Work in Progress

Newsletter of the American Sociological Association's Section on Organizations, Occupations, and Work
Webpage: http://www.northpark.edu/acad/soc/oow/

Spring 2004

OOW Officers, Council, and Staff

Section Officers:

Chair ('03-04)
Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, North Carolina State University

Chair-Elect ('04-05)
Frank Dobbin, Harvard University

Past Chair ('02-03)
Jerry Jacobs, University of Pennsylvania

Secretary/Treasurer ('01-04)
Steve Vallas, George Mason University

Council Members:

William Bridges, University of Illinois, Chicago ('02-05)

Roberto Fernandez, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Sloan School of Management ('03-06)

Heather Haveman, Columbia University, Graduate School of Business ('03-06)

Leslie McCall, Rutgers University ('01-04)

Christina Nippert-Eng, University of Illinois Chicago ('01-04)

Christine Williams, University of Texas at Austin ('02-05)

Newsletter Editorial Collective:

University of Oregon doctoral students:
Julie Cherney, Christopher Goff, Leontina Hormel, Yolanda Reyes, Joel Schoening.
Faculty advisor: Patricia A. Gwartney

Communications: 541-686-4187,
leontina@oregon.uoregon.edu

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

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

This Issue

From the Chair

Can We Finally Bring the Firm Back In?

By Donald Tomaskovic-Devey

Reflected in the section name, Organizations, Occupations and Work are three identifiable sub-groups. These are studies of organizations and their environments, studies of stratification with their origin in status attainment occupational analyses, and studies of work and the labor process. Representing almost 1,000 members, OOW is the American Sociological Association's third largest section. Our substantive diversity is a demographic strength, leading to lots of food at our annual reception and many opportunities to discuss research at section sessions and in the halls at the annual meeting.

Two new sections were recently formed in the ASA with about 50% membership overlap with OOW – Labor and Labor Movements and Economic Sociology. To some extent the formation of these sections reflects the intellectual cost of OOW's large size and diversity. On the one hand the OOW is big enough that it has something for everyone, on the other hand it is so big that it is sometimes difficult to develop and sustain innovative scientific conversations. My sense, however, is that at this moment in our intellectual history there is an opportunity for greater integration of section foci around a theoretical and methodological entity.

I am speaking of the theoretical and observational object of firms, workplaces and organizations. These are, of course, not different entities, but different labels for the same entity from the perspective of the three sub-disciplines represented in OOW section membership. The title of this essay mimics

Continued on page 2

New Newsletter Editorial Collective

With this issue, University of Oregon Sociology doctoral students claim the editorial tasks of OOW's newsletter. From Frank Steinhart's idea, we christened it *Work in Progress*. We plan to produce two or three issues each year, each containing contributions from the Editorial Collective, such as book reviews and interviews with OOW members. We welcome your contributions as well. Please send newsletter-related communication to Leontina Hormel: 541-686-4187, leontina@oregon.uoregon.edu

FROM THE CHAIR - CONTINUED

the well known 1980 essay by Jim Baron and Bill Bielby. That article was a plea to stratification researchers to acknowledge that most of the unobserved causal processes being discussed in both the status attainment framework and its upstart dual labor market challengers were actually firm level phenomena. Good jobs were to be best found in specific workplaces, rather than in reshufflings of census occupation or industry categories. Bielby and Baron's (1986) strong empirical observation was that gender segregation in employment happened across jobs in workplaces and was much more marked than national occupational aggregations suggested.

All along, the sociology of work has focused on workplaces, often through a class theoretic lens. Thus the observational units have tended to be workgroups in interaction with management. Similarly, organizational sociology has concentrated on the structure of workplaces with a focus on management and the coordination of both internal practice and environmental resources/threats. Both have tended to use case study methods and treat organizations (or relatively large chunks of organizations, or inter-organizational relationships), rather than individuals, as their observational object. These two areas have always had the firm in, and so need not bring it back. Boding well for further section integration both of these areas have begun to adopt in appropriate contexts both the quantitative methodology of the stratification area and a concern with the influence of status inequalities on work/organizational practices (e.g. Acker 1990; Kalleberg *et al* 1996; Hodson 2001: Vallas 2003).

Stratification research has a fundamentally different history. Following the rise of both the status attainment model and of survey research methodologies, its observational unit has tended to be the individual, sampled randomly from fairly large populations of individuals, often whole societies (Blau and Duncan 1967). It was this tradition that Baron and Bielby were encouraging to theorize firms as the interactional context for the production and distribution of inequality. There have been a series of changes in stratification theory and practice that suggest that field may finally be ready to embrace the charge to bring the firm back in.

First, human capital theory from economics has replaced status attainment theory as the dominant meritocratic explanation for individual labor market inequality (Becker 1975). While this approach is profoundly individualistic, it is also relational in the sense that hiring, firing, promotion, and compensation are conceptualized to happen in the employee-employer relationship. Thus, economic theory makes the firm visible in a way that status attainment theory never did.

More influential in the stratification arena has been the study of gender and to a lesser extent racial employment segregation where researchers have come to understand that occupations are merely error prone indicators of what are actually job and organizational-level processes. Early work did this in two ways. One approach was to add job level indicators of status segregation and other labor process conditions to surveys of individuals (e.g. Tomaskovic-Devey 1993). The other approach was to develop case studies of integrating occupations and workplaces (e.g. Padavic 1991). More recently, researchers have used data on all jobs in available firm level records (e.g. Petersen and Morgan 1995) or compared segregation and inequality across a subset of jobs observed through surveys of organizations (e.g. Huffman and Velasco 1997). This is not to say that analyses of occupational segregation have disappeared, there is just too little firm-level data available for the research community and the basic status attainment model is still quite firmly entrenched in the psyche of many stratification researchers for that to happen soon. Even in occupational analyses, however, we see researchers struggling to approach job level analyses by disaggregating occupations by detailed industry or geography (e.g. Cohen and Huffman 2004).

At the theoretical level, Reskin (2003) has appropriately called for increased attention to the mechanisms that produce inequality outcomes. Prominent mechanisms in the literature include the politics of workplace organization and distribution (Nelson and Bridges 2000), class relations in production (Wright 1997), social closure and exploitation across categorical boundaries (Tilly 1998), social capital (Lin 2001); othering (Schwalbe *et al* 2000), status expectations (Ridgeway 1997), and cognitive bias (Allport 1954). Every one of these sets of mechanisms is lodged in interaction, typically in an organizational or some other bounded network context.

Thus our theories, with the exception of status attainment theory, encourage us to collect data at the level of interactions, jobs, and organizations. There have been a proliferation of such studies, developing a variety of methods for observing firm and organizational-level inequality processes. While the dead weight of history endures in our profession's sunk costs in individual-level surveys, it seems to me that stratification and inequality research has made the theoretical turn, and is embarking on the observational turn, toward bringing the firm back in for good.

While I have long thought this turn was good science, it now occurs to me it may be intellectually and socially integrative for the OOW section as well.

References

Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations." *Gender and Society* 4:139-58.
Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Garden City NY: Doubleday Anchor.
Baron, James and William T. Bielby. 1980. "Bringing the firm back in: Stratification, segmentation, and the organization of work." *American Sociological Review*. 45:737-65.

Continued on page 9

OOW Members' Most Influential Books

Between January and May (2004) *Work in Progress* asked OOW members to nominate their choices for the most influential books related to the study of organizations, occupations and work. In all, 32 members participated. The entire list of nominations comprised 150 books, most of which received just one or two votes. Listed below, unranked and in reverse alphabetical order, are the 24 books that received four or more votes and thus, for this informal process, we publish as "most influential." We were surprised that certain "classics" did not make the list, e.g., C. Wright Mills' *White Collar*. For the full list of nominated books contact Leontina Hormel: 541-686-4187, leontina@oregon.uoregon.edu

Woodward, Joan, M.A. [1965] 1980. *Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Thompson, James D. 1967. *Organizations in Action: Social Science Bases of Administrative Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Selznick, Philip. 1949. *TVA and the Grass Roots: A Study in the Sociology of Formal Organization.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Scott, W. Richard. 1981. *Organizations: Rational, Natural and Open Systems*. Englewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Reskin, Barbara F. and Patricia A. Roos, with case studies by Katharine M. Donato *et al.* 1990. *Job Queues, Gender Queues: Explaining Women's Inroads into Male Occupations*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Powell, Walter W. and Paul J. DiMaggio (eds). 1991. *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis.* Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey, and Gerald R. Salancik. 1978. *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective.* New York: Harper & Row.

Perrow, Charles. 1984. *Normal Accidents: Living with High-Risk Technologies.* New York: Basic Books.

March, James G. and Herbert A. Simon. 1958. *Organizations.* New York: Wiley.

Lawrence, Paul R. and Jay W. Lorsch. [1967] 1986. *Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. [1977]1993. *Men and Women of the Corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 1983. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hannan, Michael T. and John Freeman. 1989. *Organizational Ecology.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Granovetter, Mark S. [1974] 1995. *Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers.* Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

Gouldner, Alvin Ward. 1954. *Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy.* Glencoe IL: Free Press.

Edwards, Richard. 1979. *Contested Terrain: The Transformation of the Workplace in the Twentieth Century.* New York: Basic Books.

Doeringer, Peter B. and Michael J. Piore. 1966. *Internal Labor Markets, Technological Change, and Labor Force Adjustment.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Cyert, R.M. and J.G. March. 1992 [1963]. *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Cambridge MA: Blackwell Business.

Chandler, Alfred Dupont. 1977. *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business.* Cambridge MA: Belknap Press.

Chandler, Alfred Dupont. 1962. *Strategy and Structure: Chapters in the History of the Industrial Enterprise*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Burawoy, Michael. 1979. *Manufacturing Consent: Changes in the Labor Process under Monopoly Capitalism.* Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press

Braverman, Harry. [1974] 1998. *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Bendix, Reinhard. 1956. *Work and Authority in Industry: Ideologies of Management in the Course of Industrialization.* New York: Wiley.

Abbot, Andrew Delano. 1988. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor.* Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

Next: Most Influential Articles

What **journal articles** have most influenced the study of organizations, occupations and work – for you, your students, and workplaces? *Work in Progress* solicits your nominations, which will be tabulated and reported in the fall 2004 newsletter. Send nominations to Leontina Hormel: 541-686-4187, leontina@oregon.uoregon.edu

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE EDITORIAL COLLECTIVE

Meet OOW's Officers and Council

By Julie Cherney and Yolanda Reyes

For this newsletter, we decided to acquaint the membership with OOW's current Section Officers and Council Members. Via email, we asked each one to describe how people come to fill leadership positions, clarify each position's duties, describe their vision of OOW's future, explain this section's larger contributions to sociology, and offer recent PhDs advice in their new career. We designed these questions to get a sense of OOW's organization and maintenance, as well as provide members the opportunity to get to know the people who make this ASA section possible.

Almost all of the current OOW Section Officers and Council Members (listed on page 1) responded to our inquiries. We summarize their responses in the following paragraphs.

Obtaining a Leadership Position

OOW's current leadership described five main routes to their positions, and all involve being active in the section. The five routes comprise:

1. volunteering
2. participating in section activities
3. attending section receptions
4. getting nominated by reputation in the field and personal contacts, and
5. being chosen through reputation and by personal contacts.

One respondent stated "the circulation of elite insiders is not the dominant process, if it exists at all." OOW's nominating officers stressed another goal for this section, namely to maintain a practice of diversity to ensure that "there are nominees specializing across the threes areas of work, organizations, and stratification."

Positions' Duties

For those of you interested in becoming Council Members, don't worry about overwhelming duties. The greatest time commitment coincides with the annual meetings. Of course issues arise during the year that the council members need to address, such as making "temporary alliances with other sections, whether to put the newsletter on-line, [and most importantly] where to find more money."

The Chair position, however, demands more of a time commitment. The Chair mainly appoints people to fill positions in various committees, such as the award committees. The Chair organizes and "coordinates section programs" and "notifies the whole membership about job openings or conferences." The Secretary/Treasurer's responsibilities include "the budget, minutes, organizing the reception, and handling section finances."

What rewards these hard-working officers? The "**free food**" of course!

OOW's Contributions to Sociology

Only the heart and soul of the entire discipline rests upon the study of organizations, occupations and work – or so our officers and council seem to believe. Representative comments include "the core of sociology" and "the fundamental building blocks of modern society" for which the "consequences … cannot be exaggerated."

More precisely, one council member stated "organizations are the fundamental building blocks of modern society and encompassing such divergent collectivities as social-movement organizations, government agencies, voluntary/social clubs, non-profit service providers, professional associations, schools of all stripes, and lobbying groups. In modern societies - which are overwhelmingly what sociologists study - very little happens (intentionally or unintentionally) that doesn't involve or operate through formal organizations." An officer adds "the global proliferation of organizations has consequences that cannot be exaggerated."

More mundanely but equally important, one officer said that OOW mainly contributes by creating a space to "bring together people with different interests and different insights, [and] to think about the broader theoretical implications of studies from one subfield or another."

The Future

All respondents agreed that connecting with other sections lies at the heart of OOW's future. Which sections to include, however, varies wildly.

One council member suggested OOW should "get cozier with the Communications and Information Technology Section." Another thought that "besides the 'usual suspects' (our recent and current collaborators - Sex and Gender, Economic Sociology - [there are] obvious links between OOW and Medical Sociology, Sociology of Education, and Peace, War and Social Conflict sections." Another observed the potential for "great benefits (flowing both directions) arising from links to Political Sociology and Sociology of Culture." Newer sections, such as Labor and Labor Movements and Economic Sociology, could be key to creating smaller, more focused networks to strengthen links among OOW's membership.

One Council Member saw OOW's future in the increasing the economic diversity of graduate students who attend the section meetings. The member wrote "… it would be great to have a more concerted effort in supporting the graduate students in the discipline who need financial assistance to attend our meetings."

Advice to New PhDs

For sociologists just entering their career, we summarize one OOW's leader's advice in this way: "Once you have that degree in hand and you get hired, publish your dissertation '**quickly** and **well**'. Align yourself with a strong, reputable press. Keep publishing and 'don't be seduced into a large number of projects. Focus, focus, focus!' If there is too much on your plate, projects, thus results, will move slowly. After tenure, and you hit 'the big time,' then 'it's all downhill…'."

Another officer stresses that those new in the career should stick with "the bread and butter of sociology." OOW is a dynamic field that has seen "important research over the last decade or so." Others advise new PhDs to "take risks," "think about yourself as an entrepreneur launching a new venture - your career," "push the envelope of the discipline. If you do that, you may even make some money. And even if you stay poor, you won't notice as much." In short, keep up the passion!

Finally, one officer eloquently advises that current graduate students "Seek out people whose work you admire and meet them for coffee. Write to editors, offering to review manuscripts for journals. Present papers at conferences, but always with an eye to submitting each paper for publication. Try to leave grad school with at least two peer reviewed journal articles. Learn to write without losing your own voice. Take theory seriously, for otherwise you're a technician. Read Bourdieu. Avoid crack cocaine, unsafe sex, and population ecology."

T**hank you** to our respondents for taking the time to answer our inquiries.

BOOK REVIEWS

***Framed! Labor and the Corporate Media**.* By Christopher R. Martin. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004. Pp. 272.

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

In ***Framed!*** Christopher R. Martin makes a valuable contribution to the literature concerning the mass media and the labor movement. He bases his meticulously researched book on content analysis of television and newspaper reporting on some major labor issues over the last 15 years. Specifically, Martin examines the portrayal of General Motors' whipsawing campaign and the ensuing plant closing in 1991-93; American Airlines' flight attendant strike of 1993; the Major League Baseball players' strike of 1994-95; the 1997 United Parcel Service strike; and finally, the participation of labor in the World Trade Organization protests of 2001.

Martin finds five prevailing frames used by the mass media to portray labor struggles that can be briefly summarized as: pandering to consumers, masking the production process, faith in business leaders, meritocracy, and the devaluation of collective action.

In each of his chosen cases Martin offers an historical account of the conflict interwoven with an analysis of media portrayal to demonstrate the omissions and inherent lenses that result from framing. For example, the MLB players strike was framed as "millionaires vs. billionaires" by pandering to consumer inconvenience, but this frame omitted many facts of the strike concerning salary caps, free agency, the league's antitrust exemption, and the league's desire to contract.

This process also works well to highlight some of the successes of strike organizers in getting their message out. In the case of the UPS strike, the media again attempted use the consumer inconvenience frame, but due to the many thousands of interpersonal relationships that UPS drivers had developed with their clients, much of the public remained supportive of the UPS regardless consumer inconvenience.

The book's great success, in this reviewer's opinion, is the author's connection of framing to citizenship. In all news frames, the author treats consumers exactly as that, consumers. The mass media systematically excludes from the frame any information suggesting that consumers have any interest in a labor struggle's outcome, other than the price of a loaf of bread.

In the section concerning the MLB players' strike, the author also successfully highlights the interconnections between the political economy of the mass media, MLB owners, and the reasons for the five frames' dominance. The book would have been stronger with equally robust interconnections for the other three cases. In short, Martin does an excellent job demonstrating the frames as the mass media uses them. But the reasons the mass media uses those frames remains marginal to the book's main thrust.

In sum, for anyone familiar with both framing and the labor movement, this book provides few surprises. However, this is perhaps the book's greatest strength, in the form of a splendid documentation of theoretical predictions. For any reader not familiar with the literatures concerning labor or media framing, this book can be a valuable resource. I also recommend the book for teaching undergraduate courses related to labor or the media, or for non-academics. Martin's writing is rare in that he can provide detailed information in a very clear and concise fashion, providing an informative and entertaining read, without relying on a host of fifty-cent words or disciplinary jargon.

Genders in Production: Making Workers in Mexico's Global Factories. By Leslie Salzinger. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003. Pp. 195.

Reviewer: Yolanda E. Reyes, University of Oregon
yreyes@darkwing.uoregon.edu

Do Mexico's global factories preferentially hire women into production-line positions because of stereotypes that they are inherently docile and dexterous? Or do transnational production relations construct docile and dexterous women workers?

In four transnational shop floors, Salzinger examines political economic processes that create "cheap labor." This study effectively dispels the notion that Mexico's global factories hire women into production-line positions because they are inherently docile and dexterous. Instead, Salzinger's study illustrates how transnational production relations actually construct docile and dexterous women workers.

Salzinger conducted fieldwork near the Mexican border for 18 months. During this time she worked alongside young women and men within these factories; interviewed workers, managers, job seekers, company lawyers, and industry representatives; and scrutinized the industry's newspaper and archival records through the 1990's. The result is a close examination of the processes by which factory managers control and shape global factory workers and, at the same time, how workers resist these labor control processes. Although constructed differently within each factory, Salzinger makes clear the notion of "productive femininity" in that this process produces the most effective factory worker for global production.

At core, this study argues that gender is a fundamental element of global production, but not in the way previous studies have shown. Much like the televisions and garments produced on these factories' shop floors, the transnational production line also produces the concept of gender. Throughout her analysis Salzinger effectively illustrates how the global economy produces the 'third world woman worker'.

Genders in Production contributes importantly to the study of labor processes and gender, within the framework of globalization. Salzinger succeeds in producing a well-grounded, theoretically based ethnography.

Information Society and the Workplace: Space Boundaries and Agency. Edited by Tuula Heiskanen and Jeff Hearn. New York: Routledge, 2004. Pp. 256.

Reviewer: Julie Cherney, University of Oregon
jcherney@uoregon.edu

This collection, edited by Tuula Heiskanen and Jeff Hearn, addresses the pervasive presence of knowledge that characterizes Finland's advanced and technologically saturated information society. It comprises eight original theoretical and empirical works by Finnish researchers in Psychology, Sociology, Business, Women Studies and related fields.

Hearn positions Finland's information society as greater than the sum of its parts and suggests that it is not the nightmarish embodiment of Weber's bureaucracy or Michel's iron law of oligarchy. Instead, Hearn argues that the information society should be seen as a culturally and situationally constructed phenomenon, that is created, transformed, and spread through the inner workings at workplaces and organizations.

Heiskanen's opening chapter criticizes the lack of empirical basis in scholarly discussion of information society. She states, "This book focuses on *doing* and *being* at work" (4). Each of the eight chapters addresses issues revolving around the interaction between human agency and technology.

Chapters by Tiainen, Kuusinen, and Gripenberg do not allow readers to forget that technology is not a reified construct. Tiainen discusses how information systems specialists develop and reform technology based on their views of users and their ideal of technology's role in society. Kuusinen discusses how simply creating a virtual space for communication, community and steps to develop group-centered knowledge needs to be present. Gripenberg describes how information technology commonly spreads through individuals and their innovations.

Two authors address how structural organizational changes brought about by the information society affect work environments. Both Kolehmainen and Kivimaki examine how technological changes bring about new working conditions. Kolehmainen discusses how knowledge work creates project-oriented teams, which, in turn, create new forms of control and worker relations. Kivimaki points out other ways knowledge work transforms the work environment, by focusing on "flexiwork" or telecommuting. Both mention the blurring of private and public spheres and work instability.

Contributions from Lavikka, Vehvilainen, and Korvajarvi each include a gender perspective on information society. Lavikka's study combines a gendered perspective with the effects of structural changes (i.e., team work). Her comparative research at a clothing manufacturer and an engineering plant reveals similar findings as Kolehmainen's and Kivimaki's; that is, in technologically advanced workplaces, worker control stems from the workers themselves, but work availability is unstable. Both Vehvilainen and Korvajarva look at the situated practices of women and technology, but find different outcomes.

Ultimately this book delivers what it promises. Each chapter yields terrific ethnographic work on the making of Finland's information society. Each author emphasizes each situation's context and delivers a descriptive process of how technology constructs and maintains the information society.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

New Books

Silicon Alley: The Rise and Fall of a New Media District. By Michael Indergaard. New York: Routledge, 2004. Pp. 219.

This book traces how a Lower Manhattan district that formed to develop new media products, ended up supplying the Wall Street IPO machine with stories of a "new kind of firm" and the real estate sector with images of innovation and hip-ness. It combines a robust institutional analysis with vivid portraits of edgy creative types who created new social scenes and businesses around digital technology as well as a host of financiers, executives, and business professionals who sought to become New Economy players. The book is part of a new "cultural spaces" series edited by Sharon Zukin.

Markets from Culture: Institutional Logics and Organizational Decisions in Higher Education Publishing. By Patricia H. Thornton. Stanford University Press. 2004. Pp. 240.

Institutional logics, the underlying, governing principles of a corporation, strongly influence organizational decision making. Any shift in institutional logics results in a similar shift in attention to alternative problems and solutions, and results in new determinants for executive decisions. Examining changes in institutional logics in higher education publishing, this book links cultural analysis with organizational decision making to develop a theory of attention, explaining how executives concentrate on certain market characteristics to the exclusion of others.

Analyzing both qualitative and quantitative data from the 1950s to the 1990s, the author shows how higher education publishing moved from a culture of independent domestic publishers focused on creating markets for books based on personal, relational networks to a culture of international conglomerates focused on creating markets from corporate hierarchies. This book offers broader lessons beyond publishing -- its theory is applicable to explaining institutional changes in organizational leadership, strategy, and structure occurring in all professional services industries.

Call for Papers

Research in the Sociology of Work announces a special issue on "Power, Inequality, and Workplace Participation," to be published early 2006. This volume will analyze the workplace participation's character and implications. Topics may include: the gendered and racialized processes and outcomes associated with participation programs; barriers to greater participation of people of color, white women, and working-class people; a genealogy of theories about participation over the course of industrial and postindustrial society; international, cross-cultural studies; meanings that workers attach to opportunities for involvement in the workplace in a variety of work sites; participation and consent in alternative organizations such as cooperatives and collectives, and theoretical treatments that bring new insights to the topic.

Methodologically pluralist and concerned less with specific productivity effects of worker participation, this volume will highlight its social-structural, cultural, and meta-theoretical dimensions. Submit contributions by April 29, 2005 to Vicki Smith, Department of Sociology, University of California, Davis, CA 95616. Email questions, abstracts, and proposals to Smith at vasmith@ucdavis.edu.

Special Journal Edition

The latest issue of ***Critical Sociology*** (Vol. 30, No. 1, 2004) contains a symposium on "Gender, Globalization, and Work Restructuring" with articles by Heidi Gottfried, Joan Acker, Leslie Salzinger, Cecilia Ng, and Kathryn Ward, *et al.*

Awards

Julie Kmec, Assistant Professor, Sociology, Washington State University, recently received an honorable mention from the W. E. Upjohn Institute for the Employment Research Dissertation Award. The Upjohn Institute reserves this cross-disciplinary award for employment-related dissertations, and Dr. Kmec is the first sociologist to be honored with this award. She encourages other OOW members to submit their dissertations. More information about this dissertation grant can be found at: http://www.upjohninst.org/dissert.html

Xavier Coller, professor at the Universidad de Barcelona, received Yale University's Sussman Prize at for his doctoral dissertation entitled "Fragmented Identities and Political Conflict". His dissertation also received honorable mention in the 2003 Seymour Martin Lipset Award from the Society for Comparative Research. Dr. Coller's recent book, ***Canon Sociologico***, reviews sociologists' main ideas and theories to date (including Bourdieu and Giddens). The Centro de Investigaciones Sociologicas (Center for Sociological Research), the most relevant sociological book printing in the Spanish-speaking world, soon will publish ***Organizational Analysis***, coauthored by Dr. Coller and **Roberto Garvía**.

Conference

Academy of Management's Public and Nonprofit Division 2004 Doctoral Consortium

The PNP Doctoral Consortium will take place at the Academy of Management's annual conference in New Orleans. The consortium provides great opportunities for students to discuss issues of importance to them (research, publishing, writing, career strategies, etc.) and to interact with their peers and a diverse group of preeminent faculty.

We have a strong program this year. Please share this invitation with doctoral students interested in public and nonprofit sector organizations and urge them to attend. The consortium's registration deadline is July 2, 2004. For info, contact Kirsten Grønbjerg (812 855 5971, kgronbj@indiana.edu) or Jessica Word (850 294 8815, jword@cites.fsu.edu).

MORE ANNOUNCEMENTS

Funded Research Opportunities

New National Science Foundation Funding Opportunities for Organizational Research

The NSF Innovation & Organizational Change Program is pleased to announce a new Solicitation: NSF 04-581. This is the first change in the program announcement since 1998. The highlights are:

- Two annual Full Proposal Competition Target Dates: August 15 and February 1
- Program expanded to include organization of scientific research necessary to carry out effective innovation in basic and applied research in national laboratories, multi-disciplinary university centers, and industrial research
- Methods broadened to include simulation modeling, lab studies grounded in organizational issues, organizational learning curves, and social network analysis.

The new solicitation is available on the NSF Online Document System: http://www.nsf.gov/pubsys/ods/getpub.cfm?nsf04581

John Naman, Ph.D., Program Director
Innovation and Organizational Change Program
National Science Foundation - Suite 995
Arlington VA 22230
Email: jnaman@nsf.gov

New Labor History Web Site

Opening Doors to Northwest Labor History

By Ron Renchler

Historians, sociologists, policymakers, students, educators and others needing access to research materials in Northwest labor history will no longer have to labor so hard to identify and locate critical primary documents, thanks to a new web site recently launched and hosted by the University of Oregon (UO) Libraries' Special Collections and University Archives.

The new resource, entitled *"The Labor Project: Dedicated to the Preservation of Labor and Working-Class History in the Pacific Northwest,"* (http://libweb.uoregon.edu/speccoll/exhibits/labor/) provides a portal for researchers to access the documentary history of labor in Oregon and other western states. The site combines the convenience of online searching with a carefully organized approach to research on the topic.

At the heart of the Labor Project site is a newly developed database that allows users to search the UO's Special Collections holdings related to labor and working-class history by keyword, subject, date ranges, title and related authors. Users also can browse the contents of the database in eight different labor-related topics.

Examples of archived material housed in Special Collections and referenced in the database include documents on the timber industry in the Pacific Northwest, arbitration papers from the International Longshore and Warehouse Union (ILWU) and other unions, original pamphlets from the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW), legal documents related to the trial of Sacco and Vanzetti, and extensive materials from Native American tribes in Oregon.

Special Collections staff members have identified approximately 100 collections in its holdings that are relevant to the history of labor and the working-class in the Northwest. The materials include private papers, arbitration records, corporate and organizational records, and political material. Database searches yield an extensive description of these individual holdings and their specific location within Special Collections.

Additional material will be added to the database as it is acquired and catalogued. "Labor historians have long had to spend an inordinate amount of time identifying and locating historical records like the ones housed in Special Collections," says James Fox, Special Collections and University Archives head. "We've made their work much easier by providing this online resource. It should help them access relevant records much more quickly."

Alex Morrow, a University of Oregon History graduate student who oversaw construction of the site, knows its value firsthand: "Labor historians like myself need to be able to track the existence and availability of historical records and documents from a distance," he says. "I hope this site will spawn other digital cataloging projects that will help us locate and identify the contents of important labor-history records throughout the world."

Development of the site was a collective effort by several UO units, including History, the Labor Education and Research Center and the Wayne Morse Center for Law and Politics. UO Libraries' Interactive Media Group provided web site design.

For more information on the Labor Project web site, contact Fox, 541-346-1904, <jdfox@oregon.uoregon.edu> or Morrow, 541-346-5908, <amorrow@darkwing.uoregon.edu>.

Ron Renchler is the UO Libraries communications director. Article reprinted with the permission of " Inside Oregon". http://comm.uoregon.edu/inside/

FROM THE CHAIR - CONTINUED

Becker, Gary. 1975. *Human Capital*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bielby, William T. and James N. Baron. 1986. "Men and women at work: Sex segregation and statistical discrimination." *American Journal of Sociology*. 91: 759-99.

Blau, Peter and Otis Dudley Duncan. 1967. *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Basic.

Hodson, Randy. 2001. *Dignity at Work*. Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press.

Huffman, Matt and Steven Velasco. 1997. "When more is less: Sex composition, organizations, and earnings in U.S. firms." *Work and Occupations*. 24:214-44.

Huffman, Matt and Phil Cohen. "Racial wage inequality: Job segregation and devaluation across U.S. labor markets." *American Journal of Sociology*. 109:902-36.

Kalleberg, Arne ,David Knoke, Peter Marsden, and Joe Spaeth. 1996. *Organizations in America*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

Lin, Nan. 2001. *Social Capital: A Theory of Social Structure and Action*. Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press.

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

Padavic Irene. 1991 "Attraction of male blue collar jobs for black and white women: Economic need, exposure and attitudes." *Social Science Quarterly* 72:33-49.

Petersen, Trond and Laurie Morgan, 1995. "Separate and unequal: Occupation-establishment segregation and the gender wage gap," *American Journal of Sociology* 101:329-65.

Reskin, Barbara. 2003. "Including mechanisms in our models of ascriptive inequality." *American Sociological Review*. 68:1-21.

Ridgeway, Cecilia. 1997. "Interaction and the conservation of gender inequality: Considering employment." *American Sociological Review* 47:76-88.

Schwalbe Michael, Sandra Godwin, Daphne Holden, Douglas Schrock, Shealy Thompson, and Michelle Wolkomir. 2000. "Generic processes in the reproduction of inequality: An interactionist analysis." *Social Forces*. 79: 419-52.

Tilly, Charles. 1998. *Durable Inequality*. Berkeley CA: 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.

Vallas, Steven. 2003. "Rediscovering the color line within work organizations." *Work and Occupations*. 30:379-400.

Wright, Erik O. 1997. *Class Counts*. Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press.

By popular demand, Woody Beck's classic article on interviewing for an academic job is reprinted below.

THE JOB INTERVIEW: A STUDY IN TERROR

E.M. Beck, Department of Sociology, Univ. of Georgia
(Revised February 2003. Reprinted with permission.)

So you got an interview. Terrific! This means you've zapped 50 or more other applicants. Your target school's recruitment committee has decided that you appear to be one of the best qualified for their position. Now they want to see you in person, to examine for warts, to see if you have any gross and disgusting personal habits. You're under their collective microscope, being scrutinized like a trapped bug. But don't panic just yet.

***The Competition**. In the past it was common for departments to select three candidates to interview for the same position, with an additional two being held-off stage in case the three interviewees were zombies. Because of today's tight budgets, some departments interview only two candidates, and sometimes invite the second only if the interview with the first candidate does not go well. This means that if you get an interview, there's a 50-50 chance you'll get an offer, all other things being equal. That's good news.*

It's important to realize that they're **expectin**g their good judgment to be verified in the interview. They have chosen **you**, and they're expecting a winner — give them one. I believe that most candidates come to the job interview with a score of 100, then as the interview progresses, points are deducted. After all candidates have been scrutinized, the faculty offers the job to the candidate with the *fewest negative points*. This has led me to formulate:

1. <u>The First Principle of Who's Hired</u>. The candidate about whom the faculty possesses the **least negative information** is the most likely to be hired.

Given this principle, there's a strategy for becoming the hired candidate:

1a. <u>Strategy of Active Self-Defense</u>. It is critical to minimize the opportunity to blurt out something profoundly dumb. Every minute they're answering your questions is a minute that you aren't answering their questions, thus minimizing your opportunity to gobble your foot.

We academics often have fairly elevated opinions of our abilities, and vigorously avoid any data that might invalidate these self-images. This observation has led to the Second Principle of Who's Hired:

2. <u>The Second Principle of Who's Hired</u>. Given the First Principle above, the candidate who **least threatens the self-images** of the existing faculty is the most likely to be hired.

This, in turn, leads to another interviewing tactic:

2a. <u>Strategy of Modest Competency</u>. Always act as if you have something to learn from each and every person you meet.

All departments have unfulfilled needs. The vacancy you're interviewing for is one explicit manifestation of those, but in addition to that public need, the department has many latent (implicit, unadvertised) needs. This leads to my Third Principle of Who's Hired:

3. <u>Third Principle of Who's Hired</u>. Given the First and Second principles, the candidate who best fulfills the department's **latent needs** is the most likely to be hired, all other things being equal.

The appropriate strategy during the interview is, then:

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

Keeping these three principles and their corresponding strategies in mind, let's dissect a "typical" interview. But before doing that, there are some things you should do in **preparation for the interview**.

Before the Interview
After you've been invited for an interview, ask the department chair/head (you *do* know the difference between a "chair" and a "head", don't you? If not, see below) to send copies of the faculty's *curriculum vitae* or précis, and/or a copy of the department's annual report, and outlines of both the graduate (if any) and undergraduate programs. **Study these documents carefully!** The department chair will be impressed by your professionalism. As importantly, by studying the vitae you'll know who's active and who's "deadwood", and when you're interviewing with the faculty, you'll know their specialization and academic background….they will be pleased, I guarantee.

Before leaving for the interview, jot on a 3x5 card the names of the faculty and their areas of teaching and research interest, and any other pertinent data you can glean from the vitae and/or web page. **Keep with card with you at all times…it is your trusty friend.**

Hint: *If the chair can't provide copies of the vitae or précis for whatever reason, borrow the department's copy of the ASA Membership Directory and look-up each faculty member. The Directory will tell you where the person got the Ph.D., when, and the person's specialization. This source is not as good as having the current vitae, but it's better than nothing. If you find that some of the faculty aren't listed in the Directory, you'll have some rough indication of the level of professional involvement in the department. Another source of information about schools, those with advanced degree programs, is the ASA's Guide to Graduate Departments (available in most Sociology Department offices) which publishes basic data on each department's graduate program. Check this source too. Further, almost all departments now have* ***pages on the web*** *– this is an excellent place to start your information gathering. Use you favorite web browser and search the name of the college or university, then follow the links to the sociology department. No matter how you obtain the information, do your homework!*

If you need help during your interview, excuse yourself to the privacy of a restroom to refresh your memory (you brought that 3x5 card with you) and enjoy a few seconds of badly needed "quiet" time. While there, refresh your bladder and take 4 very deep breaths – it really does help.

Thus, before leaving for the interview you should:
1. Know the name of the department head/chair, and head of the graduate program, if applicable.
2. Know whether the department is a headship or chairship.
3. Know if the department offers advanced degrees, and which ones.
4. Know the names and specializations of the faculty (on your trusty 3x5 card, of course).
5. Know what plans have been made for travel and lodging (see the section on "Odds & Ends").

A Head or Chair? *Under a headship arrangement, the university administration appoints someone as the department head to represent the interests of the administration to the faculty. Under a chairship, the department elects someone to represent their interests to the administration. Obviously, a department "head" may be significantly more powerful (even dictatorial) than a department "chair", and some "heads" may retain their positions more-or-less indefinitely, at the discretion of the university administration.*

Now, let's get to the long anticipated event, the interview itself.

A Typical Interview: The First Encounter
The typical interview will run something like this. You arrive by plane or car in the university town on, say, Sunday night. You may or may not be met by the chair of the department, or a departmental representative. (Note: if you are arriving by plane and you've never seen the person sent to meet you, try to be the *last* person off the plane…now it's easy – just look for the anxious person expectantly pacing the gate area.) If you are being met, **the interview has begun**. "Be prepared" is good advice, even if you were never a scout.

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

Interviewing with the Department Chair
After breakfast you may meet with the department chair for about an hour. This is the time to ask about the department, it's past and especially it's future. Here are some questions that you could ask the chair:
1. Where do you see the department headed in the next five years?
2. How actively does the university administration support the department?
3. What do you see as the major challenges facing the department?
4. Are undergraduate enrollments holding steady? How about sociology majors?
5. Do you foresee the department having any vacancies in the near future?
6. Where does the department recruit most of its graduate students? Their quality?
7. Where do most of your graduate students find jobs?

Here are examples of questions **not to ask**:
1. Who are the other candidates for this job?
2. What are the major factions within the department?
3. How would my salary rank with others?
4. How much "deadwood" is in the department?
5. Does your "significant other" sleep around?
6. I have a fondness for small, furry mammals – will I fit in the department?
7. Are you afraid of flying AirTrans?

You'll also discuss the courses you would be teaching.

<u>Teaching</u>. The department chair will want to know the courses you'd like to teach. What you teach is a balance between your preferences and departmental needs, so now's the time to find out how much discretion you'll have in selecting your courses, and your teaching load. But you might as well mention "Intro" along with the courses you'd really like to teach, because you'll likely teach "Intro", like it or not. If the department has an advanced degree program, show interest in the graduate courses, but **do not ignore the undergraduate program**! It's the "bread-and-butter" in most departments.

But what happens if the chair says something like this, "Could you teach Complex Organizations? We really need to have that taught next year." Now suppose your specialization is the Sociology of 14th Century Illuminated Manuscripts, and you wouldn't know a "complex organization" if you tripped over it. What do you do?

You could say that you have no competency in Complex Organizations, and wouldn't feel comfortable teaching it. That's honest although not necessarily wise. Another version of the truth could be, "As you know, Complex Organizations is not my area of specialization, but if my teaching schedule wasn't too heavy I could prepare a course in organizations." Remember the Third Principle of Who's Hired, and the concept of *Bounded Versatility*.

Besides discussing what you'll teach, always inquire about the mechanical details of teaching, for example, teaching assistance, teaching aids (videos/films), class sizes, and how textbooks are selected (by individual faculty, committees, by the department head, etc.). Now is the time to find out these things – not after you've accepted their offer and arrived on campus!

Interviewing with Individual Faculty Members
After the visit with the department chair, you'll be led through a seemingly endless parade of interviews with individual faculty members. This phase is tedious (and actually very grinding, mentally and physically) because you'll be asked the same questions repeatedly, "Tell me about your dissertation?", "What courses would you like to teach?", "What about your research plans for the future?" etc. It would be nice if you had ready answers for such questions.

> ***Rule***: *Never assume that the person you are talking with has read your curriculum vitae.*

To break the monotony, and put yourself in the very best light, punctuate each interview with **your** questions. Remember there are two reasons why you are asking questions: (a) so you won't be answering their questions, and (b) to determine whether the person will make a reasonable colleague. Here are some questions to ask the individual faculty:

1. What do you see as the major challenges facing the department? Where is the department headed?
2. Is this a good place to get your work done?
3. Are the library holdings adequate? How about the computer facilities?
4. What do you think of the undergraduate students here? The graduate students?

> ***Rule***: *Always ask each and every person some questions about the department and its programs…even if you have heard the same answers over-and-over again. Not asking about the department is invariably interpreted as a lack of serious interest on your part. This mistake could cost you the job offer. I have seen it happen.*

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

After spending the morning with your potential colleagues, you'll have to go to lunch with a small group of faculty, and perhaps some students. Don't let your guard down at these "social" events; the interview continues only the setting changes. At lunch do **not drink any alcoholic** regardless of what others do. You'll need all your wits for the afternoon's interviewing and your oral presentation.

> ***Note on Nervousness***. *Interviewing is scary, even if you've done it before, and for the first-timer, it may be paralyzing. When anxious, most of us display little behavioral weirdnesses, like twitching, profuse sweating, or going "blank". Try not to worry excessively about these things because you are expected to be nervous. It's your right! When under stress many of us tend toward one of two extremes: (a) we crawl into ourselves dreading the interaction and become fossilized, or (b) we babble incoherently, the "flapping-jaw" syndrome. Before going on the interview, try to figure out which tendency you have then concentrate on reducing that behavior. Don't over-compensate, however. That could be worse.*

The "Talk"
This is often a terrifying ordeal for the neophyte. At some point you'll have to give your "talk" to any faculty and students that can be rounded-up. This delightful custom is designed presumably to see how you think on your feet and to get some impression of what kind of teacher you'll make.

Actually it's just a degradation ceremony that we all go though, so don't get unreasonably upset about it. My experience is that the vast majority of job talks are pretty dismal. But most faculty are forgiving of all but the grossest errors…at least for assistant professors. Here are the most common mistakes that "cost" points (list unordered):

1. Being overly technical and complex…confusing and fogging the audience
2. Presenting too many graphs and tables…swamping the audience
3. Not distributing graphs and tables when they could clarify…losing the audience
4. Talking too fast…trying to tell the audience too much
5. Assuming the audience cares as much about your dissertation project as you do…not making it interesting
6. Not giving enough background…the "big picture" is missing
7. Giving too much background…never getting to the point
8. Talking too long…exhausting the audience
9. Reading a paper…boring the audience
10. Trying to "wing-it"…you'll come off as a unprepared, rambling jerk
11. Needless and repetitive "name dropping"…trying to impress without substance

Here are some suggestions that will help avoid those pitfalls:

1. Design the talk **as if** you were presenting your material to a sophomore-level sociology class (but, for god's sake, don't be sophomoric!)
2. **Use** visual aids, such as slides and/or overheads
3. Even the best of audience will retain only a very small portion of information, so choose the **one or two points** that are really important and hit those over and over again
4. **Start** and **end** the talk by telling the audience what the research is all about
5. Keep telling yourself that your technical competency is **not** on the line, but **your ability to explain is**
6. Keep it **short**…35-40 minutes, even for what's nominally called an "hour" presentation
7. **Practice, practice, practice**…(see below)

Memorize this rule:

> ***Rule***: *Keep it simple, and never inflict yourself on your audience.*

In preparation for your "talk", write a draft a couple of weeks ahead of time. For the entire week preceding the interview, read your draft several times **aloud every day** (in the privacy of your bathroom is an excellent choice). A day before the interview, drafts a set of notes to work from. Now, when you get to the interview, put the draft paper in your briefcase and **leave it there** until you return home. <u>Use only your notes</u>. Even though you've made no attempt to memorize the paper (in fact, you should **not** try to memorize it), it will be tucked away in your brain just waiting to be jogged by your notes. If time permits, give a trial presentation to some of your fellow graduate students, or anyone else who will listen. Beg for honest criticism of style and content. Do settle for the politically correct "You did a good job." They may not be very helpful, but the experience will be a confidence builder.

The most anxiety is produced out of fear of embarrassment if someone asks a question that you can't answer. Well, let's consider that possibility.

The Exception. *If you feel that you'll die if you don't have a copy of your presentation nearby, jerk it out of the briefcase and take it with you, but avoid reading it. On second thought, if you are so frightened that you can't remember your name, perhaps you should read it after all. You'll look goofy standing in front of the audience in some kind of muddled trance…that would not leave a favorable impression, I fear – although you would probably become a departmental legend… the Case of the Catatonic Candidate.*

Answering Questions. Basically there are five kinds of questions that you're likely to encounter: (1) the "Point-of-information" question, (2) the "I-want-to-show-off" question, (3) the "I've-been-asleep-but-I'd-better-say-something" question, (4) the "I'll-get-him" question – this breed is cousin to the "I-want-to-show-off" type, and (5) the "Bozo" question. In the examples below, see if you can pick-out the best answer to the question.

1. The "Point-of-information" Question — by far the most common
   Q: "I didn't understand how your sample was drawn?"
   A_1: "Where have you been, Mars?"
   A_2: "Certainly. The sample…."
2. The "I-want-to-show-off" Question — the second most common
   Q: "In my previous work, along with AAAA of Harvard, we found that…."
   A_1: "That's not a question. Why are you trying to show off?"
   A_2: "That's interesting. I'd like to hear more about your work later."

   Q: "Didn't ZZZZ do a similar piece of work a couple of years ago?"
   A_1: "Who???"
   A_2: "I'm not familiar with his work, but if you'll give me the citation, I'll look it up as soon as I get home. Thanks for mentioning it."

   Q: "XXXX has many ideas that are applicable to your research problem."
   A_1: "XXXX can't tell the difference between chocolate mousse and a cow patty"
   A_2: "Yes, XXXX does have many excellent ideas. Which ones were you thinking of?"

   Q: "Don't you think that your research would have been better if you had…."
   A_1: "If I had thought so, I would have done it, dummy."
   A_2: "You may be right. I'll have to spend some time thinking about that."

3. The "I've-been-asleep" Question
   Q: "Aren't you worried about the quality of your data?"
   A_1: "Not really. My committee has already approved the dissertation."
   A_2: "Yes, I am. We must pay more attention to questions of data quality."

4. The "I'll-get-him" Question
   Q: "How you could make *those* conclusions based on *those* data!"
   A_1: "I don't understand how you could be so criminally stupid. Is it genetic or environmental?"
   A_2: "Could you clarify your objections?"

   Q: "Isn't the problem you're working on quite trivial?"
   A_1: "My committee bought it. What's your problem?"
   A_2: "No, I don't believe that it is."

   Q: "This is the worst piece of social science research I've *ever* seen!"
   A_1: "You haven't read much, have you?"
   A_2: "Moving right along, are there any other questions?"

5. The "Bozo" Question
   Q: "Now what, again, there happens if when it does, or does not, occur the same way, or in a different way?"
   A_1: "Your question is nonsensical gibberish. Did you find your Ph.D. in the back seat of a taxi?"
   A_2: "I'm sorry, but I don't understand the question. Could you rephrase it?"

How did you do on this little test? If you answer all of them correctly, you're ready for anything!

Last word of advice. When answering questions during the presentation, it's far **better not to bluff**. Often the questioner knows, or at least thinks he knows, the answer. An honest "I don't know" or "I'll have to think about that" will do. Don't be too self-defensive.

In addition to the interview sessions with the individual members of the faculty, and giving your oral presentation, you may have to suffer two other categories of interviewers: graduate and/or undergraduate students and university administrators.

Interviewing with Students and Administrators

Students. In some departments it's a tradition that job candidates interview with graduate students, or if there's no advanced degree offered, sociology majors. These are usually rather tame affairs because students are even less likely to ask insightful questions than are the faculty. If you're squared-off with students and no one seems to know what to do next — a common situation — take the leadership role and ask **them** questions. They'll love you for it. For starters, you can always ask such intellectually probing questions as:

1. How's the training in sociology in the department?
2. How could the training be improved? (This one is always a winner.)
3. How well are graduate students funded in the department?
4. What kind of job will you be looking for after you finish your degree?
5. Do you like where the department's headed? (this can be very revealing)

These questions aren't titillating, yet they work amazingly well.

Administrators. In some schools job applicants, even for assistant professor slots, interview with administrative higher-ups, usually the Dean of Arts and Sciences (or whatever college sociology happens to be in) and the Dean of the Graduate School (if there is one), or their representatives …one of the hordes of administrative assistants that lurk in closets and dim hallways fondling memos.

The important thing to remember here is that college administrators are likely to have **no** knowledge of substantive sociology. (**Hint**: you might ask the department chair about the Dean's academic background…all information helps.) They care little about your intellectual capabilities…they leave that evaluation to the department. They want to find out if you're going to be a pain-in-the-ass. Deans like smoothly running departments that do their job and don't cause hassles. Don't be one. In other words, this is **not** the best time to float your pet theory of "Those who can't research, teach. Those who can't teach, administer."

Here are some questions for the Dean:

1. How actively does the State support higher education? (For God's sake, don't ask this question if you're interviewing in Georgia. You should know the answer.)
2. Is the university in a period of entrenchment? If so, how does this affect sociology?
3. Do you foresee any major changes in the department in the near future?

As long as you are reasonably civilized, don't drool, attack the Dean's ancestry, fall asleep, or belch excessively, the inter-view will go well…they don't like it any better than you do.

Drinks and Dinner
After spending the day interviewing and giving your presentation, you'll be exhausted yet it's not over. You'll be scheduled to have dinner with the chair or some of the faculty, afterwards there may be a small cocktail party… schools vary considerably in regard to these "social" events. There are three **key** things to keep in mind if you're forced into these kinds of situations:

1. The interviewing that goes on during these social events is just as real and consequential as the sessions during the day. But in these settings you are supposed to appear "relaxed"…so **act** relaxed and be charming.
2. **Don't drink too much**. Limit yourself to one alcoholic drink, after that fill-up with non-alcoholic beverages. One drink may help soothe the anxieties but more than one will deaden the brain and liberate the lips. Loose lips not only sink ships, they also scuttle job interviews.
3. **Don't gossip** about either the day's events, or about life at Georgia. It's just too damn easy to make a fatal error. You will be physically and mentally exhausted, and possibly somewhat loosened by alcohol…just the perfect combination to lethally impair your judgment.

During these social activities is an excellent time to ask those all-important, but nonprofession-related questions, like what's that cost-of-living, availability of local housing, the social and cultural life at the university and in town, etc.

If the chair is merciful, you'll be excused to the safety of your motel room before collapsing from nervous exhaustion. It's almost over!

The Terminal Interview
The next morning you'll have a final interview with the chair of the department. The chair will ask if you have any further questions and/or observations about the departments. Have some. If you don't, you'll appear a dullard.

The question of salary will probably be discussed here. Generally, there is little latitude to negotiate assistant professor starting salary but you might ask if the university would help with moving costs. Most don't these days but it won't hurt to ask. You can also ask about a having a reduced teaching load your first year — time to get your feet on the ground and your research program started. Many departments do this for their junior faculty, and it's an excellent sign that you're in a thoughtful department.

This is also an appropriate time to find out about such nitty-gritty (but definitely critical) details such as whether the department has travel funds for professional meetings, and what about office space and secretarial assistance? Also, don't forget to ask about personal computers. Its becoming standard to include some sort of personal computer in the offer package (DOS or Macintosh based machine, basic software, laser printer, etc.).

After the chair is finished, you'll be handed-over to an administrative secretary to fill-out the travel expense forms and take care of any other bureaucratic details. Now you are free to escape to the relative normalcy of [your university community].

The Wait
Even though it's been only 36 hours, it will seem like a week, at least. After you've left the university, you'll think of all kinds of neat questions that you should have asked but didn't. That's okay — if they are really critical, just give the chair a phone call when you get back to Athens. Otherwise, save them for the next interview.

During the terminal interview the department chair will tell you that it will be a few days (or a few weeks) before you hear anything. This means, "Don't call us, we'll call you." After you've returned to Athens, you begin one of the most difficult parts of the interviewing process…the waiting. My experience has been that when a candidate is told that he'll hear something in a week, it usually turns out to be at least a fortnight. Academic bureaucracies operate on a truly geologic time scale. Just try to be patient, and **don't call**.

Some Odds & Ends
<u>Dress</u>. You'll want to project a "professional" demeanor in every instance. Lean toward the "preppie", rather than the "punk", if in doubt. Academics, and sociologists in particular, tend to disparage the trendy. Don't wear jeans, black leather and chains, or anything that you would wear to a theme party. For males, leave your white shoes, patent belt, and red string-tie at home…the "Bible salesman" motif isn't "in" this year. On the other hand, many find the somber, corporate three-piece suit a little too much to the other extreme…unless you are interviewing in the Business School. A simple suit, or well-matched jacket-slack combo with a non-garish tie (avoid sporting miniature bulldogs) is acceptable to all.

For women, the same general rules apply. A skirt-jacket, skirt-suit, or pants-suit are appropriate in all cases. Some tailored dresses would be suitable also. In any regard, keep the colors business-like. (I have less to say on this topic because most women seem to do a better job of projecting the "professional" image than do some men.)

<u>Travel and Lodging Costs</u>. Most places expect the job candidate to pay for travel, lodging and food, then submit a travel expense form for reimbursement after the interview. This can add to a formidable stack of shekels and take several weeks, so be prepared. If in doubt about the arrangements, do not fear to ask the department chair; they understand how tight funds can be for a graduate student.

<u>Very Last advice</u>. Periodically we invite candidates to interview for vacancies in our department. Each time an applicant visits UGA, graduates are invited to interview the candidate and attend the oral presentation. I'm forever amazed that so few students take this opportunity. You should **always attend** these affairs, even if you're a first-year student because they provide a role model — good or otherwise. Watch and listen to the candidate. What did she/he do that impressed you? Turned you off? Talk to the faculty later and get their reactions. Use these experiences to learn from the candidate's mistakes…at your first job interview, you'll wish you had.

So You Got an Offer
Terrific! Do you want to buy my lunch?

So You Didn't Get an Offer
Being rejected is always painful, so you have every right to feed discouraged and hurt. But it's important to know that a multitude of factors enter into faculty decisions on hiring, and not getting the offer is not necessarily a reflection on your self-worth or your promise as a professional sociologist, although it will certainly feel that way.

I've seen excellent candidates rejected by the faculty (at the Universities of Georgia, Michigan, and Colorado) on the basis of very small, seemingly insignificant, differences among candidates. Also, sometimes political considerations or personal rivalries within the department have sway. After you get over the disappointment, try to make a **realistic** assessment of your performance in the interview, then work on your weakest points so you'll be ready for the next interview.

Preview of OOW Sessions and Roundtables at the 2004 American Sociological Association Meetings, San Francisco.
See the program for times and places.

Regular Sessions:
1. Educational Work and Educational Organizations. (Joint session with the Sociology of Education)
Organizer and Discussant -- Richard Ingersoll, University of Pennsylvania
Presider: Thomas Smith, Vanderbilt University.

2. Employment Relations in Flux
Organizer: Vicki Smith, University of California, Davis.

3. Organizational and Occupational Change Processes
Organizer and Presider: Jim Baron, Stanford University

4. The Impact of Economic Change on Organizations, Occupations, or Work (co-sponsored with Economic Sociology)
Organizer and Presider: Arne L. Kalleberg

OOW Roundtables
1. Work and Family
Presider: Judith Hennessy

2. Sex Composition and Pay Differentials
Presider: Julie Kmec

3. Gender and Race/Ethnic Workplace Inequality
Presider: Jame Elliott

4. Occupations and Professions
Presider: Corinne Post

5. Gender and Work I Presider: Sharon Bird
Vicki Dryfhout-Ferguson & Sarah Beth Estes Job Leaving Among Post-

6. Gender and Work II
Presider: Nancy DiTomaso

7. Markets, Occupations and Workplace Inequality
Presider: Michelle Robertson

8. Workplace Inequality
Presider: Melinda Kane

9. Occupational Segregation and Integration
Presider: Anne Lincoln

10. The New Employment Relationship I
Presider: George Wilson

11. The New Employment Relationship II
Presider: Kim Weeden

12. Non-standard Employment
Presider: William Danaher

13. Organizational Culture and Politics
Presider: Catherine Zimmer

14. Organizational Performance and Productivity
Presider: Debra McBrier

15. Worker Satisfaction
Presider: Kenneth Hudson

16. Status Attainment and mobility
Presider: Mikaela Dufer

17. Workers and Class Relations
Presider: Vicki Smith

18. Labor Relations in Organizations
Presider: Joan Meyers

19. Employment Relations in Organizations
Presider: Rachel Cohen

20. Organizations and Institutional change
Presider: Beth Rubin

21. Organizational Structures
Presider: Krista Paulsen

22. Organizations
Presider: Michael Sauder

23. Networks and Social Capital
Presider: Denise Scott

24. Consequences of Job Loss and Unemployment
Presider: Matthew Ervin

25. Economic Transition and Reform
Presider: Sheryl Skaggs