Organizations, Occupations, and Work

OFFICERS OF THE OOW AND NEWSLETTER STAFF

2001-02 Chair
Vicki Smith, University of California, Davis
vasmith@ucdavis.edu

Chair-Elect
Jerry Jacobs, University of Pennsylvania
jjacobs@sas.upenn.edu

2001-02 Council Members
Karen Campbell, Vanderbilt University
karen.e.campbell@vanderbilt.edu

Frank Dobbin, Princeton University
dobbin@princeton.edu

Lauren Edelman, University of California, Berkeley
ledelman@uclink4.berkeley.edu

Jennifer Glass, University of Iowa
jennifer-glass@uiowa.edu

Secretary-Treasurer
Steven Vallas, Georgia Institute of Technology
steven.vallas@hts.gatech.edu

Newsletter Editor
Thomas D. Beamish, University of Georgia
tbeamish@arches.uga.edu

Web Coordinator
Frank Steinhart, North Park University
fsteinhart@northpark.edu

Listserve Coordinator
Jeremy Reynolds, University of Georgia
jeremyr@arches.uga.edu

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

From the Chair

I am very pleased to introduce a thought-provoking and cutting edge piece entitled "Over the Pond and Across the Water: Developing the Field of Gendered Organizations," co-authored by Patricia Yancey Martin and David Collinson and forthcoming in the journal, *Gender, Work and Organization*. In the fall newsletter I noted my concern about different strands of research within the section, authors of which seldom come together and speak with one another. To follow up on this concern, I solicited Martin's and Collinson's article as an exemplar of the intellectual effort to find the common threads, as well as the dissimilarities between organizations scholars, gender scholars, and work scholars, an effort which culminates in their call for a new field, specifically, the field of gendered organizations studies.

Martin and Collinson highlight some of the institutional and professional barriers separating organizational scholars and gender scholars, and outline an improvisational approach to developing new theories of how organizations became and maintain their gendered and racialized character. I have edited the article in order to excerpt it for our newsletter, but you can read the full version in the forthcoming issue of *G, W, O*. There, too, you will find a lengthy bibliography of sources in the field of gendered organizations studies.

At this point in the year, section activities are bustling in preparation for the 2002 meetings in Chicago. A number of people have been involved organizing our program (found elsewhere in this newsletter); we are just now putting the final touches on the listings. We have an abundance of intellectual riches, with our program featuring over 150 participants, including authors/presenters, discussants, and presiders.

Our three awards committees (The Max Weber, W. Richard Scott, and James Thompson committees) are in the thick of deliberations about the 2002 winners. With the award deadline only having just passed, I am unable to report our winners, but I will circulate this information via the listserve as soon as all decisions are made. For the time being, I'd like to thank all committee members: Cal Morrill, chair of the Weber committee, and Dick Hall and Chris Williams, members; Amy Wharton, chair of the Scott committee, and Rudy Alvarez and David Knoke, members; and Beth

Bechky, chair of the Thompson committee, and Richard Arum and Jackie Krasas Rogers, members. You will have the opportunity to help celebrate with the 2002 award winners, both at the section business meeting and at the section reception, times for which will be announced in the ASA program. I want to encourage everyone to attend both! A good turnout at the business meeting indicates what many of us know from experience but that the ASA officials can only tell from numbers, which is that our section is thriving and continues to attract a considerable number of people from all walks of our discipline. (When I turned in our section's Annual Report a few months ago, I discovered that the ASA requires us to report the number of people who attend the business meeting and I was pleased to be able to write "Too many to count!") Let's keep this up.

A couple of notes about the Chicago meetings. First, Frank Dobbin has organized an Author Meets Critics Session that will take place during our usual time slot for council meeting. This session features the authors who write the 2001 Max Weber Award-winning book, *Institutional Change and Healthcare Organizations: From Professional Dominance to Managed Care* (Chicago, 2000). Please try to attend – offering such sessions at future ASA meetings would be desirable and we need to know people will support them to justify the work that goes into organizing them.

Second, I hope to see everyone at the section reception. Last year's reception, organized by past chair Arne Kalleberg, was great–the turnout was high, the food was above average (which is a high compliment when it comes to ASA reception food), and I heard lots of energetic conversation.

Which leads me to point you toward the listing, in this newsletter, of all our sessions planned for the meetings. The program committee has organized a total of 8 different sessions: an Authors Meet Critics, an invited session, 5 regular sessions (one of which is co-sponsored with the Sex and Gender Section), and roundtables. The program encompasses a number of different areas within the section as well as a diversity of theoretical and methodological stances. This program will generate much intellectual excitement (if I dare say) and it is often at the reception where people have a chance to compare notes on sessions they've attended. Of course, you'll also hear the updated gossip – all in all, a very worthwhile experience.

The next newsletter you'll receive will be from the incoming chair, Jerry Jacobs. Let me take this opportunity to thank Tom Beamish, newsletter editor extraordinaire and welcome

LisaTorres who is the incoming newsletter editor. The work to assemble the information and craft it into the product you receive is time-consuming and labor intensive, and they deserve much credit for taking it on. Also, thanks to Frank Steinhart and Jeremy Reynolds, for their work as website coordinator and listserve coordinator.

Vicki Smith, University of California, Davis
vasmith@ucdavis.edu

Comments? Share your responses with the section by contacting Vicki Smith vasmith@ucdavis.edu

---

Featured Article

"Over the Pond and Across the Water: Developing the Field of 'Gendered Organizations.'" Forthcoming in *Gender, Work, and Organization.*

Patricia Yancey Martin (Florida State University)
David Collinson (Warwick University, U.K.)

In a recent article, Dana Britton (2000) acknowledged the remarkable emergence of a "gendered organizations" field in only a decade. Pioneers who paved the way for this development include Rosabeth Kanter, Kathy Ferguson, and Cynthia Cockburn, among many others but perhaps the publication of Joan Acker's 1990 paper, "Hierarchies, bodies and jobs: Toward a gendered theory of organizations" best marks its birth.

The multitude of articles and books about "gendered organizations," "gendered occupations," and "gendered work" that have appeared since the mid-1980s shows the breadth and depth of interest in this area. The journal, *Gender, Work, and Organization*, was founded in accord with these developments. The gendered organizations field has emerged because feminist/gender scholars have committed to rewriting/revising organization theory and research so women's experiences and voices, and the lives of "men as men," are represented rather than silenced.

In order to build on this work, Britton recommends the need for greater analytical rigour in specifying the meaning of concepts like "gendered organization". Concerned with the same overall objective of enhancing the study of gender and organization, we have two somewhat different goals and concerns. One is to review challenges that we and others

face in collaborating to study gendered organizations "over the pond/across the water" (see explanation below) and a second is to argue for a "gendered organization" field that is separate from both organization studies and gender studies.

The first half of the article considers challenges to developing a "gendered organization" perspective. It reviews factors that militate against integrating (1) organization studies and gender studies and (2) gendered organizations scholarship over national/continental divides. We also consider hurdles that we have faced in working cross-nationally to study gender and organization. A U. S. sociologist woman and a U. K. business school man, both of whom study gendered organizations, have had difficulty collaborating. We note our surprise at discovering differences in assumptions about gender and organizations, theory/ies, methods, literatures with which we are familiar, and social networks within which we work.

Despite many barriers, creative work across disciplinary as well as national/continental boundaries is, we believe, possible. In fact, the emerging gendered organizations field provides fertile common ground for such a development. Accordingly, the second main section of the article argues for a separate gendered organizations field. Just as Kuhn says hegemonic theories in physics are incapable of being fundamentally altered by tinkering, including negative (or disconfirming) findings, we are increasingly doubtful about whether traditional (mainstream and critical) organization theories can be modified adequately to address gender.

We recommend the creation of new theories, "gendered organization" theories, that represent the experiences of all organization members, not only managers/controllers or the gender-free, race-free, ageless, sexless, and un-embodied mythical "empty slot" worker (Acker). Toward this end, we contend that those who care about this area should "strike out" on our own, "boldly going" into unfamiliar territory, carrying a healthy disregard for established boundaries and assumptions. Drawing on the jazz metaphor that is increasingly influential in organization studies (Hatch 1999), we urge gendered organization scholars to improvise with all and any materials and ideas that they/we deem useful in building on previous insights about gendered organizational processes. We begin by reviewing some of the disciplinary, gendered and geo-cultural forces that militate against integration.

Pressures to Diverge
A number of conditions encourage the divergence, rather than integration, of organization studies and gender studies.

[a] Organization studies, gender studies, fragmented disciplines
Organization studies is fragmented by the different academic units within which faculty are located and the different theories and interests they favour. Organization studies, a phrase used more on the European than North American side of the Atlantic, encapsulates multiple disciplinary interests. In general, the phrase stands for management units in U. K. business schools and management and organization behaviour foci in U. S. business schools. U. S. sociologists seldom use the term, instead calling themselves "organization sociologists." Public administration and psychology faculty focus on the social psychology of internal organizational dynamics and form somewhat distinct groups. These sub-disciplines differ in the theories and methods they use and journals they publish in. As a result, organization studies stands for an aggregate of people who identify as organization scholars with varying interests, activities, and professional associates; their chief commonality being their identity as organization scholars.

Gender studies (a term rarely used in the U. S.) is similarly fragmented. Gender studies began as women's studies with early foci on violence against women, income and educational inequality, women's unequal treatment in the workplace and home/family, women's political rights, and so on. Gender studies evolved in many directions with some (but not all) scholars identifying as feminists. Some focused on institutions like the family, church, and politics, others on organizations and work, others on bodies, weight, appearance, the women's movement, and so on. From the outset, women's/gender studies was multi-disciplinary with historians, political scientists, literary scholars, sociologists, anthropologists, philosophers, and religion scholars working together. As Gherardi (2002) notes, feminists speak in many voices and have many interests. Diversity and fragmentation within gender studies partly explains why integration with organization studies is so difficult.

Gherardi (2002) argues that the separateness of organization theory and feminist theory is inevitable except for an occasional "confluence" of effort and that this condition is not regrettable. She encourages both feminist theory and organization theory to view itself as partial understandings of how knowledge is embedded in power relations. While taking Gherardi's point, we see divergence as having costs. Organization theories and research that

represents gender as absent from workplaces silence the voices of the less powerful, especially, but not only, women. Theories that represent work processes as gender free (or "race" free) obscure gender's role in the social organization of work and do harm when taught to students and bureaucrats as accurate portrayals of organizational life.

[b] Gender composition, gendered practices
A second condition that fosters divergence is gender itself. Most organization scholars are men (J. Martin 1994), most gender scholars are women, a pattern with historical roots and contemporary effects. Gender scholarship was developed by feminists focusing on women's lives (but they also analyzed men's lives relative to women, e.g., violence, excluding women from public life, sexual exploitation, and so on). Feminists/women's studies/gender studies paid little attention to organizations until recently but, in the past decade, have helped to found the gendered organizations field. During this decade, scholars also began studying men and masculinities at work and enhanced development of the gendered organizations field, as we review later.

In contrast with gender studies, organization studies was developed and is populated largely by men and mostly it has ignored gender. Max Weber theorized bureaucracy in a time when women could not own property, attend university, or hold most paying jobs yet Weber, who was keenly aware of power, failed to address gender. Men's theories, lives, and interests are foundational to "classic" organization theories yet these theories claim to be gender-neutral. Martin and Knopoff (1997:33) show how Weber's ". . . language [and its absence or silence] can be used to suppress women and other subordinated groups, sometimes without mentioning women directly . . ."

Gender affects divergence in other ways. When a field is numerically dominated by one gender and that same gender has more power, for example, relative to journal editorships, controlling funds, or occupying elite chairs, the other gender may be excluded or subordinated and marginalized, even if unintentionally. Pressures on men to avoid gender as a specialty are greater than the reverse because gender is often taken to mean women and women's work which, compared to men and men's work, is devalued in pay, status, promotions, etc. Senior academics often discourage junior colleagues from studying gender, advising them to stick to a "mainstream" research agenda and avoid such a marginal, politicized topic. In this climate, interested scholars who avoid gender to protect their careers narrow the field's diversity and help marginalize gendered organization scholarship.

Citation patterns, and the reputational capital that accrues from being cited, vary by gender (Baldi 1998). Men cite men more than they cite women whereas women cite women and men about equally (P. Martin 1982). Differences in such patterns cannot be fully explained by content, furthermore. If few men study gender and many women study gender, men may cite women less because women's work is less pertinent to theirs; women may cite men more (than the reverse) because men's work is viewed as "classic" and/or because men are the publishing gatekeepers. Baldi (1998) shows, however, that men cite women less even in fields where the content is "non-human." For example, in a specialty area of physics known as celestial masers, the single best predictor of citations was author's gender, after taking account of differences in proportions of men and women and many control variables. That is, articles written by women were cited much less than articles written by men, prompting Baldi to conclude that "women's work is strongly devalued in astrophysics" (1998:843).

[c] Geography: spatial distance, cultural divides
When growing up in the deep South U.S.A., Pat Martin's family used a phrase "across the water" to describe cousins who went to Europe in the military. When she went to England on sabbatical in 1979, she heard a parallel British phrase for the U. S. and Canada, "over the pond." These similar but not identical phrases draw attention to cultural differences symbolized by a vast body of water and thousands of miles. Despite a common language, North America and the U.K. have different academic traditions, values, meanings and practices that can hinder the accumulation and communication of ideas across the water/over the pond.

This section focuses on the effects of geography as a contributor to cultural differences. Why does North American and European scholarship often proceed along parallel rather than intersecting tracks? How do theories, methods, academic and professional practices, and social networks foster divergence? We are interested in divergence among people separated by nation and/or continent and associated values, customs and practices but who have interests in common.

Theory vs. Data, Constructionism vs. Positivism
Working across the pond is challenged by differing views of what constitutes "useful" knowledge and proper analytic methods. Having different words for the same idea or different theories altogether poses problems; using the same theories differently is also a hurdle. Different views of how research is conducted, and toward what end, are divisive.

Such differences, while not based solely on culture, are exacerbated by geographical distance.

In general, U. S. and European scholars (and not just those in the gendered organizations area) use theory and data differently. To oversimplify, Europeans are more enamored of theory and theorizing, whilst North American scholars place a higher priority on data and "rigorous" research methods (Hofstede 1996). As a result, they often view each other's work as less competent or useful. To North Americans, UK and European papers tend to read as if the goal is to invoke complex, obscure theory while paying scant attention to data or findings. European work seems to be concerned with theoretical debates and ontological and epistemological assumptions to the near exclusion of data. Similarly, UK/European scholars view North American work as paying too little attention to theory and as overly concerned with numerical results. They appear to be obsessed with the "scientific" rigour of positivist methods. Despite extensive critiques of positivist principles, the U. S. love affair with positivism persists.

Theories favoured by U. S. organization scholars are as a rule positivist and deductive rather than social constructionist and inductive. Favoured theories in sociology such as resource dependence, population ecology, and institutional theory pay minimal attention to internal dynamics such as agency and voice, power and resistance, and identity-related practices. As Kalleberg (2001) notes, U. S. sociologists began in the 1960s to focus on the environment to the neglect of many other issues. This development led to separation of the study of work (labour markets, labour processes, trade unions) from the study of occupations and professions and both from the study of organizations (Kalleberg 2001). Understanding global developments such as the declining significance of firms, increasing reliance on work teams over specific jobs or occupations, and the internal labor market processes of occupations and professions can be enhanced if each area addresses the other from its own perspective, Kalleberg says. As discussed earlier, and partly related to these developments, dominant theories in the U. S. represent members' gender as irrelevant to organizational structure, processes, and outcomes.

Critical approaches such as social constructionism, post-structuralism, and postmodernism in Europe and elsewhere are ignored by many U. S. organization scholars in business, public administration, psychology and sociology departments. As a consequence, positivist and functionalist philosophies remain hegemonic. Consequently, critical scholars, those who question the claims of logico-rational depictions of organizations, work in a more hostile climate in the U. S. than in the U. K. and Europe.

We support a caution offered by Grey (2000) about geographic differences. He argues that differences between North America and Europe are political distinctions for which continents are only proxies. North American "normal science" is globally dominant in management and organization research, thereby blocking critical work on both sides of the pond. As a result, "US scholars working outside functionalism are as excluded as those from Europe and functionalist scholars from Europe are as welcome as those from the US" (2000:12). A positivist centre encompasses much US research and some European work and a critical margin encompasses much European research and some US work, Grey says. Although he does not address gender, his analysis supports our thesis that institutional academic influences produce divisions between "a non-critical centre and a more critical margin." Cultural differences associated with spatial separation thus foster, but do not simply determine, different norms for theory and methods that in turn affect organization studies as well as gender studies and the emerging field of gendered organizations.

Is Integration Possible . . . or Worth the Effort?
We agree that some organization theories are more useful than others for taking gender into account. For example, critical theory, post-structural theory, and post-modern theory have this potential. J. Martin (2001) argues that critical organization theory and feminist theory overlap in ways that are potentially useful to both. Highlighting their "unexplored synergies," she observes that despite a number of important commonalities, critical theorists rarely cite feminist scholarship while feminist theorists are just as unlikely to incorporate critical theory. She criticises some critical theory for assuming that feminist approaches are simply a narrow sub-theme of a "broader" critical perspective. By contrast, she asserts that "any domain of inquiry is by definition narrow if it excludes women's concerns" (2001 p. 41). Martin remains optimistic, however, that integration is not only desirable but also possible.

While we agree about potential synergies, we are increasingly skeptical that critical scholars will incorporate gender analysis and its wide-ranging implications into their work on organizational issues like structure, strategy, power, resistance, and subjectivity. In our experience, feminist and pro-feminist writers have been the primary agents in producing studies concerned to identify and explore potential synergies. Since critical, post-structural, and post-

modern organization scholars have not developed a reciprocal focus on gender (or on age, sexuality, able-bodiedness, and race/ethnicity) it might be time to question whether the effort to "reform," reframe, and revise organization theory is worth the trouble or, indeed, is possible. Alternatively, would we be advised to "strike out" on our own, to re-focus our efforts on the development of a 'gendered organizations' field? If so, how would we do this?

Striking Out—Through Improvisation!
The metaphor of "striking out" has several meanings. In baseball, a batter gets three "strikes" and is "out," thus losing their turn to bat. If we take this route, we may "strike out" as in lose the chance to be heard or be influential. Yet, to "strike out" also means to enter uncharted territory, forge into the unknown, and take chances and risks. Developing a new field of "gendered organizations" (or "gendered occupations," "gendered work," or "gender, work, and organization") would entail such contingencies.

Without question, and despite the foregoing divergent pressures, critical scholars of "gendered organizations" have already provided a role-model for striking out. They have produced path-breaking challenges to hegemonic conceptions of organizations by using feminist, critical, post-structural, and post-modern theory. Studies such as these have produced new and arresting insights into gendered organizational processes and have stimulated new forms of representation, new ways of giving voice to subordinated groups and new challenges to gendered power relations.

Many of the foregoing studies have adopted eclectic, multi-perspectival and in some cases experimental approaches to the analysis of gendered organizations. Accordingly, in addition to striking out, we propose "improvisation" as a useful metaphor for advancing a feminist analysis of gendered organizations (Crossan and Sorrenti 1977, Weick 1998). Improvisation does not refer to the absence of structure and order (as is sometimes presupposed) but the playing with and creative reinterpretation of structures. For Weick (1998: 544) it involves, "reworking precomposed material and designs in relation to unanticipated ideas." Arguing that improvisation is akin to conversing, rethinking and organizing, he suggests that "living itself is an exercise in improvisation" (1998: 550). To exemplify this he quotes a passage from Mary Catherine Bateson (1989) whose observations highlight some of the ways that improvisation can also take gendered forms, as she suggests, "the physical rhythms of reproduction and maturation create sharper discontinuities in women's lives than in men's . . . . [T]he ability to shift from one preoccupation to another, to

divide one's attention to improvise in new circumstances, has always been important to women."

Hatch uses jazz as a metaphor for "redescribing" the concept of organizational structure (1999) and for 'organizing' in the 21st century (1998). She identifies parallels between jazz improvisation and the emerging vocabulary of organization studies such as flexibility, adaptability, teamwork, loose boundaries, minimal hierarchy and sense-making. Through improvisation, jazz musicians interpret structure loosely and playfully, which in turn encourages creativity, experimentation, imagination and innovation. In its celebration of ambiguity, emotionality and temporality, jazz improvisation breaches structure and control before creating a new, more complex order.

The metaphor of jazz improvisation may help us re-think the structures and practices of gendered organizations. It could stimulate new metaphors, new vocabularies and new modes of thinking about the conditions, processes and consequences of gendered organizations. Equally, the improvisation metaphor resonates with the emphasis in feminist research on women's simultaneous and creative use of multiple skills, knowledge and experience (Davies and Rosser 1996). With its roots in ethnic/racial oppression, jazz is also a potentially radical means by which the subordinated can give "voice" to their experience of exploitation. The metaphor of improvisation reflects and reinforces an emphasis on the changing, shifting and dynamic character of (gendered) organizational processes. Improvisation examines issues like ambiguity, contradiction, paradox and multiplicity that are central to the analysis of gendered organizations (see *Gender, Work and Organization*, Special issue, 1998). It is precisely this kind of approach to the analysis of gendered organizations that we would like to encourage.

Both striking out and improvisation are risky and we cannot know the outcome in advance. A new field has fewer conventions to limit risk-taking and enforce orthodoxy. Britton (2000) criticizes users of the term "gendered organizations" for laxity in specifying its premises but she also acknowledges the heuristic potential of this emerging field. While we would not wish to prescribe too tightly the (multiple) meanings and definitions of gendered organizations for fear of constraining insight and creativity, let us briefly consider what this more expansive, eclectic and improvised field of "gendered organizations" might include. "Improvised striking out" holds promise in at least three areas: National, gender, and disciplinary inclusiveness;

theoretical and methodological innovation; and an expansive stance on content, methods, theory, and approach.

National, Gender, and Disciplinary Inclusiveness

Scholars in the gendered organizations field are diverse nationally, disciplinarily, and relative to gender compared with writers on organizations generally. Despite barriers, many are building on each others' work across national boundaries (e.g., J. Martin 2001; Sinclair 1995; Gherardi 2002). In the 1980s, men joined women as investigators of gender and work issues (e.g., Cohn 1985; J. Miller 1986; Bielby and Baron 1986). Increasingly , men's identities and actions as men, and the social dynamics of masculinities, became key areas of concern (Collinson 1992, Whitehead and Barrett 2001). Scholarship on men and masculinities at work is burgeoning on multiple continents, fostering innovative theory and methods. Gendered organization scholars are collaborating across disciplinary boundaries also—with business school and sociology faculty, in particular, finding common ground. This article is testament to two scholars' commitment to transcend national, gender, and disciplinary divides.

Theoretical and Methodological Innovation

"Gendered organization" scholars are free to do unorthodox, creative, and non-conventional work, both theoretically and methodologically. While many publications have sprung from mainstream organization studies perspectives (e.g., post-modern theory, narrative analysis, relational theory, and so on), authors have ventured into uncharted terrain without concern for mainstream approval (e.g., Calas and Smircich 1991).

An Expansive Stance on Content, Theory, Methods, and Claims

No longer constrained by mainstream conventions, gendered organizations scholars can accept any scholarly work informed by feminist values that they find useful. Surveys, archival data (on occupations, organizations, or jobs), experimental research (e.g., on perceptions or group processes), and so on, are as acceptable as qualitative fieldwork, ethnographic work, deconstruction, and narrative analysis. If a work sheds light on the gender of organizations and work (or its absence), it can be used. Constructionists and deconstructionists can learn from quantitative work just as positivists may learn from critical writers; cross-methods/cross theoretical critique can produce promising research agendas and theoretical insights.

Furthermore, the field of gendered organizations needs to expand beyond gender to embrace all forms of inequality

which lack legitimacy in organizations that claim to use merit and performance as their evaluative standards. Indeed, a critically important feature of an expansive gendered organizations field is its questioning of status differences other than gender. As Lorber (2000) notes, much of feminist theory intends to undermine gender and all other status distinctions that create and sustain inequality in work/economic and other institutional spheres. Certain streams of feminist work on gendered organizations already address race/ethnicity, sexuality, and able-bodiedness, appearance, weight, and social class. We expect this trend to accelerate.

A fundamental contribution of gender scholarship has been to frame organizations as systems of power relations that are embedded in gender, arguing that they cannot be adequately understood unless gender is acknowledged. Building on these insights, feminist scholarship could extend its appreciation of the importance of organizational processes in reproducing gender inequalities (and vice versa). Indeed the workplace is a, if not the, prime arena where men in developed countries construct their masculine identities and relations with each other and, as the privileged and dominant gender, significantly shape femininities and women. Thus it is important to (re-)examine work organizations' structures, practices and ideologies, including their resonance with bureaucracy, capitalism and western conceptions of science, in order to understand how masculinities that are hegemonic in the developed world today are created and sustained. For example, if powerful corporate men practice "destructive" masculinities under the guise of behaving as "gender-free" bureaucrats, managers, or scientists, they may place people, organizations and even society at risk (e.g., Maier and Messerschmidt 1998).

The gendered conditions, processes and consequences of contemporary organizational processes such as team-working, outsourcing, e-commerce, surveillance, business process re-engineering, McDonaldization and globalization all require more extensive feminist analysis. Similarly, the gendered nature of "resistance" in the workplace (Collinson 2000) and in anti-corporate social movements (Klein 2000) needs further examination. In addition, even apparently more "innocent" interactional dynamics like workplace humour and joking relations can reflect and reinforce complex and sometimes quite damaging gendered power asymmetries and these could be very fruitful lines of enquiry. The field of gendered organizations also expands beyond paid work to address the complex relations between "work" and '"life." Given that gender equality incorporates a concern with work/life balance (Lewis 1997), it needs to examine how

this might be achieved as well critically exploring productivist and masculinist organizational processes that continue to privilege 'work' over 'life.'

A final aspect of expansiveness is insistence on the fluidity and permeability of definitions, boundaries, and polarities (Lorber 2000), including respect for variability in the specification and uses of concepts, theories, and methods. Indeed, an expansive gendered organizations field will welcome debates over whether a gendered organizations field should even exist, much less the meaning of specific concepts and perspectives.

Similarly, it will resist "bounding" of the diverse and often incompatible kinds of work that gendered organizations scholars do. Neat typifications, such as Britton's (2000) recent list of three—of premise, numerical composition, and discourse—will be questioned. P. Martin identified eight structural and eleven interactional aspects of gendered organizations scholarship in the early 1990s (1992) and, we suspect, a current census would replicate these and add at least as many more. We view diversity as a strength, a sign of viability and creativity, not an indictment for lack of either orthodoxy or definitional precision. The standard for good work should be clarity, provocativeness, innovativeness, utility, and insightfulness, not uniformity or consensus. In accord with Sandra Harding (1991), we believe multiple perspectives, experiences, conceptions, theories, and methods produce a "less false" rendering of gender as it actually "exists" (or not) and "works."

Conclusions

We invite readers of this article to join us in improvising, in "striking out" to advance and consolidate an emergent field of study. Gendered organization scholars in North America, the U. K., and Australia/New Zealand as well in Italy, Denmark, Belgium, Finland, and other European nations are numerous enough to ground the field. The journal *Gender, Work, and Organization* is a valuable resource and the recent "Rethinking Gender, Work, and Organization Conference" at Keele, organized by GWO, brought together scholars from many nations, fostering acquaintance and awareness and, we hope, accumulation and collaboration across boundaries. Extending Kalleberg's suggestion (2001), we encourage "gendered work" and "gendered occupations" scholars to look afresh at work done from a "gendered organization" or "gendered labour markets'" perspective (and, of course, the reverse) to see how each can enrich the other. We celebrate the emerging, multi-disciplinary field of gendered organizations. If we decide later that the field has run its course or stopped being useful,

we can abandon it. In the meantime, we believe that concerted collaboration across national/cultural, disciplinary, theoretical, methodological, gender, race/ethnicity, sexuality, and other status distinctions can foster inclusive, challenging and provocative scholarship on gender, work, and organization.

References

Acker, J. (1990) "Hierarchies, bodies, and jobs: A theory of gendered organizations." *Gender & Society* 4:139-58.

Baldi, S. (1998) "Normative versus Social Constructivist Processes in the Allocation of Citations: A Network-Analytic Approach." *American Sociological Review* 63 (December):829-846.

Bateson, M. C. (1989) *Composing a Life*. New York: Atlantic Monthly,

Bielby, W. T. and J. N. Baron. 1986. "Men and Women at Work: Sex Segregation and Statistical Discrimination." *American Journal of Sociology* 91:759-99.

Britton, D. (2000) "The epistemology of the gendered organization." *Gender & Society* 14:418-34.

Calas, M. and Smircich, L. (1991) "Voicing seduction to silence leadership." *Organization Studies* 12 (4):567-602.

Cohn, Samuel. (1985) *The Process of Occupational Sex-Typing: The Feminization of Clerical Labor in Great Britain*. Philadelphia PA: Temple University Press.

Collinson, D. L. (1992) *Managing the Shopfloor: Subjectivity, Masculinity and Workplace Culture*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Collinson, D. L. (2000) "Strategies of resistance: power, knowledge and subjectivity in the workplace." K. Grint (Ed). *Work and Society: A Reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 163-198.

Crossan, M. and Sorrenti, M (1997) "Making sense of improvisation. *Advances in Strategic Management* 14: 155-180.

Davies, C. and Rosser, J. (1996) "Gendered Jobs in the Health Service: A problem for Labour Process Analysis." D. Knights and H. Willmott (Eds). *Gender and the Labour Process*, Aldershot: Gower.

Gherardi, Silvia. (2002) "Feminist Theory and Organizational Theory: A Dialogue on New Bases." *Organizational Theory As Science: Prospects and Limitations*. Christian Knudsen and Haridimos Tsoukas (Eds.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Grey, C. (2000) "Them and Us? From a Geopolitical to a Political Understanding of Management and organization Research in North America and Europe." Paper presented at EGOS, Helskinki, July.

Harding, S. (1991) *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?* Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.

Hatch, M. J. (1999) "Exploring the empty spaces of organizing: how improvisational jazz helps redescribe organizational structure." *Organization Studies* 20 (1): 75-100.

Hatch, M. J. (1998) "Jazz as a metaphor for organizing in the 21st century." *Organization Science* 9 (5): 556-557.

Hofstede, G. (1996) "An American in Paris: The influence of nationality on organization theories." *Organization Studies* 17 (3):525-37.

Kalleberg, A. (2001) View from the Chair. *Organizations, Occupations and Work Newsletter* (Spring):1-4.

Klein, N. (2000) *No Logo*. London: Flamingo.

Lewis, S. (1997) "Family friendly employment policies: a route to changing organizational culture or playing about at the margins?" *Gender, Work and Organization* 4 (1): 13-23.

Lorber, J. (2000) "Using gender to undo gender." *Feminist Theory* 1 (1): 79-95.

Maier, M. and J. Messerschmidt. (1998) "Commonalities, conflicts, and contradictions in organizational masculinities: Exploring the gendered genesis of the Challenger disaster." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 35:325-44.

Martin, J. (1994) "The organization of exclusion: institutionalization of sex inequality, gendered faculty jobs and gendered knowledge in organizational theory and research." *Organization* 1:401-431.

Martin, J. and K. Knopoff. (1997) "The gendered implications of apparently gender-neutral theory: Re-reading Max Weber." Edward Freeman and Andrea Larson (Eds.). *Women's Studies and Business Ethics: Toward a New Conversation*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 30-49.

Martin, J. (2001) "Feminist Theory and Critical Theory: Unexplored Synergies." M. Alvesson and H. Willmott (Eds.). *Critical Management Studies*. London: Sage. Forthcoming.

Martin, P. Y. (1992) "Gender, interaction, and inequality in organizations." Cecelia Ridgeway (Ed.). *Gender, Interaction, and Inequality*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 208-231.

_____. (1982) "Fair Science: Test or assertion? A response to Cole's 'Women in Science.' " *Sociological Review* 30:478-508.

Miller, J. (1986) *Pathways in the Workplace: The Effects of Gender and Race on Access to Organizational Resources*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sinclair, A. (1995) "Sex and the MBA." *Organization* 2:295-317.

Weick, K. (1998) "Improvisation as a mindset for organizational analysis." *Organization Science*, 9 (5): 540-555.

Whitehead, S. and F. Barrett (Eds.) (2001) *The Sociology of Masculinity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

ASA Meetings, Chicago 2002

Nearly Everything You Need to Know about the Section Proceedings during the 2002 Meetings in Chicago

The program committee and the session organizers have done a superb job coordinating our program for the Chicago meetings. I think you will agree with me that we have a robust and well-rounded program this year, which includes over 150 participants.

I would like to thank the outstanding program committee — Sean O'Riain, program committee chair; Kim Shauman, chair of the roundtable organizing committee and Dina Okamoto, Eileen Otis, and Jonathan Isler, all of whom performed the largely invisible work of grouping together a large number and broad range of papers for the roundtables, as well as arranging presiders for each.

I also want to thank those individuals who accepted the invitation to organize sessions: Lisa Catanzarites, Laurel Smith-Doerr, William Ocasio, John Van Maanen; Brian Uzzi, who organized an invited session; Frank Dobbin, who put together an "Authors Meet Critics" session (featuring the winners of the 2001 Max Weber Award); and Paula England, who organized the session we are co-sponsoring with the Sex and Gender Section this year. The sessions and roundtables feature cutting-edge research on numerous topics in organizations, occupations, and work.

Viewing the work of all these individuals from my vantage point of Chair of the section has given me a deeper appreciation for this behind-the-scenes work that makes it possible for our section to offer a vibrant and relevant program year-after-year.

Please note that the "Authors Meet Critics" Session will take place during the time slot normally allotted for the council meeting while the OOW council will hold its council meeting over breakfast (TBA) while. The OOW business meeting, open to all members and nonmembers as well, will take place directly following the "Authors Meet Critics" panel. Feel free to attend the business meeting: old and new business will be discussed and, a most popular item on our agenda,

the 2002 OOW Awards for book, article, and grad student paper will be awarded.

Also note: Our section reception this year will be generous. The reception will be scheduled for Friday evening (Aug. 16). Please come! It's a great chance to meet old and new members, chat with and congratulate award recipients, meet the incoming section chair, Jerry Jacobs, find friends, and enjoy some food–drinks too!

1. *Session: The Authors (of the 2001 Max Weber Award-winning book) Meets Critics*

Book: *Institutional Change and Healthcare Organizations: From Professional Dominance to Managed Care* (University of Chicago Press, 2000).

Organizer and Presider: Frank Dobbin (Princeton University)

Authors: W. Richard Scott (Department of Sociology), Martin Ruef (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill), Peter J. Mendel (RAND Health), Carol A Caronna (University of California, Berkeley).

Critics: Donald W. Light (University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey).

Heather A. Haveman (Graduate School of Business, Columbia University).

2. *Session: Occupational Communities*

Organizer and Presider: John Van Maanen, MIT

Discussant: Steve Barley, Stanford University

Michael Anteby (New York University): Poaching in an Aerospace Factory: Narratives and Practices.

Susan Eaton (Harvard): The Emergence of a Social "Non-contract": Evidence from the Biotechology Sector.

Timothy Hoff (Suny, Albany): The Trajectory of Physician-Employee Sense-making in a Nonprofit HMO.

Diane Vaughan (Boston College): Distinction and the Construction of Occupational Boundaries: The Case of Air Traffic Control.

3. *Session: Gender and Race Restructuring in Organizations*

Organizer and Presider: Lisa Catanzarite, University of California, San Diego

Discussant: Gloria Jones-Johnson, Iowa State University

Sheryl Skaggs (University of Texas at Dallas): Producing Change or Bagging Opportunity? The Effects of Discrimination Litigation on Women and Minorities in Supermarket Management.

Gerhard K. Daday and Beverly Burris (University of New Mexico):The Effects of Teaming Structures on Race, Ethnicity, and Gender Differences in a High-Tech Corporation: A Case Study.

Rebecca S. Carter (East Carolina University): Working it Out in North Carolina: Employers and Mexican Immigrants.

Ana Rodriguez-Gusta' (Universidad de General San Martin, Buenos Aires, Argentina):A Gender Account of Managerial Attainment: The Case of the Public Sector in Uruguay.

4. *Session: New Directions in Organizational Theory*

Organizer and Presider: William Ocasio, Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University .

Discussant: Frank Dobbin (Stanford University).

Doug McAdam and W. Richard Scott (Stanford University): Organizations and Movements.

Calvin Morrill (University of California, Irvine), Mayer N. Zald (University of Michigan), and Hayagreeva Rao (Goizueta Business School, Emory University): Covert Political Conflict in Organizations: Challenges from Below.

Patricia H. Thornton (Fuqua School of Business, Duke University): Culture and Cognition: A Theory of Attention Applied to the Strategy and Structure of the Firm.

Alessandro Lomi (School of Economics, University of Bologna): The Ties that Make the Market: An Empirical Examination of the Organization of Production Across Multiple Networks.

5. *Session: The Social Organization of Care Work* (Co-Sponsored with the Sex & Gender Section)

Organizer: Paula England, Northwestern University.

Presider and Discussant: Andrew Jones, University of Vermont

Elizabeth West, Radcliffe Infirmary, Oxford, England: The Emotional and Financial Costs of Caring Incurred by Men and Women in the British Labour Market.

Susan Eaton (Harvard): Keeping Caring Caregivers: How Managerial Practices Affect Turnover among Front-line Nursing Assistants.

Naomi Gerstel (University of Massachusetts): Care Work and Employment: Explaining the Gender Gap in Caring for Parents.

Louise Roth (University of Arizona): Having It All? Childcare Arrangements and Gender Inequality in Professional Careers.

6. *Session: Network Organizations: Synthesizing Instrumentalism and Trust*

Session Organizer and Presider: Laurel Smith-Doerr (Boston University)

Discussant: Joseph Galaskiewicz (University of Arizona)

Jason Owen-Smith (University of Michigan) and Walter W. Powell (Stanford University): Knowledge Networks in the Boston Biotechnology Community.

Rick Grannis (Cornell University), David A. Smith (University of California-Irvine) and Judith Stepan-Norris (University of California-Irvine): Working Connections: Shopfloor Networks and Union Leadership.

Thomas Hinz (Ludwig-Maximilians University Munich), Monika Jungbauer-Gans (Ludwig-Maximilians University Munich) and Peter Kriwy (Ludwig-Maximilians University Munich): Reputation and Social Capital in the German Film Industry.

Holly Raider (INSEAD): Organization Relations and Fee Structures in Technology License Contracts.

7. *Invited Session: Aspects of the Social Construction of Labor Markets*

Organizer and Presider: Brian Uzzi, Northwestern University

Discussant: Lisa Amoroso, Beloit College

Diane Burton (MIT): Careers in the New Economy.

Robert L. Nelson (American Bar Foundation/Northwestern University) Monique R. Payne (Northwestern University) and Rebecca L. Sandefur (Stanford University) with John P. Heinz (American Bar Foundation/Northwestern University) Harris Kim (University of Chicago) and Edward O. Laumann (University of Chicago): From Exclusion to Internal Stratification: Changing Patterns of Stratification By Ethnicity, Race, and Gender Among Lawyers in Chicago, 1975-1995.

Valery Yukobovich (University of Chicago): The Social Organization of a Local Russian Labor Market: New Insights from Linked Employer-Employee Data.

William Bielby and Michael Bourgois (UC Santa Barbara): Insuring Discrimination: Making a Market for Employment Practice Liability Insurance.

8. *Refereed Roundtables* (Apologies for not being able to fit in all the paper titles and authors; please refer to the program for details) :

Organizers: Kim Shauman (Committee Chair), Sean O'Riain, Dina Okamoto, Eileen Otis, Jonathan Isler.

(1) **Social Construction of Professional Work.**.
Presider: Peter Meiksins, Cleveland State University.

(2) **Constructing Careers.**
Presider Joan Manley.

(3) **Gender Inequality and Work.**
Presider: Mary Blair-Loy, Washington State University.

(4) **Intersections of Race and Gender at Work.**
Presider: Rhacel Parrenas, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

(5) **Labor Relations and Organizations.**
Presider: Leslie Salzinger, University of Chicago.

(6) **High-Tech Work.**
Presider: Beth Bechky, University of California, Davis.

(7) **Macro-Level Influences on Organizational Structure**.
Presider: Carol Caronna, University of California, Berkeley.

(8) **Negotiating Rationality in Organizations.**
Presider: Thomas D. Beamish, University of Georgia.

(9) **Organizational Response to Inequality/Diversity**.
Presider: Christine Williams, University of Texas, Austin.

(10) **Influences on Organizational Commitment.**
Presider: Jean Wallace, University of Calgary.

(11) **Structural Influences on Labor Force Participation**.
Presider: TBA.

(12) **Work Practices in Social Context.**
Presider: Andrew Perrin, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

(13) **Consequences of Economic Restructuring.**
Presider: Charles Koeber, Wichita State University.

(14) **Organizational Communication/Representation.**
Presider: TBA.

(15) **Constructing Work Rules and Regulations.**
Presider: Ryken Gratter, University of California, Davis.

Call for Papers, Chapters, Books

Call for Papers: The *American Sociological Review* invites manuscripts from members of the Section on Organizations, Occupations, and Work. *ASR*'s mission is to publish the best contemporary scholarship from all areas of sociology. Without a healthy volume of submissions on organizations, occupations, and work, this goal is seriously compromised.

We thus encourage members of the Section on Organizations, Occupations, and Work to submit their work for possible publication in *ASR*.

The *ASR*'s Deputy Editors and the members of the journal's Editorial Board for 2002 comprise the largest and most intellectually diverse editorial team in *ASR*'s history. The editorial team joins the Editors in welcoming a wide range of theoretical and methodological approaches and contributions from all substantive areas of the discipline. Also, *ASR*'s current editorial policies are highly flexible as to form and can accommodate manuscripts of various lengths and styles. (Full information about manuscript requirements is available in the August 2001 and February 2002 issues of the journal, at the *ASR* website (www.pop.psu.edu/ASR/asr.htm), or upon request to (asr@ssc.wisc.edu.)

As a result of these editorial arrangements, we hope to publish more than our fair share of the best contemporary work on organizations, occupations, and work. We therefore strongly encourage Section members to submit their manuscripts to the *American Sociological Review*.

Charles Camic and Franklin Wilson, Editors

OOW Book Notes

Cornfield, Daniel B., Karen Campbell, and Holly McCammon, editors, *Working in Restructured Workplaces: Challenges and New Directions for the Sociology of Work* **(Sage Publications, 2001).** Presents a new framework for conceiving of "workplace restructuring" and a research agenda for analyzing human consequences of and worker responses to workplace restructuring. The 24-chapter collection of new articles and reprinted *Work and Occupations* journal articles is organized into six parts: 1) Introduction; 2) Reconfiguring Workplace Status Hierarchies; 3) Casualization of Employment Relationships; 4) Restructuring and Worker Marginalization; 5) Comparative Labor Responses to Global Restructuring; and 6) Conclusion.

Cornfield, Daniel B. and Randy Hodson, *Worlds of Work: Building an International Sociology of Work* **(Kluwer/Plenum, 2002).** Each chapter highlights a given country or region and contains an appendix with contact information (emails, web addresses, and so on) for national research institutes and journals related to the sociology of work in that country. This latter aspect may be particularly useful in assisting the internationalization of the sociology of work. The book is being highlighted at the International Sociology Association World Congress meetings in Brisbane Australia this August. The web address for the book is: http://www.wkap.nl/prod/b/0-306-46605-8

Finlay, William and James E. Coverdill. *Headhunters: Matchmaking in the Labor Market.* **Cornell/ILR Press, 2002.** Headhunters—third-party agents paid a fee by companies for locating job candidates—perform a unique sales role. The product they sell is people, matching candidates with jobs and companies with candidates. Headhunters affect the professional lives of thousands of employees every day, and their work has a profound, though hidden, effect on the employment picture in the United States. William Finlay and James E. Coverdill draw on interviews with the observations of headhunters and on analysis of headhunting-training seminars, lectures, industry newsletters, and a mail survey of headhunting firms. The result is a frank and sometimes unsettling portrait of the aims, attitudes, and tactics of practitioners.

Freidson, Eliot, 2001. *Professionalism, The Third Logic.* **(University of Chicago Press, 2001).** We are all familiar with the basic logic underlying the concepts of bureaucracy and of the market. While the concept of professionalism is also familiar, its distinctive logic as a way of controlling work is not. This book analyzes professionalism as an ideal type composed of a number of interconnected economic and political institutions that are distinctly different from those of markets and hierarchies. Building on the official imputation of a special kind of knowledge and skill, divisions of labor and labor markets controlled by occupations are shown to have their own logic. Also distinctive is the way vocational training is designed both to recruit and train members and to support the creation and control of knowledge and technique. Unlike the ideologies of market and hierarchy, which exalt generalist knowledge, professionalism exalts specialized knowledge tempered by humane learning and advances some transcendent value.

Handel, Michael, editor, *The Sociology of Organizations: Classic, Contemporary, and Critical Readings* **(Sage, Summer 2002).** The book includes well-known works in the field, condensed for this anthology to permit coverage of a wide range of theoretical perspectives and substantive topics. Extensive section introductions provide context and fill in any gaps left by the readings. The book is designed so it can be used as either a supplementary reader for a course using a textbook or as a stand-alone text in which the section introductions substitute for a textbook. The table of contents can be viewed at

http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/~mhandel/. Copies will be available at the Sage booth at the ASA in August.

Leicht, Kevin T. and Mary L. Fennell, *Professional Work* **(Blackwell Publishers, 2001).**

Clifford C. Clogg, Scott R. Eliason, and Kevin T. Leicht, *Analyzing the Labor Force: Concepts, Measures and Trends* **(Plenum Publishers, 2001).**

Charles L. Harper and Kevin T. Leicht, *Exploring Social Change: America and the World* **(Prentice-Hall, 2002).**

Lounsbury, Michael and Marc J. Ventresca, editors, Social Structure and Organizations Revisited. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations* **(JAI Press/Elsevier, 2002, vol. 19, Sam Bacharach, series editor)**. This volume re-engages Stinchcombe's (1965) classic essay ""Social structure and organizations,"" with original papers that extend this tradition with empirical studies of organizations and stratification, entrepreneurship, politics, and ideas and meanings in diverse economic and institutional contexts. The volume includes an introductory essay, nine empirical chapters, and three commentary essays, as well as a postscript by Stinchcombe. The project charts an agenda for research on social structure and organization that gives a central place to culture, stratification, power and domination, and historical contingency in the idiom of Weber and the Pragmatist tradition of historical institutionalism.

Meiksins, Peter and Peter Whalley, *Putting Work In Its Place: A Quiet Revolution* **(Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002).** $25. Through interviews with 127 technical professionals from *a wide range of employment settings, Putting* Work in Its Place refutes the myth of part-time work as inevitably a mommy track or a return to traditionalism among women. Most of the professionals interviewed for this book (young and old/male and female) remain strongly committed to their jobs but wish to combine work with other activities they value just as highly. Moreover, by viewing their work arrangements as more than a short-term expedient, they are challenging prevailing views of time and helping to shape a new agenda for the future of the workplace.

Taplin, Ian and Douglas S. Fletcher, *Understanding Organizational Evolution: Its Impact on Management and Performance* **(Greenwood/Quorum Books, 2002).**

OOW Section News

Transitions:
Beth Rubin is moving from Tulane University to the Department of Management in the Bel School of Business Administration at University of North Carolina, Charlotte, effective August 2002.

Funding and Research:
Robert Perruccit and Shelley MacDermid, Purdue University, have received funding from the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation for a three-year project entitled, "Expanding Options for the Time and Timing of Work in a Continuous-Operations Environment." The research will focus on the impact of shift work on workers and their families, and the effects of enhanced participation by workers and families in the design of alternative shift schedules.

Michael Polgar, Washington University, has received two NIH grants, for "Families as Partners in Homeless Drug Abuse Service," NIDA (R03-DA14364), and "Service Transition Points: Bridges for Young Adults," NIMH (R03-MH59108).

Shostak, Art, Drexel University, is writing a 10-year follow-up of his 1991 book, *Robust Unionism: Innovations in the Labor Movement*. He would appreciate learning of ANY examples of creativity by locals or International Unions since 1998, especially if the tip includes names and e-mail addresses. Please contact shostaka@drexel.edu

---

GOT NEWS????????

Send your news, short papers or paper ideas, new publications, calls for papers, tid-bits, editorials, and so forth you think would fit OOW newsletter format to the newsletter editor or OOW's Chair !!!!!!!

Chair Elect, Jerry Jacobs, University of Pennsylvania, *jjacobs@sas.upenn.edu*

Editor-to-be, Lisa Torres (Newsletter Editor) University of California Santa Barbara, galvani2@lycos.com