the chance that your paper will get lost in the organizational shuffle, not be forwarded to the appropriate roundtable session, or otherwise lessen your opportunity to present the paper.

Gerson Named 1998 SWS Feminist Lecturer

Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) has selected Kathleen Gerson, Professor of Sociology, New York University, as the 1998 SWS Feminist Lecturer on Women and Social Change. Gerson's Lecture, "Moral Dilemmas, Moral Strategies, and the Transformation of Gender," will examine how fundamental changes in family and work institutions have undermined traditional conceptions of moral obligation and created new "moral dilemmas of gender." In the wake of irrevocable but inconsistent social changes, such as the rise of employment among women and the decline of homemaker-breadwinner families, women and men must create new strategies for defining, balancing, and deciding between self-interest and commitment to others.

Building on her research about how women and men negotiate conflicts between family and work, Gerson will present an innovative framework for reconceptualizing the link between gender and morality.

The SWS Feminist Lectureship on Women and Social Change was created in 1985 to help disperse scholarship on women to campuses and consortia which have limited access to feminist scholars. Each year SWS selects a notable feminist sociologist to deliver the lecture, whose research, teaching, and professional service show a commitment to the study of women and social change. The most recent lecturers have been Verta Taylor, Ronnie J. Steinberg, Rose M. Brewer, Mady Wechsler Segal, Myra Marx Ferree, Judith Lorber, and Arlene Kaplan Daniels.

Two schools will be chosen as sites for Professor Gerson to visit during 1998. For more information about the lectureship or to propose inclusion of your campus in the 1998 itinerary, contact Eleanor Miller, Chair, SWS Feminist Lectureship Committee, Department of Sociology, P.O. Box 413, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI, 53201, or by email, ellie@csd.uwm.edu.

Letters of application must be submitted on school stationery at the above postal address. Applications to host the 1998 SWS Feminist Lectureship are due by January 15, 1998.

OOW Committees — 1997

Council

Nicole Biggart, U. California, Davis
William Bridges, U. Illinois, Chicago
Michael Lounsbury, Northwestern
(graduate student representative)
Ken Spenner, Duke
Ronnie Steinberg, Vanderbilt
Don Tomaskovic-Devey, N. Carolina
State
Mayer Zald, U. Michigan
Dan Cornfield, Vanderbilt, Past Chair
Barbara Reskin, Harvard, Chair
Paula England, U. Arizona, Chair-Elect
Jerry Jacobs, U. Pennsylvania, Secretary

Membership Committee

Karen Loessi-Miller, Arizona State, Chair
Marcia Bellas, University of Cincinnati
Jacqueline Johnson, North Carolina State
Michael Sacks, Northwestern

Graduate Committee

Bob Althaus, Indiana University, Chair
Naomi Cassirer, U. Notre Dame
Marlese Durr, Wright State U.
Daniel Jones, U. Arizona
Michael Lounsbury, Northwestern
(liaison to Council)

Nominations

John Sibley Butler, University of Texas,
Chair
Rachel Rosenfeld, U. North Carolina
Richard Scott, Stanford U.

James Thompson Award

Holly McCammon, Vanderbilt, Chair
John Walsh, U. Illinois, Chicago
Patricia McManus, Indiana
Brian Uzzi, Northwestern, Kellogg
School of Management

Program

Bill Bridges, University of Illinois,
Chicago, Chair
Karen Campbell, Vanderbilt
Frank Dobbin, Princeton
Alison Davis-Blake, University of Texas
Jackie Rogers, Penn State Labor and
Industrial Relations

Publications Committee

(partial listing)

Steve Vallas, Georgia Tech, Chair
Frank Steinhart, N. Park University
Toby Parcel, Ohio State University
Jack Martin, University of Georgia

Weber Award

Robin Leidner, U. Pennsylvania, Chair
Lee Clarke, Rutgers
Heather Haveman, Cornell

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

**Non-Profit Organization
U.S. Postage Paid
Washington DC
Permit No. 504**