

ACCOUNTS VOLUME 11, ISSUE 3

JULY 2012

GREETINGS FROM THE SECTION CHAIR

This is the last newsletter that we will produce at Stanford. We are pleased to pass the baton to incoming chair Vicki Smith at UC Davis, but I will miss the pizza and beer dinners with members of the Editorial Collective. Our issue is chock full of great features and important news. The section has been approached by a publisher about considering a new journal in economic sociology. Andrew Isaacson has done us a great service by looking at different models of journals, talking to experts, and sketching some thoughts about what a journal might look like should the section decide to move forward. Feedback is welcomed on this essay; the section officers will continue the discussion

about the idea of an economic sociology journal at the Denver meetings.

I am pleased to announce the winners of the section's key awards, the Burt, Granovetter and Zelizer Prizes for best student paper, best published paper, and best book, respectively. I want to thank the committees for each of the prizes for their hard work, and I would like to congratulate the prize winners. This issue features two interviews with social scientists whose acclaimed work has been in the news of late, providing us with an opportunity to consider how social science and public discourse and practice intersect. Finally, we tried to do something a little different with the



roundtable presentations at the annual meetings this year. Kaisa Snellman and Matt Vidal have organized a thematically coherent set of papers and arranged discussants for the roundtables. These will be held on Friday, August 17th and segue into the section business meeting, followed by the section reception. We highlight them in order to urge you to attend both events.

- Woody Powell, Stanford University

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

GREETINGS FROM THE SECTION CHAIR, BY WOODY POWELL, STANFORD UNIV.	1
STARTING A NEW JOURNAL UNDER CONTEMPORARY CONDITIONS, BY ANDREW ISAACSON, STANFORD UNIV.	1
TRANSFORMING WORK: CREATING A MARKET FOR TEMPORARY WORKERS, AN INTERVIEW WITH VICKI SMITH, BY DINA BISCOTTI, UCDAVIS	4
2012 BURT PRIZE, BY TIM BARTLEY, INDIANA UNIV.	6
2012 GRANOVETTER AWARD ANNOUNCEMENT, BY GRETA KRIPPNER, UNIV. OF MICHIGAN	6
2012 VIVIANA ZELIZER AWARD, BY MONICA PRASAD, NORTHWESTERN UNIV.	7
RELATING RESEARCH AND POLICY: INTERVIEW WITH FRANK DOBBIN, BY MOLLY M. KING, STANFORD UNIV.	7
DISCUSSION WITH ROBERT D. PUTNAM ABOUT RELIGION, POLITICS, AND SOCIAL INEQUALITY, BY KAISA SNELLMAN, HARVARD UNIV.	9
REVIEW OF PHILIPPE STEINER'S DURKHEIM AND THE BIRTH OF ECONOMIC SOCIOLOGY. BY JARED L. PEIFER, RICE UNIV.	11
ECONOMIC SOCIOLOGY ROUNDTABLES, AT ASA MEETINGS	13

STARTING A NEW JOURNAL UNDER CONTEMPORARY CONDITIONS

By Andrew Isaacson, Stanford University

If an academic community were to found a journal today, how would it look? At last year's economic sociology section meeting, a publisher showed interest in spearheading a new journal. Some section members were very enthusiastic, so much so

that there was talk of seeking proposals from multiple publishers. However, others worried that section dues would need to be raised to support a journal. There was also concern that a new economic sociology journal

would create competition with the younger *Socio-Economic Review*, which has begun to attract submissions from economic sociologists. And some questioned whether the older model of an editor-

New Journal, continued on page 2

New Journal, continued from page 1

run, print journal was still appropriate for the digital era.

With these issues in mind, I talked with John Willinsky, founder of the [Public Knowledge Project](#) and a leader in the Open Access movement for academic publications, and Michael Macy, a sociologist who publishes in both *Science* and top-tier sociology journals. The interviews covered many more issues than discussed below. For example, Willinsky asserted that the success of a new journal often depends on the prestige of the editorial board and submissions of initial articles from high status authors. Although this is relevant, it was probably just as valid in 1970 as it is today. In this article I focus on four areas of tension and change in academic publishing that emerged during my discussions with Willinsky and Macy – issues that might inform how a new journal would be founded in the contemporary publishing environment. The idea of a new journal will be discussed again at the section meeting in August, and we hope this article opens the door for some initial feedback on this process.

Online vs. print

Should a new journal issue a print edition or publish exclusively online? Both Macy and Willinsky preferred a completely electronic publication model. Macy focused on the cost and outdated feeling of print. He said,

“I think if I were starting a journal today, I would not want to ignore the opportunity to leverage the ability of academics to access articles via the Web. It's not only very expensive to have paper journals, but more importantly, online publication facilitates both access and searchability of the content.”

Willinsky focused on the cost of printing a first issue, and explained why a print journal lacks comparative advantages in distribution:

“There was a "volume one, number one"-itis phenomenon that existed in print... You had to have serious money to get to

that volume one, number one out the door and sustain that. You had to do a print run, you had to do mailings, you had to do promotions to libraries, you had to give away your first copies, all of those things. So this "volume one, number one" – where a journal failed after the first issue.. But we [the Public Knowledge Project] have lowered the barrier to success and sustainability. Now you have to have no money to start a journal. You have to pay no printers in advance, which can be part of the debt factor. And you don't have to do as much promotion, because Google Scholar picks up your journal and you are out there.”

Per-article vs. per-issue publication

Surely academic publishing moves slower than popular music, but editors have traditionally aggregated individual articles into issues much like music artists grouped individual songs into albums. And just as iTunes has made the album format nearly extinct by enabling single song downloads, online publishing and Google Scholar could help shift the focus of journals from issues to single articles. Willinsky talked about an extreme version of the per-article publication model, the mega-journal PLoS ONE, a science and medicine journal that is on pace to publish 14,000 articles this year. The editorial model at PLoS is unorthodox: peers review each article to determine if it is competent work, but does not make a judgment about the significance of the article for the field; if an article passes review, it goes through the typical proofing, copyediting, and layout procedures; the article is published online; and the author pays a \$1350 publication fee (but rejections are free).¹ The PLoS ONE website also offers article-level statistics such as page views, PDF downloads, citations counts, mentions on social media such as Facebook and the free bibliography software Mendeley, and blog post references. They also allow users to comment on each article (example: [Callaham and Tercier, 2007](#)).

In a per-article publication model, each article is available online the second the page-proofs are approved, which allows authors to circulate their work quickly, but it also changes the way editors make decisions. As long as the journal can cover the costs related to article publication, such as copyediting, proofing, and layout, an editor can publish every approved manuscript, be it 5 or 50 articles a year. The editor no longer has to choose a certain number of articles to appear in the next issue, which traditionally is an important editorial task. Willinsky summarized the differences in the editorial process by comparing a hypothetical ten-article issue to PLoS ONE:

“We [10-article issue editorial board] have lots of articles approved but we can only put in ten, and we have to get it out this month. Let's really sit down and decide which are the ten best. PLoS ONE isn't doing that. We have got ten articles approved; they are out today. That's the idea of continuously publishing.”

Continuous publishing has recently spilled over into the social sciences. In April of 2011, SAGE Publications started a PLoS ONE-style journal for the social sciences and the humanities called SAGE Open. The article publication fee is \$395, but it will eventually increase to \$695.

Open access vs. fee-based readership

PLoS ONE and SAGE Open are open access journals, which means that no party has to pay a fee to view articles. It's free to libraries, researchers, and the general public. Most journals in sociology are not free; libraries or individuals pay a fee to access articles. If a journal is open-access, it forgoes revenues from subscriptions, but open access offers a distribution advantage for authors. Open access articles do not necessarily increase readership at major research universities that have libraries

with large journal subscription budgets, but readership should increase among researchers at universities with smaller subscription budgets, the general public, policy analysts, and researchers in developing countries.²

If a journal is open access, it will probably not receive the full support of a commercial publisher. Commercial publishers do support open access journals, but they charge a fee similar to PLoS ONE. Open access journals run by Wiley-Blackwell charge a \$1200 publication fee and Taylor-Francis charges \$1450. And commercial publishers usually provide staff to help with tasks like managing the review process and editing approved manuscripts. Most likely, going open-access means the editor and managing editor must develop a system and a revenue stream to ensure that articles receive an appropriate level of proofing, copyediting, and layout.

How much money does a journal need to publish an article? PLoS ONE's \$1350 publication fee seems astronomically larger than the review fee for *American Sociological Review* (\$25) or *Social Forces* (\$50). Most open access journals operate at cost-per-article somewhere between these values. Willinsky conducted a survey of open access journals in 2009 and found that the cost of publishing an article varies widely among open access journals, but the average cost was about \$198 per article.³ Volunteers were also common among open access journals. As Willinsky put it, "There were always low-cost journals that could find free copyeditors, free proofreading, free layout editors because of the commitment of everyone involved to see the work published. That is not ideal, obviously, but it does speak to the sense that there are no fixed costs, no proper price." For example, the journal *Postcolonial Text* has run on a zero dollar budget since its inception in 2004, except it paid an artist \$25 for one of its covers.⁴

The speed of peer-review

The typical peer-review process in sociology is a double-blind, wherein the identities of the reviewers and authors are hidden to one another. How might the review process differ if it were single-blind or crowdsourced? Both Macy and Willinsky were interested in alternative models of peer review, but in the context of starting a new journal, speeding up the review process seemed more salient than choosing a particular form.

Macy focused on how difficult it is for a journal to decrease the review time. He described an analogy contrasting the review process at *Science/PNAS* with the typical review process in the social sciences:

"Imagine that there are these two groups whose meetings you go to. And one of the groups, group A, you know by reputation and by experience that their meetings always start exactly on time, and if you are even one minute late, you are going to miss something important. And in the other group, people wander in 15 to 20 minutes late, and it's always a half hour before anything gets done. Which one of those two groups are you going to go to on time? And so then it is a self-reinforcing dynamic. The norm for journals like *Science* and *PNAS* is to turn in your review within a few weeks. The norm for most social science journals is measured in months, not weeks. So reviewers do not feel the same pressure to submit quickly, and that is a very serious problem. It can take a year or more for a paper to get published, which can be a serious problem in areas where research is moving forward very fast."

The norm of a slow review process suggests that the traditional journal review process in sociology slows down an author's career development. The longer a paper lurks in review, the less time a paper has to accrue citations, which is especially important

for non-tenured faculty. Willinsky emphasized this point and suggested an alternative review system based on the PLoS ONE model:

"In biomedicine, it was relatively easy to convince people that delayed reviews are hurting the progress of knowledge. And if you want to participate in this journal, we have a week, not a month, not three month turnaround. We have a week expectation. If you can't do it, let us know. So if you are starting a new journal in sociology, you might say that one of the features of this journal is we are not going to delay anybody's career. We are not going to impede anyone's progress. We are going to be careful about how many reviews we assign, but we are going to have different expectations about the turnaround. We want you to spend the same time on the review. Actually, we want you to spend less time on the review because you don't have to decide if this is one of the ten-best articles you have read this year. All you have to decide is whether this has been competently conducted, whether there are any mistakes, or improper uses of methods, and we're good to go. "

Conclusion

If a new journal were to be launched, it seems worthwhile to think carefully about the current publishing environment and consider the potential of alternative models. I highlighted only four of the issues that emerged from my interviews with John Willinsky and Michael Macy: (1) publishing a print edition or exclusively online, (2) bundling articles into issues or publishing articles as singles, (3) adopting an open-access or a fee-based distribution model, and (4) reducing the turnaround time in the peer-review process. These issues are but a few of the many topics that have developed in academic publishing over the last decade or so. With so many recent innovations, it's an exciting time to contemplate the forms that a new journal could take.

Notes

1 Members of some institutions receive a discount. Authors may apply for a fee waiver.

2 Some fee-based journals make articles free to researchers in the developing world through programs like Hinari.

3 Edgar, Brian D, and John Willinsky. 2010. "A survey of scholarly journals using Open Journal Systems." *Scholarly and Research Communication* 1 (2):020105.

4 Willinsky, John, and Ranjini Mendis. 2007. "Open access on a zero budget: a case study of Postcolonial Text." *Information Research* 12(3).

TRANSFORMING WORK: CREATING A MARKET FOR TEMPORARY WORKERS

An Interview with Vicki Smith, By Dina Biscotti, UC Davis



Vicki Smith, Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Davis, is the incoming chair of the ASA's Economic Sociology section. For over 25 years, Professor Smith has examined the changing nature of work in organizations. She discusses the rise of the temporary help service industry and shares some of her thoughts on the intersections between economic sociology and the sociology of work.

Dina Biscotti: Your recent book, *The Good Temp*, with Esther B. Neuwirth, provides a fascinating account of a powerful industry that has played a major, if often overlooked, role in transforming employment relations in the United States: the temporary help service industry. Some might say that temporary employment agencies simply fill a market need for short-term workers—but your book shows how this industry actually constructed a market for its “product.”

Vicki Smith: The widespread view was that demand from private industry drove the rise of this type of employment. Estee's field work, and later my archival research looked at how the temporary help service industry created demand for its product. We found a lengthy historical record of temp industry leaders making a concerted pitch for the temporary employee. They did this in several ways. They attacked permanent workers and the concept of permanent employment, making the case that permanent employees were a liability - not just in terms of cost, but also in terms of workers' attitudes and performance. They argued that permanent workers become complacent, that they have more unproductive down time—their logic was that when you work forty hours a week, your ability to productively use all that time inevitably diminishes. In contrast, they claimed that an employee who comes in for just a few weeks or works on a less than full-time basis can really concentrate their efforts and be more productive.

Over and over, industry leaders made this very broad argument about the benefits of using people on a temporary basis, and the benefits of a new employment relationship. It's interesting to look at the record - you have leaders like Elmer Winter, the cofounder of Manpower, writing articles for *Business Week* and *Forbes* and making speeches in many different venues about this kind of employment. Historically it was very new for this type of employment to be promoted on such a wide scale. There have always been forms of temporary labor throughout the history of industrial capitalism, but after World War II you

really see this national effort to malign permanent workers and tout the virtues of temporary workers.

DB: And this went beyond just ads and articles and other forms of marketing?

VS: It was a multi-faceted effort to shift the concept of the employment relationship over time. The industry was also engaged in the courts to create this new employment relationship. You can observe high levels of industry activism in the courts to change the nature of the employment relationship, so that temporary employees would be employees of the temp agencies and not of the firms that they worked for. George Gonos has done the most definitive work on the industry's legal activism. Cynthia Ofstead published an important study of the industry in Wisconsin, showing how agency staff in that state actively went out to businesses and met with owners and managers to talk with them personally about using temporary employees. As entrepreneurial actors they aggressively marketed their product to people who were going to make the hiring decisions. Industry leaders constructed a market, they constructed demand for their product, and they were also busily constructing the product itself - the workers.

That's what a lot of *The Good Temp* is about - looking at how an agency actively worked on people to ready for them for temporary jobs. So they're really working at several different levels, polishing the supply of labor in addition to actively creating demand. The study of the temp agency in the Silicon Valley (featured in *The Good Temp*) found that agency leaders did exactly that kind of thing - they would go out and visit employers and visit human resources personnel, they would go to career conferences or career fairs where lots of different employers come and literally thousands of people show up to talk to those who hire. Across all those

efforts you have the rise of a historically unique product as well as a market for it. This is one of the most major changes in employment relations in the last 40 years and it has continued to spread across so many areas of work.

DB: In their recent book, *Identity Economics: How Our Identities Shape Our Work, Wages, and Well-being*, Nobel Prize-winning economist George Akerlof and his colleague Rachel Kranton drew from your ethnographic fieldwork to illustrate how identity shapes economic action. Specifically, they claim that standard economic models devote insufficient attention to how worker identification with their job or organization can affect work performance. They advise managers to move beyond monetary incentives and focus on worker identification with the firm—your thoughts?

VS: Regrettably, Akerlof and Kranton's argument, while laudable and promising, is antithetical to trends today where so many firms are doing everything they can to discourage a feeling of attachment to the firm and identification with the firm. Companies on the one hand invest time and money to get their employees to identify more and take the corporate mission seriously, to encourage workers to put themselves in management's shoes so they can see the bigger business agenda, but at the same time they routinely lay people off, contract non-core functions out, bring in temporary and contract workers; it's very difficult to build worker identification and attachment under those conditions. The point they make in the book is good, however: you can't ignore the subjectivities of people in their jobs.

One thing we emphasize in *The Good Temp* is that you have to look at people's personal biographies and occupational histories to understand why they embrace certain kinds of jobs. The case of temporary work raises a major sociological question: Why do we find committed temps? You would think that temporary employment is pretty degraded and that there's not a lot in it

for the worker, but a lot depends on what the individual is bringing with him or her to the job—their personal work biographies. For many of the temps I interviewed at CompTech (discussed in *Crossing the Great Divide*), a temporary job at CompTech was the best job they'd ever had. These workers had worked at Burger King; they had worked in home health care. They felt respected at CT; the whole management style at CT was generally constructive and respectful.

This was also the case with the Reproco workers described in *Crossing the Great Divide*. Those copy workers were not particularly skilled and often were subjected to insults like in the case of Shirley. (Akerlof and Kranton's work features Shirley, an African-American Reproco copy worker insulted by a high-powered white male lawyer in a law firm). There was a lot of fluctuation in their employment because they might be at a law firm for two months and then at an architecture firm for six months. They experienced organizational and temporal unpredictability. But many of these folks had come to these jobs from less desirable jobs. Many were people of color, many were entry-level, most of them didn't have college degrees, and the job at Reproco was a comparatively good job. At the time, it was actually pretty secure and they had a regular salary and they had benefits. Given how tenuous and unpromising their labor market position had been before, they were committed to making those jobs work out.

DB: Both you and Nina Bandelj, the new Chair-Elect of our Economic Sociology section, have served as editor of *Research in the Sociology of Work*; your respective volumes are on worker participation and the economic sociology of work. In her introduction, Nina cites an article by Tom Beamish and Nicole Biggart that calls for greater integration of economic sociology and the sociology of work. Indeed, your work on how temporary employment shifted from a marginal to a mainstream labor practice

helps advance our understanding of the structural and cultural embeddedness of work. What do you see as particularly critical or promising areas for investigation at the intersection of these two subfields?

VS: My view is that a lot of research being done under the rubric of sociology of work is implicitly economic sociology in its framing and in its substantive focus. It's interesting that there's not much explicit conjoining of these areas, yet theorizing work and employment using the framework of economic sociology would be very fruitful. In some ways I just see the subfields as so separate, as currently constituted; I don't really see a lot of economic sociologists explicitly taking on work or sociologists of work explicitly engaging with the theoretical frame of economic sociology. It's a peculiar silence because many studies of work look at the social side of economic processes and many studies of economic and market institutions acknowledge the importance of actors' interests and subjectivities. One reading of the divide between the subfields is that economic sociologists tend to operate at a fairly high level of theory building and refinement while sociologists of work are more concerned, comparatively, with the policy implications of their findings.

DB: What are some of your goals as incoming chair of the Economic Sociology section?

VS: Maintaining and increasing membership are both important. I suspect that we have two untapped member markets: many graduate students and many faculty who belong to other sections whose work is greatly aligned with economic sociology (organizations, occupations and work; environmental sociology; gender; education; science, technology and society; and more). I have some ideas for featured newsletter articles. For the first newsletter, which will come out in the winter of next year, I hope to have an article with economic sociologists' perspectives on the presidential election.

References

Akerlof, George A., and Rachel E. Kranton. 2010. *Identity Economics: How Our Identities Shape Our Work, Wages, and Well-being*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bandelj, Nina. 2009. "Toward an Economic Sociology of Work." *Research in the Sociology of Work: Economic Sociology of Work*. Vol. 18: 1-20.

Beamish, Thomas, and Nicole Woolsey Biggart. 2006. "Economic Worlds of Work: Uniting Economic Sociology with the Sociology of Work." In *Social Theory at Work*. Marek Korczynski, Randy Hodson, and Paul Edwards (eds.). New York and Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Gonos, George. 1997. "The Contest Over 'Employer' Status in the Postwar United States: The Case of Temporary Help Firms." *Law & Society Review* 31:81-110.

Gonos, George. 2000-2001. "Never a Fee! The Miracle of the Postmodern Temporary Help and Staffing Agency." *Working USA* 4:9-36.

Ofstead, Cynthia. 1999. "Temporary Help Firms as Entrepreneurial Actors." *Sociological Forum* 14:273-294.

Smith, Vicki. 2006. *Research in the Sociology of Work: Worker Participation, Practices and Possibilities*. Vol. 16.

Smith, Vicki. 2001. *Crossing the Great Divide: Worker Risk and Opportunity in the New Economy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University/ILR Press.

Smith, Vicki and Esther B. Neuwirth. 2008. *The Good Temp*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University/ILR Press.

Dina Biscotti is a postdoctoral scholar at the Energy Efficiency Center and a lecturer in the Department of Sociology at the University of California, Davis.

2012 Burt Prize

By Tim Bartley, Indiana University

The 2012 Ronald S. Burt Graduate Student

Paper Award committee (Tim Bartley, chair, Leslie Salzinger, and Christopher Yenkey) has reached a decision.

The award goes to Adam Goldstein's paper, "Revenge of the Managers: Labor Cost-Cutting and the Paradoxical Resurgence of Managerialism in the Shareholder Value Era, 1984 to 2001." This paper mobilizes industry-level data to investigate how a period in which managers were supposedly under attack saw aggregate increases in managerial employment and compensation.

Goldstein considers the possibility that the attack on managers was counteracted by growth in industries like finance with high levels of managerial employment and compensation, as well as the possibility that anti-managerial discourse was simply decoupled from actual employment practices. But his evidence supports a third possibility: In many industries, practices designed to increase shareholder value required greater managerial intensity to control an increasingly squeezed and deskilled labor force and to oversee externalized activities, like international sourcing. This account, inspired by neo-Marxist political economy, is consistent with Goldstein's finding that industries with greater implementation of shareholder value strategies have tended to see increases in managerial employment and compensation. The committee found the paper to be extremely well-crafted and well-executed. In our view, it represents the promise of economic sociology to combine theoretical sophistication and careful empirical analysis to speak to issues that are pressing not only for scholars but also broader publics.

It is worth adding that nearly all of this year's submissions were quite strong in linking economic sociology to vital public issues, including race and the subprime mortgage market, contingent work, end of life healthcare, financial mismanagement, media and the public sphere in China, fair trade, upward redistribution through lotteries, and a variety of other issues. Overall, the

committee enjoyed reading and discussing the many excellent papers that were nominated.

The committee awards an honorable mention to Tod Van Gunten's paper, "Cohesion, Consensus and Conflict in Bureaucratic State Elites." This paper examines neoliberal policy elites in Mexico and Argentina, combining an impressive grasp of the cases with some tools drawn from network analysis to explain why elites responded differently to fiscal crises. The committee saw this paper as making important and provocative contributions to literatures on neoliberalism and the shape of bureaucratic elites.

2012 Granovetter Award Announcement

By Greta Krippner, University of Michigan

The Granovetter Award Committee is pleased to announce that Donald MacKenzie's article, "The Credit Crisis as a Problem in the Sociology of Knowledge," published in the *American Journal of Sociology*, is the inaugural winner of the Granovetter Award for the Best Article in Economic Sociology. In the paper, MacKenzie applies insights from the sociology of knowledge to the recent credit crisis, arguing that patterned differences in evaluation practices lie at the center of the recent financial calamity in U.S. mortgage markets. The Committee was impressed with MacKenzie's mastery of the complex workings of credit markets, and his ability to construct a compelling sociological narrative in order to explicate otherwise elusive aspects of the crisis. More generally, the Committee felt that MacKenzie's effort to use the tools of economic sociology to address one of the most pressing issues of our time is exemplary and offers a model for what economic sociology can and should be.

The Committee would also like to

recognize Jason Davis and Kathleen Eisenhardt's paper, "Rotating Leadership and Collaborative Innovation: Recombination Processes in Symbiotic Relationships," published in the *Administrative Science Quarterly*, with an Honorable Mention. The paper has the virtue of asking a simple, yet important question: Why do some collaborations between firms produce innovations while others do not? The paper develops a convincing – and original – answer to this question through exhaustive qualitative research examining eight technology collaborations. While much research on interorganizational innovation has emphasized structural conditions, Davis and Eisenhardt use their rich data to explore the *process* of collaboration, suggesting that a rotating leadership structure has significant advantages over other organizational forms in fostering innovative outcomes. The Committee appreciated the importance of these findings, the clarity of the writing, and the high quality of the research represented in this paper.

On behalf of the Granovetter Award Committee, congratulations to the authors of these outstanding papers!

Greta Krippner
Cheris Shun-ching Chan
Delia Baldassarri
Balazs Vedres

2012 Viviana Zelizer Award

By Monica Prasad, Northwestern

The Viviana Zelizer committee is delighted to present the 2012 award for best book in economic sociology to Greta Krippner's *Capitalizing on Crisis*. This extraordinary book revitalizes historical approaches to economic sociology by dissecting the underpinnings of the rise of finance in the American economy. Krippner argues that the rise of finance allowed policymakers to evade difficult distributional decisions in the wake of the economic crisis of the 1970s, and suggests that the collapse of finance will bring those

difficult decisions once again to the fore. The book offers a fundamental exploration of questions that have received only surface analysis in the public sphere. The committee was impressed by Krippner's ability to resist mechanistic explanations, by the depth of her research, and by her strong command of detail in service of a compelling overarching narrative. A serious and careful analysis of a centrally important problem, Krippner's book is economic sociology at its best, and it shows how economic sociology can contribute to the central debates of our time.

The members of the committee commented: "As someone who has been thinking about this stuff for a long time, this is the first book that has given me a really good causal story of how an entire economy came to be judged by a small set of measures and how from macro to micro, finance became all." "This is an exemplary piece of work: a serious and careful analysis of a centrally important problem...It will clearly be very influential." "Persuasive and well written...the relevance for understanding the most pressing issues of our time is obvious." "I understand the American economy much better for having read this book...brings so many different theoretical schools together...Her ability to do this is simply astonishing."

Monica Prasad
Nina Bandelj
Miguel Centeno
Kieran Healy

Relating Research and Policy: Interview with Frank Dobbin

By Molly M. King, Stanford University

Frank Dobbin is a Professor of Sociology at Harvard University. He studies inequality, organizations, economic behavior, and public policy. His most recent book, *Inventing Equal Opportunity* (Princeton University Press, 2009), describes how personnel managers defined the meaning of discrimination in corporations through the development of bureaucracy, diversity management, harassment policies, work-family programs, and equal opportunity programs.

MMK: How have your interview subjects or professional organizations of personnel managers reacted to your findings about which diversity policies work and which do not? Do you get a lot of push back?

FD: We published a paper in 2006 that pointed to some of the things that are effective at promoting diversity, like diversity task forces, and having a full-time diversity manager. Mentoring is pretty effective. But it also discussed some of the things that don't work very well, such as diversity training and diversity performance evaluations. The consultants had been pushing those things very hard for a while. Firms usually put everybody, or at least all the managers, through it once a year for half a day or so. So, those findings got picked up by the press. There was an article in *Time* and the *Washington Post*, and I was on *CNN*.

I've gotten a fair amount of pushback after that. I speak fairly often to usually groups of companies, and I get invited to speak at diversity conferences. What I find is that managers push back less - that is, diversity managers and HR managers - than the consultants do. I think the consultants view this as a direct threat, this finding [that performance evaluation rubrics and diversity training are not effective]. Diversity managers within firms seem to be more open to trying to figure out what's working and what's not. As they say, I don't really have a dog in this fight, that is, I entered this without much interest in what worked or what didn't work, I just wanted to know what worked.

MMK: What do you see as the benefits and challenges of taking your science 'on the road'?

FD: I find it's often very rewarding to talk to managers and diversity managers because people will say, 'it is my experience that people react negatively to diversity training and I feel that I have to do it because all the other companies do it, especially in

the fortune 500 companies.’ I’ve found it very rewarding when people come up and say, ‘I know this doesn’t work, but I couldn’t convince my boss to get rid of, or scale back on the diversity training program and put more resources into something that had some chance of working.’ People have taken some of our papers and shown them to their bosses and try to turn things around. I don’t consult – so I feel that I have some neutrality, I’m not invested in the practices. So then it’s very rewarding to see that people are listening and a couple of big companies have taken all of our findings and are trying to implement them all.

And I have also talked to a couple of people in the employment opportunity commission – commissioners – they had seen some of our work and got in touch. We used their data. So it was very instructive to hear their perspective. And I kind of hope that the federal agencies would pick up on some of this and change what they were recommending that firms do. That hasn’t happened yet but I think it may. The EEO has a list of best practices online, and some of those best practices have not been shown to be effective, not only in our research, but in other research, like diversity training. There are ways that diversity training can work a little better but it’s not the great fix. It would be gratifying to see them change some of those things. At least the agency seems very open to finding out what research is showing.

It’s interesting to see, I think, as a more general issue, how social science research affects corporate policy and public policy. You get a lot of findings out there that never make any impact at all. And in the end this may not make much of an impact. But I think we have more firms doing more mentoring, for example, and putting in more task forces, because those are both inexpensive.

MMK: What advice do you have for social

scientists who might want to either increase the policy relevance of their work or get it out there?

FD: In the scheme of things, I didn’t try very hard to get it out there. One of my coauthors said ‘we should get the university to issue a press release’ when this paper came out, which I’d never done before. I don’t know if that made any difference at all but a couple of sources picked it up. I think the press we got, and we continue to get some now and then – NPR calls now and then – was kind of viral. Someone would see the article and send it to somebody who was a reporter.

MMK: What do you think are some of the implications for our current economic crisis of the influence of federal regulation in changing corporate culture? Any projections?

FD: I think one of the problems we have is we operate with a theory of economic incentives that dominates most legal discourse from the law and economics crowd. And the theory is that if you adjust the incentives to firms correctly, they will comply with the law or they will self-regulate. But we don’t have a lot of evidence of that – that is, there aren’t a lot of studies, partly cause it’s hard to get the data, of what happens when you increase the penalties for releasing pollutants into the environment and what happens when you break OSHA (occupational safety and health) laws, or what happens when you misreport your quarterly earnings. And in fact, speaking specifically about the crisis, there are not really many disincentives in the system for, say misreporting earnings, lying about your earnings. Hundreds of fortune 500 companies do it every year and later restate their earnings. And that’s been going up over time, not down. And there are very few disincentives for breaking federal securities regulations, for example. Almost nobody ever goes to jail. So we have this theory about incentives, which we don’t really put into practice very effectively in the field of financial regulation. But maybe that’s ok because we haven’t really tested the theory either.

That is, there are other theories of how you get people to conform to social norms. Psychologists think incentives backfire, in general, because if you give people incentives they externalize control rather than internalizing control. They learn that they only report true financial statistics because there’s a disincentive to not reporting true financial statistics, instead of thinking ‘I report the real financial statistics because I’m a professional and it’s part of my professional ethic.’ So I think we need to step back from the incentive-based theory that the law and economics crowd uses and look to other ways to get things to change.

So in our research, for example, lawsuits in your firm, in your industry, civil rights lawsuits, they lead to slight upticks in diversity, which then disappear after a couple of years. A compliance review where someone comes in and looks over your shoulder and says they’ll be back, we just wanted to see how you did things, maybe you could change these 3 things – when it’s done right, it can last 30 years. We do see that corporations that undergo early compliance reviews – early, as in the 1970s – see sustained growth in diversity and I think that’s because the compliance reviews for federal contractors were more serious, and they tended to be more in-depth and they followed up. The psychological research suggests that if you think somebody’s going to review your decision processes, in laboratory experiments, you will be more careful not to discriminate, say, in deciding wages or choosing someone for a job. So it’s pretty clear that that model, more oversight and advice, is effective, and the disincentive that comes from a lawsuit has an effect that is very short-lived. And because diversity goes up and then it goes right back to where it would have been without the lawsuit, it’s clear that the lawsuit is causing managers maybe to look to hire a few more women, members of minority groups, but the lawsuit isn’t changing anything about the firm. To me that suggests that we’re not at a stage where we really understand very well how public policy interacts with what happens

in firms. We've bought into this theory that quite possibly is wrong. But that's good news for sociology because we're more fundamentally empirical than the people in the law and economics crowd, I think we have the potential to figure out what might be a better way to try to get firms to do what you'd like them to do.

MMK: Thank you for taking the time to speak with Accounts.

Discussion With Robert D. Putnam about Religion, Politics, And Social Inequality

by Kaisa Snellman, Harvard University

Robert D. Putnam is the Peter and Isabel Malkin Professor of Public Policy at the Harvard Kennedy School. His most recent book, *American Grace: How Religion Divides and Unites Us*, was the winner of the 2011 Woodrow Wilson Award for the best book in politics, government, or international affairs and the Religious Communicator Council's Wilbur Award for the best non-fiction book in 2011.

KS: Thanks for agreeing to speak with *Accounts*. A paperback edition of *American Grace* came out in February – with some new data and analysis. For the book's first edition, you interviewed 3,000 Americans in 2006 and 2007 about their religious beliefs and behavior and their political and social engagement. For the second edition, you re-interviewed the same people in 2011. What motivated you to collect a third wave of data?

RDP: When the hardback edition was in production, sociologist Byron Johnson suggested that it would be really useful to collect a third wave, given that we had established a solid survey base. Of course, the original *Faith Matters* dataset was useful but with three waves you can do much more causal analysis than with two. With generous support from the Templeton

Foundation, we collected a strong third wave - even though we had not originally planned this as a three panel study. And we gathered the data primarily as a public utility. It is not yet in the public domain but it will be within a year or two and it will be great resource for scholars.

KS: I am sure that many people will follow you up on that offer. So what did you learn from the third wave?

RDP: For one, we learned that religious attitudes and behaviors are remarkably stable, much more than things like political attitudes or civic behavior. It is actually really hard to find as stable a social trait over time as people's religious attitudes and behaviors. For example, religiosity (as measured by a six-item index) is as stable over five years as formal level of education.

KS: How about the Great Recession? Did that have any impact on the religious landscape? You were lucky analytically that the economic crisis hit America between your second and third panel so you could examine the impact of the recession on people's beliefs.

RDP: From a scientific perspective, that was an extreme stroke of good fortune. From the national point view, it was an extreme stroke of ill-fortune, of course. In the 2011 wave, we asked a number of questions related to the Great Recession, for example, whether people had lost their jobs or knew people who had lost their jobs. None of our measures related to the effects of the Great Recession show the slightest effect on any religious beliefs or behaviors. It is an astonishing finding, really, that this massive economic transformation seems to have had virtually no religious impact – in either direction. In other words, despite the economic gales, people did not huddle under the umbrella of religion and become more religious. And they didn't abandon religion even if god had abandoned them in the Great Recession. Basically, religious behaviors and attitudes are highly stable and unaffected even by things like economic crises.

That said, highly stable does not mean perfectly stable. For example, we took a closer look at what sociologists of religion

refer to as the rise of the “young nones”, the group of young Americans who say that they have no religious affiliation. The number of young nones has accelerated rapidly and they actually constitute the third largest religious group in America. With three waves we got much more leverage in understanding the behavior and dynamics of “liminals”: people who religiously are like a bulb loose in its socket that sometimes report having a religious affiliation and sometimes report “none”.

We were also able to examine topics that had not existed before, like the Tea Party. The panel design allowed us to explore what today's Tea Party supporters were like before the Party even existed. We were able to show that that the Tea Party supporters are essentially the religious right: they are not political neophytes, but have always been more conservative and politically more active than other Republicans, and they have always had strong desire to bring more religion into politics.

KS: Is there a connection between the rise of “young nones” and the rise of the Tea Party?

RDP: We think that the primary reason for the rise of the “young nones” and the growing secularism in America is a rejection of this close affinity between religion and politics. Young people withdrew from organized religion as they saw it aligned with a conservative brand of politics that did not appeal to them. Religion has always been an important factor in American politics but this tight organizational connection between the most prominent part of organized religion and one particular political party is a historical anomaly. It came about because some political strategic decisions made by Republican leaders in 1980s that created this sharp divide that triggered the so called God Gap. In the short run, this marriage of convenience between the conservative Republicans and religious conservatives brought benefits to both; it changed the American balance of power in politics to their advantage. But in the long run, there has been an allergic reaction against that marriage that has affected both the religious and political spheres. In the religious

sphere, the rise of the young nones is mostly attributable to young people's aversion to mixing religion and politics. On the political side, the sharp mainstream rejection of the Tea Party reflects the negative feelings Americans have about the tight connection between religion and politics. Over the next five or ten years, I think we will see that alliance become much more attenuated and we will go back to the more normal times where both among seculars and among the highly religious, Americans will have more varied political preferences.

KS: What role will religion play in the upcoming election? In *American Grace*, you argue that political lines in America are less and less drawn along tribal lines of religious affiliation and more along the beliefs that all Christian faiths have in common. Do you think religious affiliation might play a different role in 2012 than in 2008?

RDP: Well, Yogi Berra is my master here: "Prediction is hard, especially about the future". At the time of this interview, the political outlook is still unclear, except to say that it will overwhelmingly be determined by the state of the economy. If the economy continues even a modest recovery, Obama will be hard to beat. Having said that, I believe that we will continue to see a God Gap in politics – the most religiously observant Americans are not going to vote for Obama and probably most secular people will vote for Obama to the extent they associate Romney with the Tea Party. I don't expect religious issues will make it high on the agenda in this economically-focused climate.

KS: What's next for you? More work on religion or are you moving on to other topics?

RDP: Over the last two decades or so when I have been practicing sociology without a license, I have focused on a series of big social changes happening in America – the big social change of declining social capital, the big social

change of immigration, and the big changes happening in the world of religion. All of these projects are ones that ordinary Americans grasp and find relevant. One of the sociological reviews of *American Grace* said that I have been practicing public sociology, which I was enormously flattered by because I aspire to this. Intellectuals should have an obligation to speak to our fellow citizens using a language that they understand but using the skills, techniques, and data that we have.

My current project is focused on another big change affecting America, namely the issue of inequality and opportunity. In this current project, we are not so much focused on inequality within the current generation but on inequality of opportunity or intergenerational inequality. Americans by and large have not historically been worried about inequality; we don't get upset about the height of the socioeconomic ladder on the assumption that everybody gets on the ladder at the same point. Historically, that might have been true but it is certainly not true today. Contemporary measurements of social mobility are always like looking in a societal rearview mirror, as mobility studies focus on people in their 30s and some of the most important influences on young people happen even before they set foot in kindergarten. So 'contemporary' mobility measurements tell us about societal influences that happened in the 1980s.

An alternative way of looking at future mobility is to look at differences among young people when they are still growing up. And as we have done that, we have found a remarkable pattern. Over the last two or three decades, there has been a sharply growing class gap among American young people; middle class kids basically have more and better social ties and social support and working class kids have less. Middle class youth are more involved in community organizations and extracurricular activities while working class kids are less involved. Middle class youth report more social trust, while

working class kids report less. Middle class kids attend church more frequently, while working class kids attend church less and less. Middle class kids spend more developmental time with their parents and get more what we call "Good Night Moon time" and working class kids get less "Good Night Moon time".

Independently, Sean Reardon has found a similar pattern in test scores: middle class kids are doing increasingly better year by year compared to working class kids. Taken together, these trends describe an increasing class divide in the amount of young Americans' social, culture, and intellectual capital. What that means is that when these generations of young people reach adulthood, we will see dramatic declines in social mobility. How well you do in life will increasingly depend on one thing and one thing only: how well you choose your parents. If you chose wealthy educated parents, you are fixed for life. If you were asleep on the day when parents were chosen and you ended up with less educated parents, your goose is cooked.

KS: What is causing this increasing class divide? How much is this a story of a growing cultural divide between the top and the bottom that Charles Murray describes in *Coming Apart*?

RDP: This is a perfect storm and there is no single explanation. Part of the story is the collapse in the working class family structure that Charles Murray has written about – I don't think he has the causal story right but the trend that he describes is real. Part of the story is related to growing inequality and volatility in financial resources but there are other important factors driving this change, such as growing differences in middle class and working class neighborhoods and the collapse of the sociological safety net in many working class neighborhoods. But what is clear is that we are becoming an increasingly class-divided society, which is both

unfair and woefully inefficient. I hope that over the next decade, all of us who are studying society (and in particular, social inequality) can convey this message to our fellow citizens in a form that will enable them to act upon this change.

KS: We look forward to hearing more about this research in the future. Thanks for agreeing to speak with *Accounts!*

RDP: Always a pleasure!

Review of Philippe Steiner's *Durkheim and the Birth of Economic Sociology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011, 249 pp.

By Jared L. Peifer, Rice University
Abridged from *Erasmus Journal of
Philosophy and Economics* 5(1):121-7.

Émile Durkheim believed that even the seemingly individual act of “thinking” is a social activity (Calhoun et al. 2007, 142). Philippe Steiner extends this Durkheimian emphasis on societal level explanations to the burgeoning field of economic sociology. Just as thinking depends upon external categories and meanings provided by society, Durkheim instructs us that we likewise cannot truck, barter or exchange without knowledge that is inscribed by society.

This is the first book on Durkheim’s economic sociology, perhaps because Durkheim was less than explicit in his intent to create such a subfield. Steiner, a prominent Durkheimian scholar, shows that simply reading Durkheim’s four most popular books that are translated into English (*The Division of Labor in Society* (1893), *The Rules of Sociological Method* (1895), *Suicide* (1897) and *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (1912)) will not yield a comprehensive view of Durkheim’s economic sociology. Instead, Steiner expertly marshals period journals, including Durkheim’s own journal *L’Année Sociologique*, and Durkheim’s personal

letters to fill in the holes. True to his communitarian sensibilities, Durkheim did not carry out his economic sociology project alone. Steiner shows how Durkheim’s students, Marcel Mauss, Maurice Halbwachs and François Simiand (among others), pushed his economic sociology research project forward during and after their tutor’s lifetime. Since these scholars are more commonly studied by anthropologists, Steiner unearths fresh classical material for economic sociologists.

The original (2005) French version of Steiner’s book is entitled, *L’école durkheimienne et l’économie: Sociologie, religion et connaissance*. This more comprehensive title, roughly translated *Durkheim’s School and the Economy: Sociology, Religion and Knowledge*, clearly signals the important role religion plays in Steiner’s interpretation of Durkheimian economic sociology. Present day sociologists have specialized in their respective subfields (such as the sociology of religion and economic sociology) and have consequently mostly ignored the relationship between these seemingly disparate realms. Steiner presents the case that not only Weber, but Durkheim too, placed great importance on the relationship between religion and the economy.

Summary of Book

Steiner argues Durkheim’s economic sociology consists of two research programs. The first is a critique of political economy, or the economists of his day. The second sees Durkheim turn to religion, instead of the economy, as the key to understanding society. The first two chapters outline each program in turn. Chapters 3 to 6 demonstrate how these programs were taken up by Durkheim’s students. The final two chapters of the book focus on extending the material covered to an economic sociology of knowledge, with an emphasis on the schooling system. Here Steiner enters into dialogue with performativity scholarship, a growing

area of interest among economic sociologists.

1st Research Program: Critique of Political Economy

Durkheim’s first program of economic sociology articulated a critique of political economists for their penchant for reductionism, wherein complex social reality was replaced with simplistic assumptions of rational actors operating outside of society. However, Durkheim did not stop there. Similar to Durkheim’s broader conception of a “social fact,” which refers to “ways of acting, thinking, and feeling external to individual consciousness that are imposed upon individuals,” (p. 22) Durkheim’s economic sociology focuses on societal level “economic facts.” For instance, Durkheim argues that a *contract* is more than the sum of each party’s self-interest, “but is possible only thanks to the regulation of contracts, which is of social origin” (*Division of Labor*, in Steiner p. 28).

Durkheim also envisioned a moral component to his conception of economic fact. Namely, a healthy society’s *collective conscience* constrains immoral economic behavior. For Durkheim though, modern industrial society was unhealthy. To fill this moral regulative void, Durkheim proposed a new social institution he called the “professional group”. This was to be an association of workers within the workplace that would create cohesion, restrain individual passions and foster a principle of justice. This was Durkheim’s early attempt to envision a remedy to the immoral aspects of the modern world.

Simiand and Halbwachs, both students of Durkheim, were principal contributors to the economic sociology section of *L’Année sociologique* for almost 50 years (1897-1942), extending Durkheim’s critique against the orthodox economists of their day. Most importantly, they “put forward an approach that would draw upon empirical investigation together with contributions from history, statistics

and sociology” (p. 107). Three of the book’s eight chapters are comprised of long, detailed analysis of the work of Durkheim’s students. Incidentally, this raises the question in the reader’s mind about how much of the school of economic sociology Steiner outlines should really be credited directly to Durkheim.

2nd Research Program: Religion and the Economy
In his doctoral dissertation, which was published as *Division of Labor* in 1893, Durkheim looked to the economy to address his perennial concerns regarding societal cohesion, particularly focusing on ‘organic solidarity’, the interdependence stemming from vocational specialization. However, just a couple of years after finishing his dissertation, Durkheim dramatically announced an important change in his intellectual orientation in a letter to the editor of a periodical. “It was in 1895 that I clearly understood the leading role played by religion in social life. It was in this year that, for the first time, I found a means to approach the study of religion sociologically. This was a revelation to me (p. 39).” Durkheim disagreed with the Marxian notion that the economy could be at the root of society. Instead, Durkheim set out to show that religion was the foundation from which the economic grew. In the closing pages of *Elementary Forms* Durkheim writes, “the idea of economic value and that of religious value cannot be unrelated, but the nature of these relationships has not yet been studied” (p. 58).

While this “revelation” was an important event, Steiner makes the case that it did not bring an end to Durkheim’s interest in the economy. While Durkheim never completed his project for linking religion to his economic sociology, Steiner argues that Durkheim’s nephew, Marcel Mauss, did. In *The Gift*, Mauss ([1923] 1990) focuses on a unique kind of economic exchange (i.e., gift exchange) that comprises both interest and disinterest; egoism and altruism. This particular form of exchange can be aptly approached from the perspective of multiple societal spheres: religion (gifts to the gods), economy (exchanging goods) and family (dowries). This leads Mauss to

the concept of a *total social fact*, which tells us no sphere of social life is more fundamental than the other. Steiner argues that Mauss’ conclusion parts ways with Durkheim’s contention that religion is more essential than the economy (when it comes to explaining the origins of social life.)

While Mauss’ stalemate answer (neither religion nor the economy trumps the other) may have been satisfying to its first readers, who were also interested in the origins of society, it strikes me as somewhat less than satisfying. Steiner does not end his story here, however. He emphasizes how Durkheim’s “sociology of knowledge” provides a more intriguing link between the sociology of religion and economic sociology. Durkheim believed social action (or social reality) is necessarily preceded by knowledge. The prime examples being religion and myth which “make and express social reality in one move, and do so through the intermediary of symbols that unite different individual consciousnesses so that they might communicate and feel things in unison” (p. 177). Durkheim sees the schooling system replacing organized religion’s role in producing knowledge. As such, the educational institution actively creates the knowledge that is planted in the next generation’s heads and also takes over the reins of society’s moral order from organized religion.

In a clever thought experiment, Steiner considers how Durkheim’s economic sociology might provide a more comprehensive explanation of how the modern profit-driven “economic man” came into being. Weber’s (1930) *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* explains the religious spark that helped start modern rational capitalism, but acknowledges that those religious forces quickly dissipated. What sustained capitalism in the following centuries? Durkheim’s emphasis on sociology of knowledge answers that “capitalism cannot survive without ideological support” (p. 213) and “that the schooling

system plays a decisive role when it becomes a central institution through which the cognitive capital embodied in the individual is produced” (p. 213).

Performativity

It is with this emphasis on the education system that Steiner most directly engages with current day performativity scholarship, a growing area of interest within economic sociology. Performativity scholars seek to uncover the extent to which economic knowledge is helping create (or ‘perform’) economic actors whose behavior often approximates that of the caricatured utility maximizer. As MacKenzie (2006) puts it, economic theory is better depicted as *An Engine, Not a Camera*, the title of his book exploring how the financial market puts economic theory into action.

For instance, Simiand shows how Fredrick Taylor’s theory of scientific management in the 1920’s produced the institutions that fostered its rational behavior. This peculiar workplace environment came about “not because of some miraculous coincidence of the ideal of an isolated theorist and the society’s law of progress, but rather through social inscription of theory in institutions in whose terms individuals are led to act in the economic world” (p. 187).

Steiner’s emphasis on economic *experts* as central performative actors in the economy closely follows the present day performativity research program. But this narrow implementation of performativity theory is tantamount to consideration of religious ideals only as they apply to clergy. The education system, broadly speaking, has the potential to inculcate economic knowledge to a much larger swath of social actors, not just those with formal economic training. Steiner’s emphasis on the education system shows promise for a wider application of performativity theory.

Steiner’s overtures to performativity

scholarship will be of great interest to economic sociologists. Does Durkheim's work and that of his students provide a sufficient foundation for performativity scholars? Will it push the field in new directions? I would like to have seen Steiner engage with questions of this nature more systematically. Nonetheless, economic sociologists owe Steiner a debt for formally introducing Durkheimian thought into the subfield's institutional repertoire. In true Durkheimian fashion, and the mark of good scholarship, Steiner leaves ample room for creative research to grow.

References:

- Calhoun, Craig, Joseph Gerteis, James Moody, Steven Pfaff and Indermohan Virk, eds. 2007. *Classical Sociological Theory*. Second ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- MacKenzie, Donald A. 2006. *An Engine, Not a Camera: How Financial Models Shape Markets*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Mauss, Marcel. 1990[1923]. *The Gift: The Form and Reason for Exchange in Archaic Societies*. London: Routledge.
- Steiner, Philippe. 2005. *L'école Durkheimienne Et l'économie: Sociologie, Religion Et Connaissance*. Geneva: Librairie Droz.

Jared L. Peifer is a Postdoctoral Fellow in the sociology department at Rice University. He specializes in economic sociology and sociology of religion with a keen interest in how social actors bring these two realms together in their everyday lives.



Special Issue on Relational Work in Market Economies

The June 2012 issue of *Politics & Society* (<http://pas.sagepub.com/content/current>) is devoted to "Relational Work in Market Economies." It includes Viviana Zelizer, "How I Became a Relational Economic Sociologist and What Does that Mean?" and articles by Nina Bandelj and Frederick F. Wherry that extend and elaborate the relational work concept. Three other pieces use the concept to

analyze specific empirical cases; Dina Biscotti and co-authors look at university-industry research collaborations, Jennifer Haylett studies egg donation, and Josh Whitford explores subcontracting relations in manufacturing. Fred Block provides an introduction to the issue.



Economic sociology roundtables at ASA meetings, organized by Kaisa Snellman and Matt Vidal

Friday, August 17, 4:30-5:30pm

1) Categories and markets

Discussant: John-Paul Ferguson, Stanford Graduate School of Business

Job Categories and Geographic Identity: A category stereotype explanation for geographic agglomeration, Ming De Leung, UC Berkeley

Getting in Touch: Impact of Niche Width and Category Interoperability on Audience Evaluations, Lionel Julien Paolella, HEC Paris; Rodolphe Durand, HEC Paris

2) The state and field emergence

Discussant: Cheris Chan, The University of Hong Kong

The Politics of Communist Economic Reform: Soviet Union and China, John F. Padgett, University of Chicago

Heavy Hand of the State in Field Emergence: China's Real Estate Industry and its Creation, Jennifer M. Choo, Univ of California-Berkeley

When Economics Meets Organizational Habitus: Technocrats, Bureaucrats and Economists in Inaugurating China's Economic Liberalization (1977-1985), Yingyao Wang, Yale University

3) Embeddedness and economic

behaviour

Discussant: Adam Slez, Princeton University

The Network Structure of Sovereign Defaults, Doga Kerestecioglu, University of Pennsylvania; Mauro F. Guillen, University of Pennsylvania

Markets, Technologies, and Mediating Institutions: Bicycle Design in France and the United States, 1892-1914; Thomas C. Burr, Illinois State University

Governance within Embedded Ties: Power Asymmetries in Agri-food Supply Chains; Sarah Lake, University of Colorado-Boulder

4) Social networks and corporate behaviour

Discussant: Brandy Aven, Carnegie Mellon University

The Contingent Value of Prior Relationships in Technology Licensing, Young-Choon Kim, National University of Singapore; Mooweon Rhee, University of Hawaii

Corporate and Family Business Executives: Matching Transactions to Interorganizational Relationships, Eric Ross Kushins, Rutgers University

5) Field dynamics

Discussant: Kjersten Whittington, Reed College

The Limits of Decoupling: Corporate Responses to the Equal Employment Opportunity Law in Japan, Eunmi Mun, Harvard University

Legitimacy, Transparency, and Economic Performance Within the Microfinance Industry, Darline Augustine, Baruch College; Christopher Wheat, Rutgers University

6) Contested practices and institutional change

Discussant: Klaus Weber, Northwestern University

Labor Resistance, Public Policy, and Changing Layoff Policies, 1984-2006; Jiwook Jung, Harvard University

Cultivating Localization through Commodity De-Fetishism: Contours of Authenticity and Transparency in the Local Organic Food Market; Zach Schrank, University of Arizona

Adopting Contested Practices and Transforming Fields: Urban Churches and Social Entrepreneurship; Alfred Reed, Rutgers University

7) State and market

Discussant: Fred Block, University of California, Davis

Clipping the Eagle's Wings: A Field Theoretic Account of the SEC's Failed Corporate Governance Revolution; Carl E Gershenson, Harvard University

Accounting for Politics: Productivity Measurement in the U.S. Bureau of Labor Studies, Amy Myrick

Transformation of local state in China, Zongshi Chen, University of California, Berkeley

8) Social Responses to the Great Recession

Discussant: Josh Pacewicz, Stanford University

Defense against Recession: U.S. Business Mobilization, 1950-1970, Todd Schifeling, University of Michigan

Foreclosure and crime: Is housing-mortgage stress associated with violent and property crime in US metropolitan areas? Roderick W Jones, Indiana University; William Alex Pridemore, Indiana University

The Meaning of Student Debt: How Undergraduate Students Make Sense of Indebtedness, Matthew Baron Rotondi, University of California, Riverside

9) Work and occupations

Discussant: Steve Lopez, Ohio State

University

Finding Worker Skill in the Closing and Restructuring of a Furniture Manufacturer, Tom Juravich, University of Massachusetts

Repurposing: The Working Lives of Retirees, Mikell Alexandra Hyman, University of Michigan

Japanese Worker's Career, Kohei Takahashi

10) Ideas and policy

Discussant: Matt Keller, Southern Methodist University

Problems with Economism, Thomas J. Burns, University of Oklahoma; Tom W Boyd, University of Oklahoma

The Politics of Ideas: Economic Thought, Interests, and Institutions in the Rise of Neoliberalism, Dustin Avent-Holt, University of Massachusetts-Amherst

A note on falling poverty in booming economies and social exclusion, Charles A. Plante, McGill University

11) Sociology of economic behaviour

Discussant: Paromita Sanyal, Cornell University

Accounting for Moral-Economic Behavior: Why Americans Give Their Money Away but are Hesitant to Invest Ethically, Jared L Peifer, Rice University

Calculation, Performativity, and Counter-Performativity in Consumer Behavior, Stephen D Rosenberg, University of Chicago

Embedded Transactions: Financial Support and Payday Borrowing, Anthony Alvarez, UCLA

12) Ownership and contracts

Discussant: Sarah Quinn, University of Washington

Relational Signaling and the Rise of CEO Compensation, Kees van Veen, University of Groningen; Rafael P.M. Wittek, University of Groningen

Categorical Coherence or Sequential Consistency: Breach of Contract in SME Financing, Jason Greenberg, NYU-Stern; Rodrigo Canales, Yale School of Management

Resource Regime and Ownership Change in Transition Economies: China's Real Estate Development Industry; Tianjue Luo, Stanford University

Table 13. Markets and institutions

Discussant: Mark Kennedy, University of Southern California

From Utopias of General Models to Realities of Innovative Capabilities, Stefan Kirchner, University of Hamburg, School of Business; Jürgen Beyer, University of Hamburg, School of Business

Challenges and Boundaries of the Brazilian Public Policies for Biotech Health, Carlos Bianchi, University of the Republic, Uruguay

Hibernated Legitimacy and Institutional Revival: The Resurgence of Private Entrepreneurship in China's Transitional Economy 1978—1996, Hongwei Xu, INSEAD; Litao Zhao, National University of Singapore

Mitigating Dystopia: Catholicism and Economic Survival in the Arabian Gulf, Brandon Rama Vaidyanathan, University of Notre Dame

To learn more about the Section on Economic Sociology, visit us on the web at:

<http://www2.asanet.org/sectionecon/>

The webpage is maintained by Craig Tutterow of the University of Chicago.

Section Officers

Chair, Woody Powell, Stanford University

Chair-Elect, Vicki Smith, UC – Davis

Past Chair, Alejandro Portes, Princeton

Secretary-Treasurer, Leslie McCall, Northwestern University

Council Members

Tim Bartley, *Indiana University*

Jens Beckert, *Max Planck-Cologne*

Alya Guseva, *Boston University*

Dan Hirschman, *University of Michigan*

Greta Krippner, *University of Michigan*

Yuval Millo, *London School of Economics*

Monica Prasad, *Northwestern University*

Martin Ruef, *Princeton University*

Committee Chairs

Alya Guseva, *Boston University*, Membership

Tim Bartley, *Indiana University*, Burt Prize

Greta Krippner, *University of Michigan*, Granovetter Prize

Monica Prasad, *Northwestern University*, Zelizer Prize

Bruce Carruthers, *Northwestern University*, Nominations