Organizations, Occupations, and Work

A Section of the American Sociological Association **Spring 2000 Newsletter**

From the Editor

By Rosemary Wright
Sociological Resources
(srwright@ix.netcom.com)

Greetings! As we enter the new millenium, it is time for your current editor to move to other pursuits. Tom Beamish of the University of California at Davis has graciously agreed to take over as newsletter editor, starting with the Fall 2000 issue. As of August 15, please send all new correspondence, questions, submissions, etc. to:

Thomas D. Beamish, Ph.D.
Technology, Energy & Society Program
Institute of Governmental Affairs
University of California
Davis, California 95616
telephone: 530-752-1212
fax: 530-752-2835
e-mail: tdbeamish@ucdavis.edu

Breaking with past tradition, in this issue you will find one long article, rather than several short ones. Because of its importance to those of us who wish to end employment discrimination, I've chosen to reprint Barbara Reskin's essay on sociology's current shortcomings in doing so from the March issue of *Contemporary Sociology*. I urge anyone who hasn't already read it to do so. I also encourage reflection and comment on the questions Nicole Biggart raises in her "From the Chair" piece. See you at the meetings!

From the Chair

By Nicole Woolsey Biggart
University of California at Davis
(nwbiggart@ucdavis.edu)

Several years ago I had the duty and pleasure of driving Herbert Simon, the organizational theorist and Nobel Laureate in Economics from Berkeley to Davis. Simon was to give an informal talk to the faculty of the Graduate School of Management at UC Davis.

Simon is a very engaging man and our hour-long drive was friendly and the conversation easy. At one point I asked him how he thought the Economics profession was doing. I was surprised when he said that the discipline was heading for trouble. "How can that be?" I countered. "Economists get most of the social science money at NSF, there's a Council of Economic Advisors in the White House, and economists run the IMF and the World Bank, and a lot of other things, too."

But Simon said he could tell there were problems ahead because he was in a position to talk to the smartest young economists and Ph.D. students in the country. According to Simon, these bright people knew they had to do fancy math models, and embrace the unrealistic assumptions of the neoclassical model, in order to get tenure. But they didn't believe that what they were doing was important, or good, research. "You can always tell a discipline is in trouble when the young people are cynical," said Simon.

I had reason to remember this conversation recently.In March I had the honor of being invited to be a keynote speaker at the Texas Organizations Conference, an annual event sponsored by the research universities in Texas for their graduate students and young faculty. Over the weekend, students and faculty, including a few outsiders like me, are brought together in an informal setting to talk about current intellectual trends and to share ideas about research projects.

On the last morning, I was part of a panel of senior scholars who spoke about career paths and professional choices. The questions from the audience were wide-ranging, but two items regarding publishing came up for discussion that gave me pause.

The first question was "*How long does the reply to the reviewers of a revise-resubmit have to be?*"

If you are a manuscript reviewer for journals you are well aware of the trend toward longer and longer summaries and justifications of changes made in resubmitted manuscripts. Fifteen years ago, if the reviewers and editor suggested changes, you made the ones you felt appropriate and sent back the revision for consideration. Eight or ten years ago, you might also send a little summary of the changes you made, or decided not to make. The point was to make it easier for the reviewers to figure out how the manuscript had been changed since the last time that they had read it.

Today, many manuscripts come back to me with "Notes to the Reviewers" that rival the manuscript in length. Often they take on the tone, "See, I paid attention to what you said and you can find it on line 18, page 22." And the author goes on, line by line, to show all of the other changes that have been made responding to my comments and to those of the other reviewers.

(Continued on Page 2)

From the Chair (Continued)

I doubt that this sort of nit-picking attention results in better manuscripts, and in fact may lead to a failure to place the authorial voice at the center of the work, a real loss in my opinion. I think that young authors may believe that if they legalistically respond to each point of criticism, that the reviewer and editor are then obliged to accept the work. Articles manipulated line by line can lose their intellectual way. In any case, when the Reply to Reviewers becomes a source of anxiety, it has taken on a ritualistic existence and ought to be reigned in, or at least rethought.

The second question that gave me pause in Texas was, "*Do you think that some of the classic articles in the field could be published today?*"

This wasn't a question about knowledge having superceded the early works and their being outdated. Rather, the questioner wanted to know if the style of scholarship that was pursued a generation or two ago could still find a place in the journals today. Could Philip Selznick, Rosabeth Kanter, or Howard Becker publish their seminal *American Sociological Review* pieces in a major journal today? I'm not sure the answer is "yes."

That makes me think that there is a lot of interesting work out there, and I'm going to have to look harder to find it. Fortunately, this is the Internet era, and new information channels are emerging daily. But the institutional status system will follow slowly, hence the concern of young scholars, particularly those who are qualitative researchers. Certainly this is issue is central to debates going on within the Publications Committee of the ASA.

Are these really problems? How do you weigh in on them? I invite you to voice your opinions on the OO&W discussion listserve. If you haven't already joined the listserve(s), instructions for doing so are given below.

How To Join the OOW Listserves

As noted in the last issue, ASA has implemented two electronic forums for members in the various sections, including ours.

OOW Section Announcement Listserve

The section announcement list is designed to disseminate information to the section. All section members with e-mail addresses have been included in this listserve that is maintained by the ASA offices in Washington. The e-mail addresses being used are those which members provided at membership renewal time. The announcement list is carefully controlled, given that all section members will receive messages, and essentially the section chair and the list manager are the only individuals who can post a message to that list. It is the intent of ASA that this list be used only for important section announcements.

If you wish to have your e-mail address added to or removed from the service, please contact the ASA at infoservice@asanet.org.

OOW Discussion Listserve

A second channel that has been established is a discussion listserve that is meant to serve as a forum for interested segments of our community. The discussion listserve is not automatically populated; one must subscribe to it.

To subscribe to the discussion forum:

1. In the address field, type in majordomo@listserv.asanet.org; leave the subject field blank.

2. In the text area or body of the message, type in *subscribe oow.* The remainder of the body must be blank.

3. Send the subscription message.

4. You will receive an e-mail confirmation from majordomo@listserv.asanet.org informing you that the request was received.

5. You will be given an authorization key and instructions to respond back to majordomo. This step is to prevent users from subscribing other users without the latter's knowledge.

6. Once this confirmation is sent back to majordomo, you will receive two messages from majordomo welcoming you to the subscribed list.

Once you have subscribed, you will be a member of an open forum, much like other listserves, and you will be free to initiate or enter into any discussion.

To Unsubscribe:

Section members can unsubscribe their list participation at any time by sending a message to majordomo@listserv.asanet.org and typing the following command in the body of the text (leaving the subject field blank): *unsubscribe oow.*

If you have any questions, concerns or comments please contact the list manager, Frank Steinhart

Frank A. Steinhart
fsteinhart@northpark.edu
773-244-5591

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

*The Proximate Causes of Employment Discrimination**

By Barbara F. Reskin
Harvard University
(reskin@wjh.harvard.edu)

High on the agenda of sociology is to understand the origins and consequences of inequality. This understanding is potentially one of our important contributions to public policy. Examples of such sociological research topics include access to quality education, welfare "reform" and poverty, and the amount of job competition between immigrants and native-born low-wage workers. In this essay, which focuses on gender and race/ethnic discrimination in the workplace, I argue that the standard sociological approaches to explaining workplace discrimination have not been very fruitful in producing knowledge that can be used to eradicate job discrimination. If sociological research is to contribute to the battle against injustice, we need to direct more attention to how inequality is produced. In the following pages, I suggest that research findings from our sister discipline, social psychology, can help us understand both the original and the proximate causes of employment discrimination. This (sometimes interdisciplinary) approach that distinguishes original and proximate causes may be useful and even necessary in other specialty areas where sociologists seek to create a more just society.

In the twentieth century, most sociologists concerned with reducing employment discrimination assumed that once we demonstrated that discrimination persisted, our evidence would find its way to policy makers who would eradicate this discrimination. Thus, sociologists and other social scientists developed a variety of innovative techniques to assess the extent of employment discrimination. Researchers conducted sophisticated analyses establishing race and gender disparities in various employment outcomes, net of qualifications; confirmed through surveys employers' aversion to hiring people of color (Kirschenman and Neckerman 1991; Bobo, Oliver, Valenzuela, and Johnson 2000); and designed ingenious ways to estimate the prevalence of discriminatory treatment (Fix and Struyk 1993; Blumrosen, Bendick, Miller, and Blumrosen 1998). In terms of our policy impact, however, we might have spent our time better in counseling labor market entrants or working as human resource specialists. If we want to use sociology to reduce discrimination in the twenty-first century, we need to move beyond demonstrating that employment discrimination exists, and investigate why it persists in work organizations. To do this, we need to expand our conceptualization of discrimination to recognize that it occurs as a result of nonconscious cognitive processes, as well as from the deliberate negative treatment of people of color and white women.

The prominent sociological explanations for discrimination at the beginning of the new century are grounded in conflict theory (e.g., Blumer 1958; Blalock 1967, 1982; Reskin 1988; Martin 1992; Jackman 1994; Tomaskovic-Devey 1993; Tilly 1998). According to a conflict-theory perspective, the beneficiaries of systems of inequality protect their privileges by using the resources they control to exclude members of subordinate groups. Thus, these theories explain discrimination in terms of the strategic, self-interested actions by members of privileged groups who intentionally exclude and exploit subordinate-group members to protect or advance their own interests. However, conflict-theoretic approaches to discrimination are deficient in important respects. Most important, they do not identify the specific processes through which group motives give rise to outcomes that preserve group interests, and they cannot explain the variation in employment discrimination across contemporary workplaces. As a result, they have not proven fruitful in identifying remedying mechanisms.

I should note that most of my past research assumes that intergroup competition prompts dominant groups to discriminate against members of subordinate groups. I remain convinced that this theoretical perspective accurately characterizes the behavior of some people. But intergroup conflict is not the only source of discrimination, or even the most important one. By conceptualizing discrimination as the result of conflict-based behavior, we cannot identify the proximate causes of discrimination that results from other processes. In sum, I argue that the theoretical approach that many sociologists embrace intellectually has not generated explanatory models of the causes of employment discrimination. If our goal in studying discrimination is to discover how to reduce it, conflict theories are not particularly fruitful in helping us to understand *why* discrimination occurs regularly in tens of thousands of work organizations.

If we want to use sociology to reduce discrimination in the twenty-first century, we need to move beyond demonstrating that employment discrimination exists, and investigate why it persists in work organizations.

In this essay, I argue that we should turn our attention to *how* as well as *why* discrimination occurs, and I propose that social cognition theory can answer both these questions. I make two claims. First, although some employment discrimination results from people pursuing their group-based interests or prejudices, much discrimination stems from normal cognitive processes (the subject of social cognition theory) that occur regardless of individuals' motives. Second, the *proximate cause* of most discrimination is whether and how personnel practices in work organizations constrain the biasing effects of these automatic cognitive processes.

In brief, social cognition theory holds that people automatically categorize others into ingroups and outgroups. The visibility and cultural importance of sex and race and their role as core bases of stratification make them almost automatic bases of categorization. Having categorized others, people tend to automatically "feel, think, and behave toward [particular members of the category] the same way they... feel, think, and behave toward members of that social category more generally" (Fiske, Lin, and Neuberg 1999). Importantly, categorization is accompanied by stereotyping, attribution bias, and evaluation bias. These, in turn, introduce sex, race, and ethnic biases into our perceptions, interpretations, recollections, and evaluations of others. These biases are cognitive rather than motivational; in other words, they occur independently

(Continued on Page 4)

Reskin on Proximate Causes

of decision makers' group interests or their conscious desire to favor or harm others (Krieger 1995: 1188).

The expected outcomes of these habitual cognitive processes are race and sex discrimination. But discrimination is not inevitable. Organizational arrangements can activate or suppress social psychological and cognitive processes (Baron and Pfeffer 1994: 191). We cannot rid work organizations of discrimination until we recognize both that much employment discrimination originates in automatic cognitive processes, and that it occurs because of work organizations' personnel practices. Sociologists' knowledge of social and organizational behavior qualifies us for this task. After summarizing the cognitive processes that produce employment discrimination, I propose that sociology in the twenty-first century should examine how employment practices mediate whether these processes give rise to discriminatory outcomes.

Social Cognition Processes as the Exogenous Causes of Discrimination

A large body of research in cognitive psychology suggests that to cope in a complex and demanding environment, people are "cognitive misers" who economize by through categorization, ingroup preference, stereotyping, and attribution bias (Fiske 1998: 362). These processes, sometimes characterized as cognitive "shortcuts," occur regardless of people's feelings toward other groups or their desires to protect or improve their own status (Fiske 1998: 364). If unchecked, they can produce outcomes that "perpetrators" neither intend nor recognize.

Social Categorization

The categorization of people into ingroups and outgroups is a rapid, automatic, nonconscious process. By conserving cognitive resources, automatic categorization helps people manage an enormous volume of incoming stimuli (Fiske 1998:364, 375). In keeping with cognitive impulses toward efficiency, categorization into in- and outgroups often is based on sex and race because of their widespread availability as "master statuses" that have long been the bases for differential treatment (Hughes 1945). However, I propose that it is primarily through categorization and its concomitants that sex and race are bases for unequal treatment.

Inherent in the categorization of people into in- and outgroups is the tendency to exaggerate between-group differences, while minimizing within-group differences, especially among members of the outgroup. (An example of this is the phenomenon: "I know an X [outgroup category] said it, but I can't remember which X" [Fiske 1998: 372]). Conceptually, social categorization resembles the sociological concept of differentiation, but each plays a different role in theoretical accounts of discrimination. While a social psychological perspective sees categorization as automatic and not necessarily group-serving, sociologists view differentiation as a fundamental mechanism of stratification through which dominant groups preserve their privileged position (e.g., to divide and conquer [Edwards 1979], or to justify unequal treatment [Reskin 1988]).

Ingroup Preference

Categorization is more than a data-reduction device that our brains use to deal with the barrage of stimuli to which they are exposed. Classifying people into ingroups and outgroups leads more or less automatically to distorted perceptions and biased evaluation of ingroup and outgroup members, and hence to discrimination (Brewer and Brown 1998). In- versus outgroup membership defines the pool of others to whom people are attracted, with whom they seek equal treatment, and who serve as their reference group (Baron and Pfeffer 1994). In general, people are more comfortable with, have more trust in, hold more positive views of, and feel more obligated to members of their own group (Perdue, Dovidio, Gurtman, and Tyler 1990). As a result, people try to avoid outgroup members, and they favor ingroup members in evaluations and rewards (Brewer and Brown 1998: 567; Fiske 1998: 361). Thus, at least in the lab, the unequal treatment associated with group membership results more often from ingroup preference than outgroup antipathy.

Given white men's predominance in many workplaces, minorities' and white women's status as outgroup members probably contributes to the devaluation of jobs that are predominantly female and predominantly minority.This account of devaluation suggests that we should observe the overvaluation of men's and whites' activities in settings in which men and whites are the ingroup as a job-level phenomenon.

Stereotyping

Stereotypes are unconscious habits of thought that link personal attributes to group membership. Stereotyping is an inevitable concomitant of categorization: As soon as an observer notices that a "target" belongs to a stereotyped group (especially an outgroup), characteristics that are stereotypically linked to the group are activated in the observer's mind, *even among people who consciously reject the stereotypes* (Bodenhausen, Macrae, and Garst 1998). To appreciate the importance of stereotyping for discriminatory outcomes, it is helpful to distinguish descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes.

Descriptive stereotypes, which characterize how group members *are*, influence how we perceive others and interpret their behavior. Descriptive stereotyping can precipitate discrimination because it predisposes observers toward interpretations that conform to stereotypes and blinds them to disconfirming possibilities (Fiske 1998: 367), especially when the behavior that observers must make sense of is subject to multiple interpretations (e.g., she worked late because women are helpful, rather than she worked late because she wants a promotion). Thus, descriptive stereotypes distort observers' impressions of the behavior of members of stereotyped groups.

Prescriptive stereotypes are generalizations about how members of a group *are supposed to be*, based usually on descriptive stereotypes of how they are. These normative stereotypes serve as standards against which observers evaluate others' behavior. Both descriptive and prescriptive stereotypes influence what we remember about others and the inferences we draw about their behavior (Heilman 1995: 6). Thus, stereotypes serve as "implicit theories, biasing in predictable ways the perception, interpretation

(Continued on Page 5)

Reskin on Proximate Causes

encoding, retention, and recall of information about other people" (Krieger 1995: 1188).

The cognitive processes involved in stereotyping make stereotypes tenacious. People unconsciously pursue, prefer, and remember "information" that supports their stereotypes (including remembering events that did not occur), and ignore, discount, and forget information that challenges them (Fiske 1998). From the standpoint of social cognition theory, stereotypes are adaptive: People process information that conforms to their stereotypes more quickly than inconsistent information, and they are more likely to stereotype when they are under time pressure, partly because stereotyping conserves mental resources (Fiske 1998: 366; Fiske et al. 1999: 244). Research on people's efforts to suppress stereotypes is relevant. In one study, subjects instructed to avoid sexist statements in a sentence-completion task could comply when they had enough time, but when they had to act quickly the statements they constructed were more sexist than those of subjects who had not been told to avoid making sexist statements. And according to a comparison of subjects who were and were not instructed to suppress stereotypes, the former could refrain from expressing stereotypes, but in a "rebound effect," they expressed stronger stereotypes in subsequent judgments than did subjects who had not tried to suppress their stereotypes in the first place (Bodenhausen et al. 1998: 326).

Evaluation Bias and Attribution Bias

Stereotype-based expectations and ingroup favoritism act as distorting lenses through which observers assess others' performance and account for their successes and failures (Crocker, Major, and Steele 1998: 539). Descriptive stereotypes affect observers' expectations and hence the explanations they construct. When the actions of others conform to our expectations, we tend to attribute their behavior to *stable, internal* propensities (e.g., ability), while we attribute actions that are inconsistent with our stereotype-based expectations to *situational* (i.e., external) or *transient* factors (e.g., task difficulty, luck, or effort). In this way, stereotype-based expectations give rise to biased attributions. For example, given the stereotype that men are good at customarily male tasks, competent performance by men doesn't require an explanation; men's failures do, however, and observers tend to attribute these unexpected outcomes to situational factors such as bad luck or lack of effort, none of which predict future failure. In contrast, women are stereotypically not expected to do well at customarily male endeavors, so explaining their failure is easy: They lack the requisite ability (an internal trait) and hence are likely to fail in the future. In contrast, their successes are unexpected, so they must have resulted from situational factors that do not predict future success (Swim and Sanna 1996; Brewer and Brown 1998: 560).

Ingroup preference and outgroup derogation lead to similar attribution processes. Because observers expect ingroup members to succeed and outgroup members to fail, they attribute ingroup success and outgroup failure to internal factors, and ingroup failure and outgroup success to situational factors. Observers also tend to characterize behavior that is consistent with their expectations in abstract terms and unexpected behavior in concrete terms. For example, given the same act—arriving late for a meeting—an observer would recall that an ingroup member was delayed, but that an outgroup member *is* a tardy person. Once a behavior has been interpreted and encoded into memory, it is the interpretation, not the initial behavior, to which people have ready access (Krieger 1995: 1203). Thus, observers would predict that the outgroup member, but not the ingroup member, would be tardy in the future.

Power and Cognitive Biases

Up to this point, I have treated discrimination motivated by status politics or antipathy and discrimination that results automatically from unconscious cognitive processes as if they were mutually exclusive. Although cognition researchers have given relatively little attention to their relationship, a handful of experimental studies indicate that power differentials condition these cognitive processes. These studies have shown that although the propensity to categorize is universal, occupying a position of power may prompt people to invest extra effort into categorizing others (Goodwin, Operario, and Fiske 1998). In addition, power affects the degree to which people act on the propensity to stereotype. People can't afford to stereotype others on whom they depend because they need to assess them accurately, but they can afford to stereotype subordinate groups and are more likely do so than subordinate group members are to stereotype members of dominant groups (Fiske et al. 1999: 241). In addition, under conditions of perceived threat, the more stake observers have in the status quo, and hence the more to lose, the more likely they are to stereotype outgroups (Operario, Goodwin, and Fiske 1998: 168). The sense of entitlement that accompanies dominant-group status is likely to give dominant group members particular confidence in their stereotypes. This propensity is reinforced by the fact that powerful observers actively seek information that confirms their stereotypes and disregard disconfirming information. However, priming the powerful with egalitarian values leads them to pay closer attention to information that contradicts outgroup stereotypes (Operario et al. 1998: 172-73). Finally, members of high-status ingroups show more bias in favor of ingroup members than do members of low-status ingroups (Brewer and Brown 1998: 570).

The Proximate Causes of Discrimination

According to social cognition theory, bias and discrimination result from the individual-level cognitive processes summarized above. Cognitive psychologists agree, however, that these biases can be controlled (Fiske 1998: 375). Thus, the proximate causes of discrimination are the contextual factors that permit or counter the effects of these habits of the brain. The course I urge for sociology in the twenty-first century is to investigate how organizational practices can check these factors. Experimental research on contextual factors that appear to minimize the likelihood of stereotyping and its biasing effects provides a starting point for this enterprise. These factors include constructing heterogeneous groups, creating interdependence among ingroup and outgroup members, minimizing the salience of ascribed status dimensions in personnel decisions, replacing subjective data with objective data, and making decision makers accountable for their decisions.

Of course, organizations' ability to apply the findings from experimental research to the exogenous causes of discrimination

(Continued on Page 6)

Reskin on Proximate Causes

depends on the external validity of the experimental results described above. Work organizations are vastly more complex than laboratory experiments. In particular, work organizations are hothouses that nurture power and status differences. Thus, the first task for sociologists—perhaps in collaboration with social psychologists—is to determine whether the cognitive processes that I have reviewed operate the same way in work organizations as they do in the lab. If they do, the next step is to investigate the proximate causes of employment discrimination: the social, contextual, and organizational mechanisms that suppress or exacerbate these exogenous causes. Below I summarize the experimental research. I hope readers view this summary as a set of propositions that specify how organizations can prevent nonconscious cognitive processes from culminating in employment discrimination.

Heterogeneity of Work Groups

Categorization is too fundamental to cognitive processing to be prevented, and ingroup favoritism is remarkably hard to eradicate, even for people with a material stake in ending it (Brewer and Brown 1998: 566). But organizations can discourage the categorization of people based on their sex, race, and ethnicity, and thus reduce sex and race discrimination. Creating work groups and decision-making groups that are heterogeneous with respect to these ascriptive characteristics should suppress ingroup preference and outgroup derogation, stereotyping, and concomitant bias personnel decisions. (In addition, if neither ingroup nor out-group members numerically dominate decision-making groups, personnel outcomes are less likely to be linked to group membership.)

Of course, organizations whose work groups are well integrated by sex and race are not the ones in which discrimination is a serious problem. Organizations in which work groups are segregated may be able to create superordinate identities (i.e., more inclusive ingroups) that are independent of sex and race (Brewer and Brown 1998: 583). In laboratory experiments, researchers can artificially create categories to which subjects become attached, even on the most trivial basis, so workers should be receptive to recategorization based on characteristics that are contextually salient (Fiske 1998: 361). Organizations may be able to create such categories by using existing functional categories that are relevant and hence cognitively available to workers, or they may be able to create new categories that supplant ascriptively defined categories as the basis for the cognitive processes discussed here. Among possible bases of categorization are teams, divisions or branches, job groups, and the organization itself. With respect to the last of these, the more organizations emphasize organizational culture, the easier it should be to expand the ingroup to encompass all employees. Organizations can maximize the impact of heterogeneous groupings by reinforcing ingroup identification through task interdependence, job rotation, and other collective activities. Sociology should place high on its agenda for the twenty-first century a study of organizations' ability to minimize ascriptively based categorization by emphasizing other categories and the impact of such re-engineered groups on stereotypes and attribution bias.

Interdependence

Intergroup contact that exposes people to individuating information about outgroup members challenges outgroup stereotypes, and hence should reduce bias. But for intergroup contact to change ingroup members' perceptions, the latter must attend to information about outgroup members (Goodwin et al. 1998: 681). The conditions that should foster such attention are enumerated in the contact hypothesis. This hypothesis argues that intergroup contact alters ingroup members' attitudes only if the groups come together with a common goal, have institutional support for their joint enterprise, and have close and sustained contact in equal-status positions (Brewer and Brown 1998: 576-78).

The logic of the contact hypothesis assumes that ingroup members' interdependence with outgroup members encourages the former to notice counterstereotypic information about the latter and thus to form more individuated and accurate impressions. By the same logic, ingroup members' dependence on outgroup members should motivate the former to seek accurate information about the latter. Based on this expected association, Goodwin and his colleagues (1998: 694) contended that supervisors who know that their salaries depend on their subordinates' productivity or evaluations will judge their subordinates more accurately.

Intergroup competition based on status characteristics is counterproductive because it encourages each group to stereotype the other. Fiske and her colleagues (1999: 241-42) speculated that this happens because group members devote most of their available cognitive resources to obtaining accurate information about their teammates, rather than about their opponents. Thus, cooperative interdependence can reduce stereotyping, while competitive interdependence increases it.

Salience

Anything that focuses observers' attention on a stereotyped category "primes" stereotyping, and it does so without the observer's awareness (Heilman 1995; Fiske 1998: 366). For example, men who were primed with stereotypic statements about women were more likely to ask a female job applicant "sexist" questions and exhibit sexualized behavior (and it took them longer than non-primed men to recognize nonsexist words; Fiske et al. 1999). Thus, a comment about pregnancy, a sex discrimination lawsuit, or diversity immediately before a committee evaluates a female job candidate is likely to exacerbate sex stereotyping in the evaluation (Heilman 1995). The process of priming may mean that injunctions to a search committee to look closely at female or minority candidates can backfire, tainting the evaluations of women and minorities. Similarly, when women and men are interacting and gender is relevant to purpose of the interaction, cultural gender stereotypes become "effectively salient" (Ridgeway 1997: 221). Organizational contexts can also make category membership salient. A highly skewed sex or race composition in a work group is likely to activate stereotypes (Bodenhausen et al. 1998: 317).

Formalized Evaluation Systems

Stereotyping and its concomitants distort how we interpret the behavior of outgroups, and the vaguer the information to which we are responding, the more subject it is to misinterpretation. In work settings, this means that recollections and evaluations that are based on unstructured observations are particularly vulnerable to

(Continued on Page 7)

Reskin on Proximate Causes

race or sex bias (Fiske, Bersoff, Borgida, Deaux, and Heilman 1991). Organizations should be able to minimize race and sex bias in personnel decisions by using objective, reliable, and timely information that is directly relevant to job performance (Heilman 1995). For objective measures to minimize intergroup bias, organizations must provide a detailed specification of all performance criteria along with precise information for each candidate for each criterion (Krieger 1995: 1246). Employers should further reduce attribution errors by routinely collecting concrete performance data and implementing evaluation procedures in which evaluators rely exclusively on these data *without attributions* explaining them.

Accountability

The biasing effects of stereotypes and other cognitive distortions on evaluative judgments are reduced when decision makers know that they will be held accountable for the criteria they use to make decisions and for the accuracy of the information upon which they base their decisions (Salancik and Pfeffer 1978; Tetlock 1992; Tetlock and Lerner 1999). If evaluators know that they will be held accountable for their judgments before being exposed to the information on which they will base their judgment, accountability not only reduces the expression of biases, it also reduces bias in non-conscious cognitive processes, such as the encoding of information (Tetlock 1992).The benefits of accountability vanish under time pressure, however (Tetlock and Lerner 1999). Indeed, time pressure, mental "busyness," and information overload—all common in contemporary work organizations – exacerbate the effects of stereotypes on judgment and memory (Bodenhausen et al. 1998: 319).

The processes underlying the importance of accountability no doubt help explain how antidiscrimination and affirmative action laws and regulations increase job access for people of color and white women. Goals, timetables, and monitoring--all effective affirmative action mechanisms--hold organizations responsible for sex- and race-balanced hiring and the sex and race composition of their job assignments (Reskin 1998). Hypothetically, organizations can achieve similar results through programs that make decision makers at all levels responsible for ensuring that their decisions are not tainted by ingroup preference and for the outcomes of those decisions.

Conclusions

All common social scientific theories of discrimination, as well as the dominant legal approach to discrimination (Krieger 1995, 1998), locate its source in intrapsychic processes such as prejudice, ignorance, the sense of threat, and the desire to maintain or improve one's position. They differ, however, in whether they view the consequences of intrapsychic processes as motivated or automatic. Theories that assume that discrimination is motivated by antipathy toward or fear of another group view discrimination as an aberration within a generally fair reward system (Black 1989). According to social cognition theory, in contrast, the basic cognitive processes through which everyone's brain sorts through data distort all our perceptions, bias all our attributions, and induce all of us to favor ingroup members. *Laissez-faire* decision making in work organizations—and other domains, including schools, voluntary organizations, and the family—transforms these biases into discrimination against outgroup members. If the cognitive processes that lead to discrimination are universal, as experimental evidence suggests, then they cause a huge amount of employment discrimination that is neither intended nor motivated by conscious negative feelings toward outgroups. And the organizational practices that determine how the input of individuals contribute to personnel decisions, and hence precipitate, permit, or prevent the activation of cognitive biases, are the proximate causes of most employment discrimination.

Although I and others suspect that most employment discrimination originates in the cognitive processes I have summarized, we should not lose sight of the fact that discrimination also results from conscious actions that are motivated by ignorance, prejudice, or the deliberate efforts by dominant group members to preserve their privileged status. Twentieth-century sociology has focused on these conscious processes of exploitation and exclusion, as well as on structures that preserve a discriminatory status quo. This approach assumes that dominant group members intentionally create work structures and organizational arrangements whose purpose is to preserve or enhance their position. Among many examples I could offer is the widespread and deliberate exclusion of minorities and women from police and fire departments (Chetkovich 1997; also see Reskin 2000). When people's group position motivates them to discriminate, exclusionary organizational practices are *superficial* causes of discrimination, and they require different interventions. Organizations, I have argued, can reduce discrimination issuing from nonconscious cognitive processes. Remedying discrimination that results from dominant group members' deliberate construction of exclusionary personnel practices will require race- and gender-conscious interventions, including formal charges of sex/race-based discrimination, collective action organized on the basis of status groups, or intervention by regulatory agencies, including sex- and race-conscious remedial affirmative action.

The same characteristics—sex, race, ethnicity—are the primary bases of both automatic cognitive categorization and social stratification; indeed, their centrality in each process reinforces them in the other process. Moreover, automatic cognitive categorization and race- or sex-based social stratification have the same result: privileging ingroup members who are usually white males of European ancestry. Moreover, both cognitive-based and conflict-group-based processes comprise "countless small acts by a changing cast of characters,...that incrementally and consistently limit the employment prospects of one group of workers compared with those of another" (Nelson and Bridges 1999: 243). Individually, either process leads to the accumulation of advantages and disadvantages. Sometimes both cognitive biases and prejudice- or conflict-based discrimination are at work, with reinforcing effects. Ridgeway's (1997:227) analysis illustrates this with respect to gender: "Only occasionally will gender be so salient in the situation that men will act self-consciously as men to preserve their interests[, but] the repeated background activation of gender status over many workplace interactions, biasing behavior in subtle or more substantial degrees, produces the effect of men acting in their gender interest, even when many men feel no special loyalty to their sex."

As I said above, some members of the dominant group actively discriminate against people based on their race, sex, national origin, as well as other characteristics such as age, sexual orientation, weight, and religion. Here I have questioned the

(Continued on Page 8)

Reskin on Proximate Causes

assumption that I and many other sociologists brought to the study of workplace inequality in the twentieth century: that most discrimination results from the purposive actions by dominant group members who seek to preserve and expand their privileges. While dominant group members benefit from such discrimination, the salience of race and sex in contemporary society and in cognitive processes such as categorization and stereotyping allows most dominant group members to benefit without their having to take any action. By assuming that discrimination is largely the result of purposive action, we are on the wrong track for reducing discrimination. Plaintiffs routinely lose discrimination lawsuits because they cannot prove that their employer intended to discriminate against them (for examples, see Krieger 1995; Reskin 2000). And employers, who share our view that discrimination involves deliberate attempts to harm people because of their status, find discrimination charges implausible and reject them out of hand. The recognition that discrimination often stems from universal cognitive processes may make organizations less resistant to charges of discrimination and more receptive to modifying their employment practices to remove the effect of cognitive biases against people of color and white women. Sociology's history of trying to expose, understand, and reduce discrimination is to our discipline's credit. Most of our progress in the last several decades of the twentieth century has been in documenting discrimination's extent and persistence. We have made less headway in understanding its persistence and very little in figuring out how to reduce it because we have not correctly theorized how or why discrimination occurs. I have argued that much of it results from nonconscious cognitive processes. If I'm right, then its proximate cause is the organizational practices that permit or prevent it. Exactly how and when organizations contain the effects of cognitive biases should be high on the discipline's agenda for the twenty-first century.

Endnotes

* These ideas benefited from the comments of Lowell Hargens and William Bielby and of the *Contemprorary Sociology* editors and editorial board members. I was also helped by talking with Marilynn Brewer. Any logical or factual errors are entirely my responsibility.

1. In addition, they do not generate research hypotheses that are falsifiable.

2. In describing these processes as "normal," I mean only that normal mental functioning requires cognitive simplification.

3. In this essay I use the term *race* as shorthand for race, color, ethnicity, and national origin.

4. For a demonstration, take the Implicit Association Tests for racism, sexism, and ageism at www.yale.edu/implicit/ (Greenwald and Banaji 1999).

5. Ridgeway (1997) offers a related analysis. While she cocurs with the psychologists whose work I cite on the importance of categorization, she construes categorization as an emergent property of interaction. Although she does not address the effect of sex categorization except through interactional processes, her conclusions on the consequences of categorization resemble some of those reviewed here. She also provides a useful account of the effect of gender categorization on gender status beliefs.

6. When "attentional resources" are limited, stereotyping increases (Fiske et al. 1999: 237).

7. Bielby (2000) believes they should be even stronger in work organizations than in laboratory experiments.

8. Of course, for these categories to supplant sex- and race-based categorization, category membership cannot be associated with sex or race.

9. Workers may initially resist these collective arrangements, however. In addition, when the context changes, the former groupings are likely to re-emerge (Brewer and Brown 1998: 582-83). In other words, intergroup contact is not a quick fix; it makes a difference only when it occurs through a permanent transformation of the workplace.

10. Interpersonal (i.e., one-on-one) competition reduces stereotyping, because competitors' success depends on having accurate information about their opponent.

11. As Ridgeway (1997: 221) observed, the diffuse nature of sex stereotypes makes them relevant in many situations.

12. See DiTomaso (1993) for a description of Xerox's successful use of accountability.

13. At least one social psychological theory, "realistic group conflict" theory, attributes discrimination to group conflict (Brewer and Brown 1998: 565).

14. For discussion of superficial causes, see Lieberson (1985) or Reskin (1988).

15. For example, in challenging intentional, bias-based racial discrimination by Shoney's Restaurants, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund publicized an 800 number for complaints against Shoneyl's, generating both the basis for a class action lawsuit and supporting evidence from white supervisory employees who supported the lawsuit (Watkins 1993).

16. For a discussion of the legal limitations associated with the standard conception of discrimination as actions intended to harm people based on their sex, race, or color, see Krieger (1995).

References

Baron, James N. and Jeffrey Pfeffer. 1994. "The Social Psychology of Organizations and Inequality." *Social Psychological Quarterly* 57: 190-209.

Bielby, William T. 2000. "How to Minimize Workplacee Gender and Racial Bias." *Contemporary Sociology* 29: 120-29.

Black, Donald. 1989. *Sociological Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

(Continued on Page 9)

Reskin on Proximate Causes

Blalock, Hubert M. 1967. *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations.* New York: Wiley.

------. 1982. *Race and Ethnic Relations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Blumer, Herbert. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position." *Pacific Sociological Review* 1: 3-7.

Blumrosen, Alfred W., Marc Bendick, John J. Miller, and Ruth Blumrosen. 1998. "Employment Discrimination against Women in Washington State, 1997." Employment Discrimination Project Report Number 3. Newark, NJ: Rutgers University School of Law.

Bobo, Larry D., Melvin L. Oliver, A. Valenzuela, and J. H. Johnson. 2000. *Prismatic Metropolis: Race, Segregation and Inequality in Los Angeles.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bodenhausen, Galen V., C. Neil Macrae, and Jennifer Garst. 1998. "Stereotypes in Thought and Deed: Social-Cognitive Origins of Intergroup Discrimination." Pp. 311-35 in *Intergroup Cognition and Intergroup Behavior*, edited by Constantine Sedikides, John Schopler, and Chester A. Insko. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Brewer, Marilyn B. and Rupert J. Brown. 1998. "Intergroup Relations." Pp. 554-94 in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Chetkovich, C. 1997. *Real Heat: Gender and Race in the Urban Fire Service.* New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Crocker, Jennifer, Brenda Major, and Claude Steele. 1998. "Social Stigma." Pp. 504-53 in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey. New York: McGraw-Hill.

DiTomaso, Nancy. 1993. Notes on Xerox Case: Balanced Work Force at Xerox. Unpublished.

Edwards, Richard. 1979. *Contested Terrain.* New York: Basic Books.

Fiske, Susan T. 1998. "Stereotyping, Prejudice and Discrimination." Pp. 357-411 in *Handbook of Social Psychology*, edited by D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, and G. Lindzey. New York: McGraw Hill.

Fiske, Susan T., Donald N. Bersoff, Eugene Borgida, Kay Deaux, and Madeline E. Heilman. 1991. "Social Science Research on Trial. Use of Sex Stereotyping Research in Price Waterhouse v. Hopkins." *American Psychologist* 46: 1049-60.

Fiske, Susan T., Monica Lin, and Steven L. Neuberg. 1999. "The Continuum Model: Ten Years Later." Pp. 231-54 in *Dual Process Theories in Social Psychology*, edited by Shelly Chaiken and Yaacov Trope. New York: Guilford Press.

Fix, Michael and Raymond J. Struyk, eds. 1993. *Clear and Convincing Evidence. Measurement of Discrimination in America.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Goodwin, Stephanie A., Don Operario, and Susan T. Fiske. 1998. "Situational Power and Interpersonal Dominance Facilitate Bias and Inequality." *Journal of Social Issues* 54: 677-98.

Greenwald, Anthony and Mahzarin Banaji. 1999. "Implicit Association Test." www.yale.edu/implicit/

Heilman, M. E. 1995. "Sex Stereotypes and Their Effects in the Workplace: What We Know and What We Don't Know." *Journal of Social Issues* 10: 3-26.

Hughes, Everett C. 1945. "Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status." *American Journal of Sociology* 50: 353-59.

Jackman, Mary R. 1994. *The Velvet Glove.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kirschenman, Joleen and Kathryn M. Neckerman. 1991. "'We'd Love to Hire Them but....': The Meaning of Race for Employers." Pp. 203-34 in *The Urban Underclass,* edited by Christopher Jencks and Paul Peterson. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Krieger, Linda Hamilton. 1995. "The Contents of Our Categories: A Cognitive Bias Approach to Discrimination and Equal Employment Opportunity." *Stanford Law Review* 47: 1161-248.

------. 1998. "Civil Rights *Perestroika*: Intergroup Relations after Affirmative Action." *California Law Review* 86: 1253-1333.

Lieberson, Stanley. 1985. *Making It Count.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Martin, Patricia Yancey. 1992. "Gender Interaction and Inequality in Organizations." Pp. 208-31 in *Gender Interaction and Inequality*, edited by Cecilia Ridgeway. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Nelson, Robert L. and William P. Bridges. 1999. *Legalizing Gender Inequality: Courts, Markets, and Unequal Pay for Women in America.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Operario, Don, Stephanie A. Goodwin, and Susan T. Fiske. 1998. "Power Is Everywhere: Social control and Personal Control Both Operate at Stereotype Activation, Interpretation, and Inhibition." Pp. 163-75 in *Stereotype Activation and Inhibition*, edited by Robert S. Wyer. Rahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

(Continued on Page 10)

Reskin on Proximate Causes

Perdue, C. W., J. F. Dovidio, M. B. Gurtman, and R. B. Tyler. 1990. "'Us' and 'Them': Social Categorization and the Process of Intergroup Bias." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59: 475-86.

Reskin, Barbara F. 1988. "Bringing the Men Back In: Sex Differentiation and the Devaluation of Women's Work." *Gender & Society* 2: 58-81.

------. 1998. *The Realities of Affirmative Action.* Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

------. 2000. "Employment Discrimination and Its Remedies." Forthcoming in *Handbook on Labor Market Research*, edited by Ivar Berg and Arne Kalleberg. New York: Plenum.

Ridgeway, Cecilia. 1997. "Interaction and the Conservation of Gender Inequality." *American Sociological Review* 62: 218-35.

Salancik, Gerald R. and Jeffrey Pfeffer. 1978. "Uncertainty, Secrecy, and the Choice of Similar Others." *Social Psychology* 41: 246-55.

Swim, Janet K. and Lawrence J. Sanna. 1996. "He's Skilled, She's Lucky: A Meta-Analysis of Observers' Attributions for Women's and Men's Successes and Failures." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22: 507-19.

Tetlock, Phillip E. 1992. "The Impact of Accountability on Judgment and Choice: Toward a Social Contingency Model." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 25: 331-76.

Tetlock, Phillip E. and Jennifer S. Lerner. 1999. "The Social Contingency Model: Identifying Empirical and Normative Boundary Conditions on the Error-and-Bias Portrait of Human Nature." Pp. 571-85 in *Dual Process Theories in Social Psychology*, edited by Shelly Chaiken and Yaacov Trope. New York: Guilford Press.

Tilly, Charles. 1998. *Durable Inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Tomaskovic-Devey, Donald. 1993. *Gender and Racial Inequality at Work: The Sources and Consequences of Job Segregation*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Watkins, Steve. 1993. "Racism *du Jour* at Shoney's." *The Nation*, October 18.

[Reprinted with permission from *Contemporary Sociology*, vol. 29, no. 2 (March 2000), pp. 319-328. The author requests that readers recognize that this is an ongoing project and not a final statement.]

OOW Sessions in Washington

The following section activities are planned for the 2000 meetings in Washington D.C. All of the OOW sessions are at the Marriott Wardman Park Hotel.

A. Organizational Theory, Organizational Change

Identifier: #385, Tuesday, 8:30-10:15
Organizers: William Barnett, Aimee-Noelle Swanson
Presider: Aimee-Noelle Swanson

Papers: (1) Luca Solari, Ruggero Rossi; (2) Stanislav D. Dobrev, Tai-Young Kim, Michael T. Habnan; (3) Martin Ruef; (4) Kathleen M. Carley; (5) Jonathan Jaffee

B. Organizations and Risky Technologies: Managing Hazards and Disasters (co-sponsored with SKAT)

Identifier: #469, Tuesday, 2:30-4:15
Organizers: Thomas D. Beamish, Kathleen Tierney
Presider: Gary R. Webb
Discussant: Charles B. Perrow

Papers: (1) Michal Tamuz, James B. Battles, Harold S. Kaplan; (2) Constance Perin; (3) Lee B. Clarke; (4) Thomas D. Beamish

C. Authors Meet Critics : *The Changing Nature of Work: Implications for Occupational Analysis* (National Academic Press, 1999) by the NRC Committee on Techniques for the Enhancement of Human Perform-ance: Occupational Analysis

Identifier: #495, Tuesday, 4:30-6:15
Organizers: Nicole W. Biggart, Ken Spenner
Committee Members: Thomas A. Kochan, Nicole W. Biggart, Arne L. Kalleberg, Ken Spenner, Robert Vance

Critics: Donna Dye, Paula England, Richard Klimoski, Barbara F. Reskin

D. Technological Innovation, Information, and Organizations

Identifier: #515, Wednesday, 8:30-10:15
Organizer: Toby Stuart
Presider and Discussant: Jesper Sorensen

Papers: (1) Ken Frank; (2) Jason Owen-Smith; (3) Holly Raider; (4) Scott Shane; (5) Patricia H. Thornton

E. Technology and Inequality

Identifier: #538, Wednesday, 10:30-12:15
Organizer: Steven Vallas
Discussant: Daniel B. Cornfield

Papers: (1)Steven G. Brint; (2) Gerhard Daday, Beverly Burris; (3) David Hakken; (4) Eric Meyer, Rob Kling

(Continued on Page 11)

OOW Sessions in Washington

F. OOW Roundtables

Identifier: #417, Tuesday, 10:30-12:15
Organizers: Vicki Smith, Ananad Swaminathan, Sean O'Riain, Eva Skuratowicz

1. A Dialogue on Women of Color in Corporate America

   Presiders: Elizabeth Higginbotham, Jacqueline Johnson

   Papers: (1) Jennifer Tucker, Leslie R. Wolfe, Wendy G. Smooth, Rose Ann M. Renteria

2. Environmental Change and Organizational Evolution

   Presider: James Wade

   Papers: (1) Linda J. Andes; (2) David Dornisch; (3) Ernesto Gantman; (4) James A. Kitts

3. Personal and Institutional Determinants of Work

   Presider: Carol J. Auster

   Papers: (1) Scott North; (2) George T. Patterson; (3) David Schulman; (4) Eileen T. Lake

4. Processes Leading to Gender Inequality

   Presider: Rosemary Wright

   Papers: (1) Nicole T. Flynn, Joan E. Manley; (2) Matt L.. Huffman, Lisa Torres; (3) Robert L. Kaufman

5. Space, Time, and Gender

   Presider: Melinda J. Milligan

   Papers: (1) Ivy Kennelly, Hiromi Taniguchi; (2) Chardie L. Baird; (3) Marjukka Ollilainen

6. Current Trends in the Employment Contract: Contingent and Part-Time Work

   Presider: Kevin D. Henson

   Papers: (1) Eric Barth, Naomi Cassirer; (2) Melanie A. Hulbert; (3) Debra Osnowitz

7. Organizations: Team, Professional, and Managerial Performance

   Presider: Donald Palmer

   Papers: (1) Greg Greenberg; (2) Joan E. Manley; (3) Patrick Nolan, Marilyn Dudley-Rowley

8. Demography: Point and Counterpoint

   Presider: Pamela Forman

   Papers: (1) Alexandra Kalev; (2) Eui Hang Shin, Casey Adam Borch; (3) Mary Lizabeth Gatta, Patricia Roos

9. Stratification and Mobility

   Presider: Marlese Durr

   Papers: (1)Lorraine R. Bell; (2) Mikaela Dufur; (3) Vincent Serravallo

10. Professions and Professionalizing Processes

    Presider: Carrie Yang Costello

    Papers: (1) Kathryn J. Lively; (2) Paula M. Moore; (3) Jennifer Wilson; (4) Laurel Smith-Doerr

11. Commitment and Satisfaction in Organizations

    Presider: Maura Belliveau

    Papers: (1) Matthew Oware; (2) Jackie Zalewski

12. Organizations and Community

    Presider: Sean O'Riain

    Papers: (1) Gregory Peter, Peter F. Korsching; (2) Raymond Russell, Robert Hanneman, Schlomo Getz

13. Occupational Case Studies

    Presdier: William Finlay

    Papers: (1) Ariel M. Ducey; (2) Katherine L. Hughes; (3) David Schweingruber

14. Institutional Power: Unions and Workplace Democracy

    Presider: Jonathan Isler

    Papers: (1) Young-Dal Chung; (2) Ed Collom; (3) Arthur Shostak

G. OOW Council Meeting: Tuesday, 12:30-1:30

H. OOW Business Meeting: Tuesday, 1:30-2:15

WEB PAGE SEEKING LINKS: E-MAIL TO FRANK STEINHART AT fsteinhart@northpark.edu

Other Conference Announcements

Labor Studies Division of the Society for the Study of Social Problems Washington D.C.: August 11-13, 2000

The following activities are planned for the 2000 SSSP meetings in Washington D.C. All of the SSSP sessions are at the Renaissance Mayflower Hotel.

A. New Structures and New Strategies: Transnational Labor and the Future of Unionism

Identifier: SSSP #8, Friday, 11:00-12:45
Co-Organizers: Lars Christiahsen, Fernando Gapasin
Presider and Discussant: Lars Christiansen

Papers: (1) Fernando Gapasin, Edna Bonacich; (2) Harry Targ, David Cormier; (3) Natalia Sarkisian; (4) Marina Karides

B. Contingent Employment: Social Policy, Inequality, and Marginal Employment.

Identifier: SSSP #31, Saturday, 11:00-12:45
Organizers, Presiders, & Discussants: Jackie Krasas Rogers, Kevin Henson

Papers: (1) Chloe Bird, Martha Lang, Jocelyn Chertoff, Benjamin Amick; (2) Charles Koeber; (3) Debra Osnowitz; (4) George Gonos

C. *Manufacturing Consent* Re-Examined

Identifier: SSSP #66, Sunday, 1:00-2:45
Organizer, Presider, & Discussant: Heidi Gottfried

Panelists: Michael Burawoy, Robin Leidner, Jennifer Pierce, Gay Seidman, Steve Vallas

D. Laboring to Learn: The Collective Action of Graduate Employees

Identifier: SSSP #33, Saturday, 11:00-12:45
Organizer: Melissa Marcello

Panelists: Cedric de Leon, Eric Odier-Fink, Kevin Wehr, Richard Sullivan, Darcy K. Leach, Jeff Rickert, James A. W. Shaw, Raina Joines, Jason Newman

Carework: Research, Theory, and Advocacy Washington D.C.; August 11, 2000

This conference will bring together researchers, policymakers, and advocates involved in various domains of carework for one day of meetings and networking. Participants from all academic disciplines, and who take various approaches to the study of carework and carework policy, are welcome.

Carework research and policy focus on the caring work of individuals, families, communities, paid caregivers, social service agencies, and state bureaucracies. Paper sessions will address shifts in carework across the private/ public boundary, cross-national comparisons of care provision, and conceptualizing/ theorizing care. Roundtables will address topics such as how women's labor force participation has affected the nature and scope of women's and men's caring work; how identities influence carework; how inequality based on gender, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, and other factors relates to caring; how caring work is recognized and compensated; how various state welfare policies shape the distribution of carework; and whether and to what extent citizens have a right to receive, and a duty to provide, care.

For more information about the conference, or to join ongoing discussions at the cutting edge of carework research and policy, please subscribe to the carework listserve by contacting the list administrator at careadmn@soc.umass.edu.

Organizing Knowledge Economies and Societies; APROS 2000 Sydney, Australia; December 14-16, 2000

Sponsored by Asia Pacific Researchers in Organization Studies, in collaboration with the International Sociological Association Research Committees on Economy and Society, and on the Sociology of Organizations.

Sub-themes are likely to include Global Management and International Business, Business in Asia, Latin American Perspectives, Gender, Technology and Globalization, Learning and Innovation, Culture and Society, Organization Theory, Globalizing Professional Services, and the Framing of Organizing Knowledge in Societies around the Pacific Rim.

Further information may be found at the web site http://man-bus.mmu.ac.uk/confs/apros.

Industrial Relations Research Association Annual Meeting New Orleans; January 5-7, 2001

This year's theme is "Ensuring Respect for Human Rights in Employment." Topics to be addressed include the right of workers to form and join unions and engage in collective bargaining; the right of workers to be free from discrimination in employment and on the job on the basis of race, gender, ethnicity, religion, age, disability, or sexual orientation; child labor and prison or other forms of forced labor; work environments with acceptable standards regarding health safety, hours of work, and compensation; the appropriate scope of such rights; labor market implications of such rights; the interplay between "the economy" and such rights; campaigns to publicize and enforce such rights; and the role, responsibility, and current practice of domestic and international organizations in ensuring such rights.

Further information is available from Paula D. Wells, IRRA Executive Director, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 121 LIR Bldg, 504 E. Armory Ave., Champaign, IL 61820, telephone 217-333-1485, e-mail pdwells@uiuc.edu.

Calls for Papers

Work and Occupations

Work and Occupations invites you to submit your manuscripts for peer review and possible publication. Now in its 25th volume, WO is a scholarly, sociological quarterly that publishes original research in the sociology of work, employment, and labor, social inequality in the workplace, worker-customer relations, deviance in the workplace, 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 address: daniel.b.cornfield@vanderbilt.edu.

Review of Religious Research

Review of Religious Research, an interdisciplinary journal now co-edited by Christopher G. Ellison and Darren E. Sherkat, is seeking manuscripts on any topic dealing with religious beliefs, activities, and organizations. We strongly encourage submissions investigating organization and occupational approaches to religious institutions, and connections between religious organizations and other voluntary organizations. To submit, send 4 copies of manuscripts and an e-mail or disk version of the paper to Darren E. Sherkat, 1811-B Dept. of Sociology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville TN 37235; e-mail address: sherkade@ctrvax.vanderbit.edu. There is a $15 processing fee for scholars who are not members of the Religious Research Association. Membership is only $24, and information can be found at: http://rra.hartsem.edu.

Contributions in Sociology Series

Contributions in Sociology Series (Greenwood Press) welcomes scholarly manuscripts (60,000-85,000 words) monographs/edited volumes on a wide array of subjects in sociology and related disciplines. Submit proposals to the Series Advisor: Professor Dan A. Chekki, Department of Sociology, University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 2E9. Fax: 204-774-4134. E-mail: sociology@uwinnipeg.ca.

International Sociology

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

Papers on Labor Revitalization for Research in the Sociology of Work, Volume 11

Original, social scientific articles which address the revitalization of declining labor movements and labor organizations in all world regions are sought. The articles should report the findings of rigorous, qualitative or quantitative original research. In addition, they should make theoretical social scientific contributions to the study of labor as a social movement, as an organization or set of organizations, or as an institutional economic actor, although other theoretically-informed conceptualizations of [organized] labor are also possible. Each article should also draw policy-relevant implications from the analysis.

Topics include, but are not limited to, the patterning of "demand" for labor organization among unorganized workers; the development of new constituencies of labor movements; innovations in labor organization and organizing; trends in union membership growth and decline; and political-legal constraints on labor revitalization. For further information, contact either of the guest editors: Daniel B. Cornfield or Holly J. McCammon, at e-mail addresses daniel.b.cornfield@vanderbilt.edu and mccammhj@ctrvax.vanderbilt.edu, respectively.

Papers on Worker Training for Research in the Sociology of Work, Volume 12

Job training is an important feature of the workplace in both the United States and throughout the world. Manuscripts are sought that develop sociological analyses of job training. These may include, but are not limited to, factors influencing the decisions of employers to provide job training, factors facilitating or restricting the ability of workers to pursue training, the organizational or institutional settings and environments in which training takes place, legal or historical aspects of job training, and analyses of job training across nations or in non-U.S. settings. Empirical work based on any appropriate research methodology is welcome, as are conceptually or theoretically based papers. Submissions will be accepted starting in June 2001, but the editor David Bills, at e-mail address david-bills@uiowa.edu, would be pleased to discuss specific ideas or proposals before that date.

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

Position Announcements

Vanderbilt University

The Department of Sociology invites applications for an assistant professor of sociology, tenure-track faculty position, commencing August, 2001. The candidate will be expected to teach graduate statistics courses. Preference will be given to candidates with expertise in one or more of the following areas: medical, organizations, education, gender, or stratification. Applicants should submit a letter of interest in the position, curriculum vitae, and any supplemental material (e.g. reprints, pending manuscripts, teaching evaluations) indicating promise or evidence of outstanding scholarship and effective teaching. Application materials, including three letters of recommendation, should be received by October 16, 2000. Vanderbilt is an Equal Opportunity-Affirmative Action Employer and women and minority candidates are encouraged to apply. Send all materials to Search Committee Chair, Department of Sociology, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 27235. Information on the department, the College of Arts and Science, Vanderbilt University, and e-mail addresses can be obtained on the Internet at http://www.vanderbilt.edu/AnS/sociology.

Georgia Institute of Technology

The School of History, Technology, and Society invites applications for a tenure-track Assistant or Associate Professor of Sociology, to begin August 2001. Ph.D. required at time of appointment. Candidates are sought in the sociology of technology and science. The ability to teach sociology of the environment and/or social theory/methods is also desirable, but not required. The School of History, Technology, and Society is an interdisciplinary department composed of sociologists and historians whose research concerns the relationship between culture, society, and technology, broadly defined. The successful candidate will be expected to show evidence of excellence in scholarship and teaching, both of which are important to our growing undergraduate and graduate programs. We encourage applications from women and members of underrepresented groups. Please send a letter of application, curriculum vitae, three letters of reference, and examples of written work to: Mary Frank Fox and Steven Vallas, Co-Chairs, Sociology Recruitment, School of History, Technology, and Society, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0345, USA. Review of applications will begin October 20.

General Announcements

Special Issue of Women's Studies Quarterly

"Building Inclusive Science: Connecting Women's Studies: Women in Science and Engineering." Special issue, Vol. 28 (Spring/Summer 2000), edited by Sue V. Rosser. This article collection focuses upon the impact that women's studies and feminism have had on the theory, practice, curriculum, and pedagogy, as well as the participation of women, in science, engineering, and mathematics.

Twenty articles address topics of: 1) History of women in science; 2) Current status of women in the profession; 3) Inclusions and exclusions: gender differences; 4) Revitalizing male subtexts and building alternative models; 5) Theory into practice; 6) Feminist science studies in the daily lives of women. Published by The Feminist Press at City University of New York. Phone: 212-817-7915; website: www.feministpress.org.

Research in the Sociology of Work

Research in the Sociology of Work, JAI Press, now has a website at http://www.sociology.ohio-state.edu/work/. The site lists the contents of recently published volumes and the topics of "in process" volumes. The site also provides submission information and links to guest editors. It may therefore be useful to section members who are potential contributors and who would like information on the topics of volumes currently in preparation.

Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP)

The Society for the Study of Social Problems provides an intellectual home for scholars, practitioners, and community activists who believe that social research should be oriented toward solving social problems. SSSP organizes and supports scholarship and activism committed to pursuing social justice through its publications, meetings, and fellowship. Membership includes a subscription to the journal Social Problems, membership in special problems divisions (for our members, especially Labor Studies), and access to the annual meetings (which overlap with the ASA).

To become a member, please contact them via their website at http://www.it.utk.edu/sssp/membership. You can also call the SSSP offices at 423-974-3620 or e-mail Michelle Smith Koontz at mkoontz3@utk.edu for additional information.

About OOW and Its Newsletter

This newsletter is published twice a year for the members of the American Sociological Association's Section on Organizations, Occupations, and Work.

Announcements sent to either the newsletter or web page editors below will be cross-listed, i.e. posted on the web page as soon as received and included in the newsletter as long as space allows; issues of the newsletter will be posted on the homepage as soon as prepared.

Please send any section-relevant news, articles, announcements, or letters of opinion intended for the newsletter and homepage in

(Continued on Page 15)

electronic form to one of the two addresses listed below. Articles should be 1,000 to 1,750 words, unless specifically negotiated with the editor, and other items should be shorter. Please understand that space requirements may compel us to edit what you send.

Newsletter Editor until August 15: Rosemary Wright, Sociological Resources, 10 Woods Lane, Chatham, New Jersey 07928. Telephone: 973-635-7312; fax: 973-635-7151; e-mail: srwright@ix.netcom.com.

Newsletter Editor as of August 15: Thomas D. Beamish, Institute of Governmental Affairs, University of California, Davis, California 95616. Telephone: 530-752-1212; fax: 530-752-2835; e-mail: tdbeamish@ucdavis.edu.

Web Page Editor: Frank Steinhart, Department of Sociology, North Park University, 3225 W. Foster Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60625. Telephone: 773-244-5591; e-mail: fsteinhart@northpark.edu.

Submissions to the Members' Book Corner, following the format of the entries in previous issues, should be sent to the address below. (Note: no submissions were received for the Spring 2000 issue.)

Book Corner Editor: Laura O'Toole, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Guilford College, Greensboro, NC 27410. Telephone: 919-3162271. E-mail: lotoole@guilford.edu.

OOW Committees - 1999-2000

Council
Nicole Woolsey Biggart, U C Davis (Chair)
Arne Kalleberg, U N C Chapel Hill (Chair-Elect)
Paula England, Pennsylvania (Past Chair)
Robert Nelson, Northwestern (Secretary-Treasurer)
Rosemary Wright, Soc. Resources (Newsletter Editor)

Karen Campbell, Vanderbilt
Ray Friedman, Vanderbilt
Jennifer Glass, Iowa
Peter Meiksins, Cleveland State
Kenneth Spenner, Duke
Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, N C State

Membership Committee
Melinda Milligan, Tulane (Co-Chair)
Beth Bechky, Pennsylvania (Co-Chair)
Eebbie Balser, Missouri - St. Louis (Co-Chair)

Nominations Committee
Pat Thornton, Duke
Amy Wharton, Washington State - Pullman
Neil Fligstein, U C Berkeley

Publications Committee
Rosemary Wright, Soc. Resources (Chair)
Frank Steinhart, North Park
Laura O'Toole, Guilford

Thompson Award Committee
Harland IPrechel, Texas A&M (Chair)
Robin Leidner, Pennsylvania
Nancy DiTomaso, Rutgers

Weber Award Committee
Elisabeth Clemens, Arizona (Chair)
Mitchel Abolafia, SUNY Albany
Marc Ventresca, Northwestern

New Award Committee
Arne Kalleberg, U N C Chapel Hill (Chair)
Marlese Durr, Wright State
Elaine Draper, U C Santa Barbara

Program Committee
Vicki Smith, U C Davis (Chair)
Anand Swaminathan, U C Davis
Eva Skuratowicz, U C Davis