NOTE FROM THE CHAIR

The 2013 annual convention takes place next month, at which point you will be able to enjoy the fruits of a tremendous amount of labor, undertaken over the last year. I think you’ll agree with me that section members’ efforts have guaranteed that our profile at the New York City meetings will be impressive.

You will have the luxury of attending a great many section activities at the convention. You can find the information about all our sessions at the end of this newsletter (check the final ASA program for information about locations of sessions and events). We’ve organized six section sessions (one co-organized with Organizations, Occupations and Work), along with session round tables. Get them into your planner—we hope you can attend and enjoy.

Please join us at the Section reception, onsite, Saturday, August 10th, 6:30-8:30 p.m. Section receptions are great places to catch up with old friends and network with new ones. Awards will be presented at 7:15 p.m., no matter the volume or size of the crowd (see pgs. 17-19 for award announcements). This is always a special part of the reception, a way to collectively honor the very best work being done in economic sociology.

The next day (Sunday, August 11th), the Section business meeting takes place from 1:30-2:10 p.m. The business meeting is open to all section members and the Council and I welcome your participation. So that award winners can be honored in a more intimate setting, we will again announce the section awards, starting at about 1:50 p.m.

After the business meeting, plan to stay for the special invited session featuring the Zelizer Award-winning books. The first half of this session will be devoted to Monica Prasad’s book (with two discussants), the other half to Lyn Spillman’s book (with two discussants). (And be sure to read the reviews of these amazing books, starting on p. 12).

Powering through a full cycle of section activities over the course of a year requires extensive work and much dedication. I’d like to thank the nominations committee, chaired by Alya Guseva, with members Tim Bartley and Monica Prasad. This committee carefully considered potential candidates for officer positions, did all the groundwork required to persuade people to run for the positions (no small feat, I can say from personal experience), and met all ASA deadlines so that by the time the election rolled around, all our information was in place, ready for your votes. Thank you. Election results can be found on p. 2.
ELECTION RESULTS

The Economic Sociology Section has a new slate of officers coming on board.

Greta Krippner, University of Michigan, will serve as the 2013-14 Chair-Elect, and 2014-15 Section Chair.

Assuming position after the NYC meetings this summer, Delia Baldassarri, New York University, will serve a three-year position as Secretary/Treasurer (2013-16).

New Council members Frederick Wherry (currently at Columbia and joining the Yale Faculty this fall) and Jennifer Bair (University of Colorado) will serve three-year terms (also 2013-16).

And Lindsey Ibanez, Ohio State University, will serve a two-year term as Student Representative to the Council (2013-15).

Congratulations to all. We welcome these new officers and thank everyone who agreed to allow themselves to be nominated as candidates for these positions.

FIVE QUESTIONS FOR NINA BANDELJ

Nina Bandelj, Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Irvine, is the incoming Chair of the Economic Sociology section. Her work examines structural, political and cultural foundations of economic processes, often connected to social transformation in Central and Eastern Europe after communism, and globalization. She serves as one of the editors of Socio-Economic Review, and on the Executive Council of the Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics. Her books and edited volumes include From Communists to Foreign Capitalists (Princeton, 2008), Economy and State: A Sociological Perspective (with Elizabeth Sowers, Polity, 2010), The Cultural Wealth of Nations (with Frederick Wherry, Stanford, 2011), and Socialism Vanquished, Socialism Challenged: Eastern Europe and China, 1989-2009 (with Dorothy Solinger, Oxford, 2012).

Bandelj asked a team of graduate students at UC Irvine, who are interested in issues of economy and society from an interdisciplinary perspective, to serve as the Editorial Collective for the Accounts Newsletter in the next academic year. They include Tamer Elgindi, a doctoral candidate in Planning, Policy and Design, Scott Mitchell, a doctoral student in Business, Paul James Morgan, a doctoral candidate in Sociology, Taylor Nelms, a doctoral candidate in Anthropology, and Anne Tatlock, a doctoral candidate in Sociology. By way of introducing themselves, each of them posed one question to Nina.
Taylor Nelms (Anthropology): My own work in economic anthropology is grounded methodologically in ethnographic fieldwork. It focuses in part on the official adoption of the US dollar in Ecuador, and thus explores the monetary and finance interfaces between the worlds of "hard" and "soft" currencies. Could you reflect on the importance of money, currency, and value in your own work, and characterize your own research methodology?

Nina Bandelj: Economic sociology section members may know my research on foreign direct investment (FDI) in Eastern Europe. That work interrogates the social meaning of money, in certain respects, and not surprisingly, given that I studied with Viviana Zelizer at Princeton. From a perspective of multiple monies, for recipients of foreign investment (the part of the FDI process that has received little attention in scholarship which predominantly starts from the rational investor point of view), investment from the U.S. is not the same as that from Germany, for instance. Still, cultural understandings of transaction partners are not the only influential social force determining FDI efforts – as I tried to argue in my work, which combines attention to culture, power and structure -- but they do play a consequential, not epiphenomenal, role. Nationality also matters because of social ties forged on the basis of national membership, such that investment is facilitated by émigrés back to their home countries. This links migratory flows to investment monies, and connects to work on transnational entrepreneurs by Alejandro Portes, with whom I also studied. And talking about Princeton influences, research methods I use include cross-national comparative quantitative research, which Bruce Western (who was my advisor at Princeton before moving to Harvard) introduced me to, as well as content analysis and interviews. I have not (yet) conducted an ethnography but recognize the value of sustained observation of economic behavior, and not simply how formal models characterize it, or what statistical correlations are able to capture. I may even take on experimental research to further my interest in emotions and economic decisions, given that we now have a Social Science Laboratory at UC Irvine. I suppose I am a methodological omnivore, driven more by empirical questions than by specific analytic methods. But I am also interested in theoretical issues. Here I should mention Paul DiMaggio, another of my mentors at Princeton. Paul asked me a question on my comprehensive exam about how we can think of rationality at the level of organizations. It was the toughest question, and it has me thinking about a sociological theory of economic action ever since.

Scott Mitchell (Business): There is a large body of work by economic sociologists located in business schools, where I'm from. Are there any research topics or conversations that you'd like to see more of at business schools?

Nina Bandelj: I agree that economic sociology produced by scholars located in business schools has been quite influential in defining the field at large. Mostly in the network tradition, and research on financial markets. In fact, there seems to be an affinity between economic sociology topics and approaches that get more traction in business schools. For instance, we see less scholarship adopting cultural approaches – although one could think of Lauren Rivera at Kellogg and Michel Anteby at HBS, and work on institutional logics by Michael Lounsbury at Alberta Business School in Canada, so I suppose there are exceptions... But, there is less political economy, or political economic sociology, at business schools, I believe, even if locating organizational behavior and markets in a broader historical and political context is very fruitful. More importantly, I think that business scholars can learn more from economic sociologists, overall. I was surprised to find out that less than 10 percent of economic sociology section members are actually located at business schools. I thought it would be at least about one third of membership... There is a really strong contingent from MIT Sloan that stands out, some are also at Northwestern, Chicago, Michigan but then only one or two members from Wharton, Yale, Stanford, Columbia, a few from Canadian, and French business schools. We could do better! Next year, when the ASA and the Academy of Management meetings are not
scheduled at the same time, as they are this year, unfortunately, it’s our chance to get more of our business school friends over to San Francisco and involved in the section activities more generally.

Paul Morgan (Sociology): My research focuses upon contemporary craftspeople to explore and understand the ways in which key values of craft interact in and relate to the subsequent price for which the craft is sold. I am interested in moments when multiple values converge, either as complementary to each other or even as antagonistic. But I also draw on relational work, which is something you have written on more recently.

Nina Bandelj: Yes, my recent theoretical preoccupation in economic sociology has focused on relational work. For anyone interested in reading more about this work, there is a special journal issue on the topic in Politics and Society (July 2012), edited by Fred Block. In my contribution to that collection, I extended Viviana Zelizer’s concept of relational work to propose that a focus on how economic actors create, maintain, negotiate or dissolve economic relations provides a distinctive understanding of relationality in economic life. It integrates attention to the three key social forces, which economic sociologists have examined in a rather disjointed fashion – social ties/networks, culture, and power/politics. The focus on relational work, as I propose it, also undergirds a practical actor theory of economic action, and provides microfoundations to a Polanyian understanding of embedded economies. Further, it underscores the emotional underpinnings of economic decisions, which links to my previous writing on emotions in economy in Theory and Society. With financial crisis, emotions have generally started to receive more attention. I argue that they matter not only because they shape preference formation but also because they result from, and are influenced by, interactions between economic actors during the course of economic exchange, during relational work. This complicates the means-ends logic of rational decision making, resulting in situational adaptation and improvisation rather than maximization. One could say that the focus on relational work helps me further my interest in how culture, power, social ties and emotions all influence everyday economic processes. I suppose I am a theoretical omnivore as well.

Tamer Elgindi (Planning, Policy and Design): I study income inequality in developing countries, with a special focus on Muslim countries. Your work on income inequality in Central and Eastern Europe has emphasized various processes that led to substantial, although varied, increases in income disparities in postsocialism. I observed that the topic of income inequality usually receives less attention in policy, especially compared to its related cousin, poverty. Have you observed that as well? And if so, why do you think this is happening?

Nina Bandelj: First off, I want to say that economic sociologists have more to say about social stratification than we have thus far. As an economic sociologist writing on income inequality my primary goal has been to place economic inequalities between people in their structural, cultural and political context. Especially in the case of Eastern Europe, one cannot understand sweeping rises in income inequality in some countries but less in others, without thinking about how the fall of socialism put privatization front and central — and privatization is fundamentally about individual differentiation — how it retrenched the state, amplified discrimination against minorities that was dormant in socialism, and flooded the region with foreign direct investment. But on the topics of inequality vs. poverty, I do think poverty is more squarely placed in the neoliberal dictionary next to growth, investment, finance… and the focus of international organizations reflects that. There are poverty alleviation targets instituted within these organizations, but there is less consensus that economic inequality is something we should be concerned about. In the end, we can see how social issues of the day reflect broadly accepted economic paradigms, not some self-evident social problems.

Anne Tatlock (Sociology): I study debt in cross-national perspective, and I notice that I started to see things in my day-to-day life, outside of my work, through a "debt lens." Do you notice as you take on
new projects with different foci that it changes the way you go about your daily life, or how you make sense of the world?

Nina Bandelj: Absolutely. I call it professional deformation. Whether a blessing or a curse, it seems I wear my economic sociology glasses wherever I go. This is how my dissertation research started, in my first year of graduate school in fact, when the Slovenian company my father worked for was being taken over by an American multinational, and my father would tell me about all “non-economic” aspects of this foreign investment effort during our weekly Sunday phone conversations. (Yes, the phone bill was huge.) On the topic of debt, which is close to crisis, I do worry about what I see around me when I travel back to Eastern Europe, or Europe more broadly, actually. People ask me what I think should be done to get out of the crisis, and I fall back on being an armchair intellectual distant from policy making. (I do think this is a difference in being an academic in the U.S. compared to Europe.) It is easy to say that focus on austerity is part of current economic culture, and point to its social and political foundations. It is easy to remark how short-term profit-oriented managerialism has been wholeheartedly embraced by economic elites in Eastern Europe and has left many skeletons in postsocialist closets that were forced open when crisis hit. But as we know when situations are defined as real, they are real in their consequences. I am left with hope that by uncovering the fundamentally social origins of economic processes and policies, we, economic sociologists, nevertheless play a role in re-constructing our economic realities.

Thank you, Nina! We’re excited to work with you on the newsletter and section activities in the next academic year.

WHY ECONOMIC SOCIOLOGISTS SHOULD CARE ABOUT EDUCATION

Lauren A. Rivera, Northwestern l-rivera@kellogg.northwestern.edu

Mitchell L. Stevens, Stanford mitchell.stevens@stanford.edu

Education currently plays only a modest role in the work of economic sociologists, often appearing as a control variable in studies of organizations and careers. This is a missed opportunity and intellectual problem. Our premise in this brief essay is that education—the formal organization of schooling—is essential to the sociology of economic phenomena, and also comprises an influential market worthy of study in its own right. We focus here on higher education because colleges and universities most directly shape the things economic sociologists study directly. Colleges and universities also provide the primary homes for most economic sociologists’ own professional lives.

So, why should economic sociologists care about (higher) education?

It drives economic inequality. Understanding the structure of economic exchange and opportunity is at the heart of our subfield. Economic sociologists have analyzed sex and race inequalities in organizations, industries, and careers (Castilla 2011; Fernandez and Greenberg 2013; Fernandez-Mateo 2009), and in light of the recent financial crisis have become increasingly interested in investigating economic inequality—arguably the paradigmatic problem of North American sociology. Economic inequality in the United States is at its highest point since the Gilded Age, and mobility prospects have decreased significantly (Piketty and Saez 2003). The widening gap between rich and poor is of more than ethical concern because it has detrimental effects on worker productivity, organizational performance, and market effectiveness (Thorbecke and Charumilind 2002).

When analyzing drivers of inequality, economic sociologists have looked primarily to states, corporations, and economic policies (e.g., Fligstein and Goldstein 2010; Halliday and Carruthers 2009; Mouw and Kalleberg 2010). However, both the quality and quantity of education are key mechanisms of economic stratification, contributing more than a third of the growth of income inequality.
over the past 40 years (Western and Rosenfeld 2011). The earnings gulf between college and high school graduates has widened substantially in recent decades (Carnevale, Rose, and Cheah 2011). Access to higher education is now among the primary mechanisms of economic stratification in the United States (Goldin and Katz 2008).

**It is human capital.** Workers are the building blocks of the markets, organizations, and industries that economic sociologists study. Their job-related skills, knowledge, and experiences enhance or inhibit the success of virtually all economic endeavors. Schools are the primary formal means of human-capital acquisition and dissemination. School experiences shape cognitive, social, and technical skills. Educational credentials are some of the most consequential ways employers assess productivity at point of hire (Bills 2003; Farkas 2003; Spence 1974). Educational attainment is strongly correlated with ascriptive characteristics such as parental social class and race (Bowen and Bok 1998; Soares 2007; Stevens 2007), mediating the social stratification of human capital as well as processes of hiring and promotion.

The content of education matters too. This is especially true in high school and college. Whether higher education focuses on Proust or programming affects what types of skills particular groups of individuals do and do not acquire, the demand for particular types of skills and products, and where innovation and talent are located in social and geographic space (Armstrong and Hamilton 2013; Florida 2002; Lloyd 2006).

**It is social capital.** Education plays a pivotal role in structuring social relationships (Coleman 1988). Classmates are likely to be the friends, romantic partners, and spouses that comprise close and distal networks—shaping the quantity and quality of economic, social, and symbolic resources to which individuals and groups have easy access (Stevens, Armstrong, and Arum 2008). Economic sociologists have long understood that social ties play essential roles in how people hear about job openings (Granovetter 1995), their likelihood of being hired (Fernandez and Weinberg 1997), and their compensation levels (Mizruchi, Stearns, and Fleischer 2011). More recently, they have described how particular schools also are important forms of institutional social capital. Even if individuals do not have preexisting ties to one another, having a similar alma mater facilitates trust and positive sentiment that can positively affect hiring decisions, perceptions of performance, and promotion (Rivera 2011; Sterling and Rider 2012).

**It shapes beliefs and practices of work, organizations, and markets.** Schooling inculcates worldviews and beliefs that shape economic behavior. The kinds and amounts of schooling people receive affect what they value in jobs, what types of careers they pursue, and how they identify as men and women (Halaby 2003; Dinovitzer and Garth 2007; Charles and Bradley 2009). Schooling also affects how people define and measure merit and talent in interpersonal exchange (Rivera 2012).

Schooling shapes what kinds of formal organization, economic institutions, and whole social systems people find legitimate, optimal, and just. Students in prestigious boarding schools are socialized to believe their elite status is earned, reinforcing the legitimacy of inequality (Gaztambide-Fernández 2009; Khan 2011). The informal curricula of elite colleges teaches future investment bankers particular logics of what counts as appropriate economic action and has facilitated financial markets characterized by crisis rather than stability (Ho 2009). Business school curriculum systematically encourages students to prioritize firm profitability over any other substantive value (Khurana 2007). The neoliberal economic theory produced and disseminated by U.S. academics has influenced the reorganization of national economies (Babb 2004).

**It comprises some of the largest markets in the United States.** Whether we like it or not, higher education has become a commodity. In the US, the chronic decline of state government support for higher education, coupled with unabated (and virtually unregulated) tuition price escalation has created conditions under which
access to college has come to be defined as a consumer good (Armstrong and Hamilton 2013). This is a major shift in the culture and finance of an entire institutional sector. Through much of the last century, higher education was conceived of and funded as a public good, with governments bearing most of the costs for an institutional edifice built officially in service to the national good (Kerr 2001 [1963]; Berman 2012; Loss 2012).

With increased competition for spots in elite schools and growing disparities in earnings between those with college degrees and those without, a multibillion-dollar college preparation sector has emerged to facilitate college entry and completion (Stevens 2007). Increasing demand, higher prices, and limited public capacity have precipitated an explosion of for-profit colleges and new organizational forms delivering educational services (Christensen and Eyring 2011). Economic sociologists have scarcely addressed this dynamic industry.

You work here. The logic of efficient markets is being deployed by lawmakers, philanthropists, education economists, the mass media, and many university leaders to reorganize US higher education. Academic decision-makers are routinely expected to make economically-driven calculations: gaming the rankings (Espeland and Sauder 2007), emphasizing creature comforts over academic rigor (Arum and Roksa 2010), courting wealthy students over poorer ones (Armstrong and Hamilton 2013), and replacing tenure-track faculty lines with adjunct and term positions (Kirp 2003). Economic sociology’s own house is an institution in economic transformation. We’d best pay attention.
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Nicole Woolsey Biggart is the Chevron Chair in Energy Efficiency, Director of the UC Davis Energy Efficiency Center and Professor of Management at the UC Davis Graduate School of Management. Her research interests include economic and organizational sociology, social networks, industrial change and the social bases of technology adoption.

**Dina Biscotti:** Please tell us about your role as Director of the UC Davis Energy Efficiency Center.

**Nicole Woolsey Biggart:** I'm the Faculty Director of the UC Davis Energy Efficiency Center. We are a research center, and also the umbrella organization for several other research centers oriented towards reducing carbon emissions in the built environment. So I'm the head of a collection of research centers whose mission is to save energy.

**DB:** What role do you see for sociologists in technology-focused centers like the Energy Efficiency Center?

**NWB:** Energy efficiency is very much a world dominated by technologists—by people who make energy efficient devices. But the fact that devices are culturally embedded and fit into institutional patterns and practices of production and...
consumption is just never really thought about. I see a much larger role for sociologists than currently exists. The contribution that sociologists can make is typically never considered when energy efficiency projects are conceived. If we play a role at all, it's usually only after the technologies don't work or fail to be adopted, and I think that needs to change.

**DB:** You hosted an Energy, Organizations and Society (EOS) workshop with Tom Beamish at the University of California, Davis Graduate School of Management in October 2011 in order to engage a broader community of scholars in energy research. Why do you think sociologists should be more engaged in this area?

**NWB:** I think we are toying with climate collapse and sociologists should be concerned with what is the major challenge of our time. It's not going to go away or be solved at an individual level. It's going to be solved socially, at the level of states and multi-state organizations. Sociologists understand how those work, so I hope sociologists become engaged. Why haven't sociologists jumped in? I think there are two primary reasons. The first reason is that it doesn't fit our categories of scholarship. Sociologists study race. We study organizations. We study gender. We study many different kinds of social phenomena, but if they don't fit into our own institutional categories that are represented by our section structure in the ASA, it's very hard to get people engaged. I think the second factor has become more true over time, and that is that we're very happy to study social change, but not professionally engage in it.

We study social problems, but we don't study social solutions. It doesn't have to be that way. I think of some of the people that I've studied with, like Philip Selznick. He was very much interested in how social science was a moral science and how it could make a difference in the world. I think there are other social scientists of his era who strongly felt the same way. I studied with Reinhard Bendix. His book, *Work and Authority in Industry*, was about understanding practices so that one could actually do something differently and better for society. C. Wright Mills is another. We have lost that. I think the discipline has lost its connection with social practice and the social good. We're much more hands-off, trying to be purely scientific and stand apart from our objects of study.

Michael Burawoy of course has tried to step into the breach. And I think it's actually natural for sociologists, who often personally have a revolutionary bent, to want to see social change. But as social scientists, we've been very reluctant to take on projects that might change practice. That is seen as consulting and therefore somehow tainted. And since I was Dean of a business school, I recognize the difference! I think that to some extent, we limit our own power in the world by refusing to engage with issues of interest to the public in the way that economists and psychologists do. We stand alone with anthropologists in not becoming engaged with the societies or the tribes that we study. I think that's too bad because we have a lot to contribute.

**DB:** Please tell us about your recent research on faith-based organizations. What does that have to do with energy efficiency?

**NWB:** Most of the energy efficiency community tries to save energy through either information technologies or devices. Government agencies and the energy efficiency business community tend to look at energy from an instrumentally-rational perspective. I think that we miss a great deal when we don't look at other reasons why people consume. There are moral and institutional reasons that shape consumption. I think that looking at faith-based organizations is a great way to examine a more substantive rationality. Together with Dina Biscotti, I have been researching an incipient social movement—the religious environmental movement. We've been examining interfaith communities that view the earth as a product of God's creation and something to be stewarded. So this has been an opportunity to look at how social and moral factors influence consumption.

**DB:** A recent blog entry by Kelsey Meagher on your website systemsofexchange.org describes sales strategies by solar companies that are reminiscent of
your groundbreaking work on direct selling organizations in Charismatic Capitalism. What are your thoughts on these developments in the renewable energy industry?

NWB: The website is based on my Academy of Management Review article “Systems of Exchange,” coauthored with Rick Delbridge, and it is intended to be a resource for researchers, students, and instructors of economic sociology. We developed the website as a way for scholars to link economic sociology to current events and policy issues in a theoretically-grounded way.

For example, I think that the house party strategy, whether it’s used in the direct selling of jewelry, or Tupperware, or solar panels, is a wonderful example of how the social can inform consumption practices. People don’t just buy things as individuals. They’re influenced by others and by their structure of belief. In the case of solar panels, a recent study (Bollinger and Gillingham 2012) found that California homeowners are much more likely to install solar panels if their neighbors have already installed them. This is a great example of how selling and consumption are social and can shape the adoption of low carbon technologies. The Systems of Exchange website contains many other examples of socially informed economic action, and I encourage readers to use this resource in the classroom and send their own examples to info@systemsofexchange.org.

DB: Since its launch in April, the Systems of Exchange website has attracted new contributions from scholars such as David Chandler, author of Strategic Corporate Social Responsibility: Stakeholders in a Global Environment. Tell us about the trends you observe in global corporations around energy use and why this should be of interest to management scholars and economic sociologists.

NWB: I think that one of the biggest unheralded changes in the corporate world is the reporting of carbon emissions. Every year, more and more of the Fortune 500 companies report their carbon footprint. This has been happening quietly, but finance and risk management scholars are beginning to take notice. This is the start of a new era because once you report something, you have to manage it. California now has a cap and trade market for carbon. How exactly this will spread, I don’t know, but I think there is a sea change coming.

DB: The EOS workshop has inspired a forthcoming conference: “After the Gold Rush: Theorizing the Institutional Outcomes of Alberta’s Oilsands” that will be hosted by Roy Suddaby at the University of Alberta. Please tell us about this upcoming workshop.

NWB: I’m excited that EOS is going to continue. Roy Suddaby is Editor of The Academy of Management Review. It’s the ASR of the management community—a really fine theory journal that is well-regarded and widely-read. Roy is at the University of Alberta, which is the home of the tar sands—a very substantial, carbon-rich fuel source. We both have tremendous interest in carrying these discussions forward, so I very much welcome his partnership.

I think that people like Loren Lutzenhiser, Riley Dunlap, Tom Dietz, Kari Marie Norgaard and others who have been working on these issues for a long time can really use some help in studying energy and climate change. There are gender issues, issues involving race and class, and tremendous issues around development. In developing nations there are people whose families and livelihoods will be decimated because of climate change. We need to be studying these things and informing policy makers where we can.
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NOTE FROM THE CHAIR CONT.

The membership committee worked on an issue that challenges every section, every year: developing effective strategies for increasing our membership numbers. Thanks to Emily Barman, Brandy Tepper, and Alya Guseva for taking on this work. Economic sociology’s membership remains robust with over 800 members, something about which we can’t be complacent. If any of you come up with dazzling or innovative ideas about how to recruit new members, be sure to send them to next year’s membership committee.

The work of the session organizers was considerable. All organizers reported that they received many outstanding papers. All had to be reviewed, ranked, accepted, or redirected to other sessions. Yanjie Bian, Alexandra Kalev, Donald Light, Gina Neff, and Allison Pugh have organized some terrific panels, consisting of diverse papers that will make a strong contribution to the conference proceedings. Frank Dobbin coordinated an invited session at which four prominent economic sociologists will discuss the Zelizer Award-winning books.

Finally, Fred Block accepted the unenviable task of organizing the section round tables. As many of you know—especially if you’ve organized ASA sessions in recent years—working with the online system is challenging. Organizing round tables is challenging “times ten”, as session organizers have to forward papers to second choice session organizers, at which point organizers may then forward papers to round table organizers, often at a very late date. Round table organizers can end up having to sort through, place or reject scores of papers at the last minute. Thanks to Fred and the Davis contingent—Dina Biscotti, Jennifer Tyree-Hageman, Brian Halpin, and Jennifer Kutzleb—for putting together an outstanding round table program, including distinguished discussants for each.

Participating on awards committees is one of the most important contributions members can make to the section. This year each committee received many high-quality nominations. All submissions had to be considered carefully and hard decisions had to be made about selecting the best. Committee chairs attest that there is much superb research being conducted in the field of economic sociology, good news for the relevance and vitality of our section.

Many thanks to Frank Dobbin for chairing the Viviana Zelizer Award for Best Book Committee, and to Committee members Stephanie Mudge and Fred Wherry. Big thanks to Lyn Spillman for chairing the Ronald Burt Outstanding Student Paper Award Committee, and to Committee Members Adam Goldstein and Harland Prechel. Finally, much gratitude to Sarah Quinn for chairing the Granovetter Prize for Best Article Committee, and to her committee comrades, Ashley Mears and Ofer Sharone.

I’d like to thank everyone who responded positively to my requests to write reviews and articles for this newsletter. Everyone, to a person, met their deadlines and wrote readable, high-quality entries, enabling me to continue to produce a first-rate newsletter with up-to-date items of interest to the membership.
Last but hardly least: thank you, Jennifer Haylett, for producing *Accounts*. Jennifer is a UC Davis Ph.D. student, currently residing in Bloomington, Indiana. Her work is impeccable. It is hard to express how indebted I am to Jenn, for her work ethic, her meticulous attention to detail, and her efficiency—Jenn has been a newsletter co-editor *par excellence* and a genuine pleasure to work with. She is also a bright, up-and-coming young economic sociologist who has already made her mark in this subfield with her fine article, “One Woman Helping Another: Egg Donation as a Case of Relational Work,” published in the special issue of *Politics and Society* on relational work (2012, vol. 40 [2], edited by Fred Block; the volume was reviewed by Andrew Schrank in *Accounts*, Dec. 2012, vol. 12 [1]).

This issue of *Accounts* includes two other pieces of note to economic sociologists. The first is “Why Economic Sociologists Should Care About Education,” written by Mitchell Stevens and Lauren Rivera. I initiated the “Why Economic Sociologists Should Care About...” column for *Accounts*, with earlier columns addressing why economic sociologists should care about the 2012 elections and why they should care about relational work. Remember: all back issues of *Accounts* are available at [http://www2.asanet.org/sectionecon/newsletter.html](http://www2.asanet.org/sectionecon/newsletter.html).

The second is an interview with Nicole Biggart, a founding parent of this section, its former chair, the former Dean of the Graduate School of Management at UC Davis, and currently the Director of the UC Davis Energy Efficiency Center. Nicole is an internationally prominent economic sociologist; Dina Biscotti, postdoctoral fellow at UCD, interviews her and brings us up-to-date on her work (Nicole’s new website on “Systems of Exchange” was profiled in the last issue of *Accounts*).

I’ve enjoyed chairing the section and receiving feedback from you throughout the year. Chairing a large section entails a lot of work and this job is transitioning into excellent hands. As incoming chair, Nina Bandelj already has things in place, with

---

**BOOK REVIEWS**

The 2013 Viviana Zelizer Award for Best Book has been awarded to two outstanding books: Monica Prasad's *Land of Too Much: American Abundance and the Paradox of Poverty*, and Lyn Spillman’s *Solidarity in Strategy: Making Business Meaningful in American Trade Associations*. Coincidentally, I had solicited reviews of these two books prior to the announcement of the award so you have the good fortune to read about each in greater depth in this issue of *Accounts*. On p. __ Committee Chair Frank Dobbin explains why these two books were selected to share the Zelizer Award.


Michael McQuarrie
University of California, Davis
London School of Economics
mmcquarrie@ucdavis.edu

Prasad’s exciting new book, *The Land of Too Much*, synthesizes historical work on agrarian politics and the growing literature on American political development to formulate a novel thesis that will reorganize the discussion of comparative political economy. In doing so, she also overcomes many of the exclusions and narrow readings that sustain the debate on American exceptionalism. Prasad’s intervention starts with a deceptively simple conceptual maneuver: she abandons the
scholarly obsession with welfare states in favor of an interest in the broader category of state intervention in the economy. From this perspective the United States is highly interventionist, even in comparison to European nations: "...it is clear that no country has managed to make capitalism work without heavy state intervention. Indeed, the United States is not a laissez-faire or liberal political economy at all, and it never has been" (263). Certainly this is a provocative argument that is likely to spark a healthy debate.

More practically, Prasad's conceptual maneuver enables the construction of a new narrative of American political development and comparative political economy that connects the depression of the 1890s to the fiscal crisis of 2007-8. In this narrative, many conventional markers of American political development such as the stock market crash, Social Security, unionization, and the National Labor Relations Act fall by the wayside, while others such as the Interstate Commerce Act (1887), the ratification of the sixteenth amendment (income tax, 1913), the Banking Act (Glass-Steagall regulations, 1933), Huey Long's Share Our Wealth campaign, the establishment of Fannie Mae (1938), and the Financial Services Modernization Act (revoking Glass-Steagall, 1999) all move to center stage.

These milestones sustain a "demand-side theory" of American political development that makes visible an interventionist state that relies on access to credit rather than income support or in-kind goods such as government-managed health insurance or housing. These policy preferences were made necessary by the unprecedented abundance of the postbellum American economy and related agrarian protest. The policy-making creativity that emerged in response ultimately coalesced into the "purchasing power paradigm" of American political economy (this term originates with the historian Meg Jacobs). In addition to access to credit, this paradigm is characterized by efforts to break up concentrations of wealth (Anti-trust legislation, progressive income taxes, inheritance taxes), which were understood to remove money from circulation and drive down prices. Once in place, these policies yielded a distinctive trajectory of state development. For example, progressive taxation tended to result in tax preferences which, in turn, encouraged the private provision of welfare benefits. The complexity and visibility of income taxes, moreover, encourage resistance to taxation which effectively places a fiscal collar on the American state.

The effect of American abundance was equally consequential for the construction of European welfare states. European economics, in Prasad's account, were simply uncompetitive in the face of American economic productivity. The response in Europe tended to be protective tariffs and limitations on consumption so that capital could be directed to productivity increases in the hope that these efforts would enable economic survival. Welfare states, in this view, are basically tools to ensure quiescence in the face of this political economic imperative.

Prasad sets an ambitious goal for herself in constructing her account of comparative political economy and American political development. For her a successful account must be able to incorporate the reality of America's interventionist state with an appreciation of the distinctiveness of its political economy and the fact that this intervention still yields high rates of poverty relative to other OECD nations. Prasad's demand-side theory of state development accounts for the first two requirements. How does it account for differential poverty? This ends up being a subordinate argument in the book, but the basic claim is clear: what began as progressive interventions ended up having regressive results. While the credit economy was initially regulated to limit risk and impoverishment, it was deregulated beginning in the 1970s because there was no longer any constituency in favor of regulation (not exactly true, new regulatory measures expanding reporting and limiting the mobility of bank capital were introduced in response to a wave of neighborhood organizing). Looking at comparative outcomes in the wake of the 2007-8 financial crisis, Prasad sees an unregulated credit-based economy on one hand and unregulated production-based economies on the other with the former, the US, being the epicenter of the financial crises and rapidly
expanding inequalities. More broadly, credit-based social provision requires a certain minimum level of income and assets to actually be helpful. In short, more poverty is baked into the American political economic cake than in nations where consumption is limited but welfare is more expansive.

Prasad's is an extraordinarily ambitious work that attempts to reorganize the way we think about comparative political economy over the last 120 years. Prasad's ability to do this in a relatively slim package is a testament to her scholarship. She is highly logical in her argumentation, emphasizes parsimony in explanation, and never gets distracted by alternative explanations. Where political sociologists are complicated, she turns to economists or historians to get to the crux of the issue and arbitrate the question efficiently. But this comes with many costs that make the account seem incomplete. This will likely open her account up to criticism, or if not it still leaves many questions to be addressed. For example, whether the discussion was one between members of the Farmers' Alliance in 1893 or between Friedrich Hayek and Milton Keynes, credit is not usually discussed as a policy issue more or less divorced from questions of money and interest, and yet Prasad's account hardly deals with either at all. It appears as a contextual issue on occasion, but never as a component of a political economic logic. But if the basis of the American interventionist state is the availability of credit, talking about legislative measures and their political economic logic without discussing how they fit with policies towards money and interest is like talking about wages but not benefits and taxes in a discussion of income. While Prasad establishes her primary point: the American state was highly interventionist, as an account of how this political economy functioned we have only learned half the story. One must incorporate the history of money along with the history of credit to give a complete account that can sustain other theses relative to this insight. Similarly, the account of a consumption-based economy sees the primary problems as one of policy and popular backlash rather than one that creates its own internal tensions. But what happens when you have a consumption-based political economy that is unable to produce competitively (and to build on the prior point, why do you choose a monetary policy that privileges one over the other)?

These are a few criticisms that come immediately to mind and others will certainly raise other issues. Indeed, the nature of Prasad's account invites just this sort of questioning. On the other hand, Prasad's book has merits that more than outweigh these shortcomings. It is tightly argued, it is based on elements of American political development and political economy that have been overlooked for too long, it utilizes comparisons along elegant axes of distinction, and it synthesizes much recent research on credit and American political development. However, it's greatest merit might be the generative nature of her argument. Land of Too Much offers a compelling thesis that will re-energize comparative political economy while offering a better account of recent developments. This work will occupy economic, comparative-historical, and political sociologists for some time to come.


Lyn Spillman’s and Robert Faulkner’s recent books make strong contributions to the cultural side of economic sociology, each providing a wealth of valuable ideas and data about corporate solidarity (Spillman) and misconduct (Faulkner). In *Solidarity in Strategy: Making Business Meaningful in American Trade Associations*, Spillman challenges economic sociologists to “come to terms with the empirical fact that business culture is necessarily structured by an orientation to disinterested solidarity as much as an orientation to strategic interest in competitive profit seeking” (p. 367). She critiques Weber and Marx for sharing Adam Smith’s homo economicus view (p. 11) that “people of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices.” What they failed to adequately consider was Durkheim’s concern that an unbridled division of labor, absent mechanisms to restore solidarity, would lead to anomie and an unsustainable Hobbesian state of all against all. One potential solution suggested by Durkheim was establishing occupational communities to expand members’ shared economic interests to more social and community-oriented activities.

In this comprehensive survey and portrait of American trade associations’ historical and current activities, Spillman makes a powerful case for considering how they can provide a bridge between the narrow self-interest of their memberships and a broader concern for the society in which they operate. From a comprehensive qualitative/comparative analysis of the discourses and activities of 25 representative trade associations, combined with an ambitious population census of 4,465 business trade associations, Spillman finds their activities include an interest and engagement in gathering and producing information for their memberships, organizing trade exhibitions, producing industry-wide meetings and conventions, increasing technical excellence, educating the public about their industries, and meeting with government officials. In this way, trade associations help produce an identity for their members, enabling them to better connect with each other and provide a coherent picture of themselves and what they do for the general public. They also produce cognitive categories and networks, in accordance with normative and status orders, and occupational camaraderie (p. 346).

Spillman sees these activities as the production of industry cultures for their members and industries, which a more conventional view of individual firms competing against one another would miss. While she emphasizes the solidarity and greater sensemaking that these provide, Spillman also acknowledges the strength and power of the more profit-focused “strategic” side of the members’ goals and purposes they serve. She states (p. 367): “To claim that meaning making in capitalist business is as solidaristic as it is strategic seems to ignore the many destructive and stratifying powers unleashed by capitalist business, the inevitable political conflicts it generates, and its human costs.” Her study does not contradict this view, but rather supplements it with a fuller picture of the roles played by trade associations in helping these industries, conceptually and culturally, to get both their profit-seeking work done (with better information), as well as make contributions back to the larger society in which they operate.

*Solidarity in Strategy* advances economic and cultural sociology into empirically rich territory, in which an enormous amount can be learned about the activities and roles of trade associations. For aspiring scholars, Spillman deliberately recounts the extended and detailed process of qualitative data analysis she used, to enable others to conduct similarly ambitious research projects. An additional contribution of Spillman’s study is to focus on the discourse which trade associations have also enabled, for example to emphasize their members’ contributions to society (e.g., providing jobs) rather...
than more narrow goals (e.g., returning profits to investors).

In Corporate Wrongdoing and the Art of the Accusation, Faulkner turns our attention to a different, though complementary aspect of economic sociology and business culture. From his analysis of 1,103 public accusations of wrongdoing against large firms between 1994 and 2003, he develops a typology around how much publicity the allegation received, and whether criminal or civil charges were brought to court.

In Faulkner’s typology, innuendo and admonition are weak and discrete expressions of disagreement, in which the innuendo receives neither publicity nor legal attention. The admonition engages government action but receives little publicity (for example, the legal ritual of a “consent order,” in which a company neither confirms nor denies committing an alleged offense but promises not to do it again). Absent much media attention and public awareness, neither innuendo nor admonition is found to significantly embarrass or punish the (alleged) offender. Accusations and legal indictment are more consequential, with both being more widely discussed and publicized. While the accusation may not get to court, it brings the issue and company to public attention and often serves as an early warning which signals that something is wrong and may (later) be brought to court.

Interestingly, Faulkner sees the accusation as more consequential reputationally and effective in altering behavior than (waiting on) the possible legal follow-ups and potential conviction. “The accusation is a tool for evoking unambiguously unfavorable symbols... (It is) less about money and more about violations of unwritten agreements... Our conclusions highlight ways in which crime and consciences are conjoined as Durkheim and Erikson suggest, yet our conclusions differ... We suggest that the often-accepted use of the criminal indictment and formal charges may be weak rather than strong indicators of moral excitation, group sentiment, and ‘a common sense of morality.’ Rather, it is the public accusation of wrongdoing preceding the official criminal charges that generates the excitement, the tempo, and the sentiment that are assumed to underlie ‘the public temper and the moral order’” (pp. 8-10). Faulkner notes that the ability of publicly made accusations to affect a corporation engaged in wrongdoing is based on the context in which the corporation is located. Durkheim, Coase, and White have all addressed the social nature of market exchanges. As a social institution with rules to be followed, the market’s order is protected when corporate wrongdoing is exposed.

Faulkner sees accusations as having cultural and structural manifestations. Knowing how to make an accusation of wrongdoing and how, and through what channels to deliver it effectively is an art (much like fraud). He turns our attention to the component parts of effective accusations and to how ways of assembling them depend on the target company. Different ways to assemble an accusation are needed for companies in the consumer products industry, in finance and banking, or for companies that rely heavily on the government to secure their profits. Faulkner emphasizes the links between the social context of the company and types of accusations, pointing out the types of misbehavior to which each refers. At one end, accusations of wrongdoing within the corporation may refer to stock backdating and other schemes, while at the other end accusations of wrongdoing may refer to money laundering for criminals or criminal organizations or cases of corporations bribing government officials to gain control over the desirable natural resources.

Faulkner’s typology and review of the many different corporate wrongdoing acts comes together with an intriguing evaluation of possible locations for both accusations and the culprits tied to them. He follows cases of accusation from the initial announcement in a newspaper to later editorials and articles, tracks keywords and phrases, identifies vocabularies and concepts, and provides us with prototypical themes. He explains such themes as misrepresentation, misdirection and circumvention of rules, and provides a fascinating repertoire of wrongdoing acts on the part of the corporation with
a valuable repertoire of corrective cultural recipes to fight such acts.

In their impressive contributions, both Spillman and Faulkner cast light on the moral and ethical lines which business should not cross in pursuit of unbridled profit. Spillman sees trade associations as one mechanism that provides its members a cultural identity which goes beyond chasing profits with no restraint. Faulkner examines how excesses may be brought in line by well-formed accusations, and of how this is done. In so grappling with the balance between making profits and doing right, each provides a helpful response to Thurman Arnold's concern in his *Folklore of Capitalism* (1937, p.62) that "In spiritual things it is essential that men do right according to some final authority. There was thought to be no such compelling reason to prevent them from ruining themselves economically."

---

**ECONOMIC SOCIOLGY**

**2013 AWARD-WINNING BOOKS AND ARTICLES**

**The 2013 Viviana Zelizer Award for Best Book**

**Award Committee:** Frank Dobbin, Department of Sociology, Harvard University (Chair); Stephanie Mudge, Department of Sociology, University of California, Davis & Sheffield Political Economy Research Institute, University of Sheffield; Fred Wherry, Department of Sociology, Columbia University.

The committee received over 25 nominations this year. Many excellent books were in the mix, and we had long and spirited discussions about the merits of at least a dozen of the books. In the end, we chose two marvelous books that deal with issues central to the field of economic sociology, that use evidence to great advantage, that develop both substantively and theoretically important insights.

Lyn Spillman's *Solidarity in Strategy: Making Business Meaningful in American Trade Associations* (2012, University of Chicago Press) is a ground-breaking, agenda-setting, treatise that puts American business associations on the map of political and economic sociology, right alongside business associations in the corporatist countries, which have been much studied. This is the first comprehensive study of U.S. business associations, which makes it ground-breaking. It is agenda-setting because it shows us how important business associations have been, and are today, not only as political and economic actors, but in forming collective sentiments among industry members. The book is empirically ambitious, as it brings together rich historical and survey data to tell its story. This book makes a central contribution to the reclamation of markets, and action in markets, as sociological objects. But it's fundamentally Durkheimian and constructivist approach does not reduce behavior and sentiments to profit-seeking. In the tradition of Viviana Zelizer, for whom this award is named, the book takes a broadly interpretive approach, exemplifying what grounded theory is all about.

Monica Prasad's *The Land of Too Much: American Abundance and the Paradox of Poverty* (2012, Harvard University Press), explains U.S. welfare state exceptionalism in exciting new terms. Comparing the U.S. to its peers, Prasad shows us that in the twentieth century, developed states had two options for handling income inequality and smoothing out the effects of the business cycle on the working and middle classes. States could build welfare systems. Or they could create progressive systems of taxation and expand access to credit. For historical reasons, having to do with agrarian power, the United States pursued the latter strategy. Cheap credit became a way to stimulate the economy as well, for in hard times the U.S. practiced “mortgage Keynesianism,” stimulating the economy by making mortgages more accessible, and thereby buoying housing prices in hard times. Prasad's book helps us to understand not only American social insurance exceptionalism, but the alternative system of economic support that emerged, and also the boom and bust cycle in the housing market, which is kindled by cheap mortgages.
Frank Dobbin  
Harvard University

The 2013 Granovetter Prize for Best Article

Award Committee: Sarah Quinn, Department of Sociology, University of Washington (Chair); Ashley Mears, Department of Sociology, Ofer Sharone, Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Twenty-two articles were submitted by the closing date, and over the next few months each committee member reviewed the pool. Committee members independently came up with a list of top choices, and then met and discussed the finalists, arriving at a decision over the course of that meeting. Committee members noted the incredibly competitive nature of this field. There were a number of highly impressive contributions, and we believe this speaks to the vibrancy and rigor of research currently being undertaken in the economic sociology section.

The Committee awarded the 2013 Granovetter Prize Lauren Rivera for her article “Hiring as Cultural Matching: The Case of Elite Professional Service Firms.” In this study, published in American Sociological Review (December 2012 77: 999-1022), Rivera used participant observation and interviews of elite firms to investigate hiring practices. Her research sites were carefully chosen to allow her to tease out occupational variations and selection patterns. She found that access to these elite jobs was not gained simply through the mastery of the right skills or impressive demonstrations of productivity but also through the right kinds of cultural displays. These findings have enormous implications for our understanding of hiring, inequality and stratification. Her lucid writing – especially her deft use of revealing quotes – makes these findings readily accessible not just to her fellow researchers but also potentially to the general public.

This is all to say that Rivera has pried open the black box of hiring to show us how this process, all-too-often mistaken for being meritocratic, is in fact a matching game where cultural resources may beat out skills or productivity as the key to entry. The work is methodologically rigorous and inventive. The arguments are convincing and the writing is elegant. The findings are sociologically noteworthy and socially important. This article advances our understanding of organizations, labor markets, stratification, elites, and how culture works in markets. For all of these reasons we are remarkably impressed with her work, and are delighted to give her this award.

Frank Dobbin  
Harvard University

The 2013 Ronald Burt Outstanding Student Paper Award

Award Committee: Lyn Spillman, Department of Sociology, University of Notre Dame (Chair); Harland Prechel, Department of Sociology, Texas A&M; Adam Goldstein, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley.

Our committee confidently reports that – judging by submissions for the Ronald Burt Outstanding Student Paper this year – we anticipate a new wave of strong, innovative economic sociology in the near future. As a committee, we enjoyed and learned from reading all the papers submitted: they opened up important new questions, and they all made sophisticated theoretical contributions based on impressive empirical research efforts. All the authors should be proud of the contributions they are making.

But difficult as the selection was, the committee agreed that the winner of the award this year is “Defense Against Recession: U.S. Business Mobilization, 1950-1970,” by Todd Schifeling, of the University of Michigan.

The paper addresses central issues in economic sociology with particular resonance for contemporary economic concerns. Schifeling asks what influences firms’ responses to economic conditions in uncertain times. Challenging the
assumption that it’s natural for firms to reduce employment during recessions, he develops and tests a model of firm-level employment which demonstrates that otherwise similar firms vary significantly in whether they or not they respond to downturns by cutting jobs. Among several notable conclusions, he finds, consistent with his model, that during recessions, companies affiliated with the relatively progressive Committee for Economic Development protected their workforces, while companies affiliated with the more conservative National Association of Manufacturers slashed employment. So top executives’ membership in ideologically distinct associations led to starkly divergent employment reductions during recessionary periods. The committee agreed that this paper stood out not only for its significant findings, but perhaps even more for its impressive data gathering effort and sophisticated analytic models, including its treatment of alternative explanations of the findings. This is an important contribution to economic sociology.

We also agreed that the quality of submissions merited two Honorable Mentions.

In “Giving Your Baby Away: Identification with Work in the Sale of Handicraft Products,” Aruna Ranganathan, of the MIT Sloan School of Management, develops an important connection between the sociology of work and economic sociology. She examines the economic impact of identification with work on prices and pricing behavior. In a compelling and very thorough mixed methods analysis which includes ethnography and field experiments, she extends audit studies of price discrimination in a novel way. She demonstrates that creative workers’ strong identification with craft leads them to sacrifice profits for the well-being of their creative output. Comparing two similar occupations with different scope for creative expression, she shows that artisans will often charge significantly lower prices to discerning buyers who are likely to care for their products beyond the point of sale, even if those buyers are wealthy and willing to pay more. The research is theoretically well framed and very carefully developed to rule out alternative explanations in terms of reputational concerns or community norms. We look forward to seeing more research on this important finding.

A second Honorable Mention goes to “The Wage Share of GDP in the Long Run: Class Power and Economic Cycles in the U.S., 1870-2009,” by Edo Navot, of the University of Wisconsin-Madison. Creatively blending innovative macroeconomic analysis with a sociological approach to labor market institutions, this paper challenges assumptions that institutional changes in workers’ bargaining power with New Deal policies and unionism increased workers’ wage share (which remained relatively constant over time). Rather, institutional changes around the mid-1930s stabilized wage volatility and reduced job insecurity, thereby increasing aggregate demand. Navot carefully locates and traces theoretical and empirical implications of his findings for our understanding of trends in inequality. In doing so he offers a model of ways that economic sociology might engage closely with economics.

So, to oversimplify three very careful arguments, we learn that social context affects job-cutting more than economic necessity; that identification with work affects pricing; and that long-term changes in workers’ bargaining power stabilize jobs but do not change workers’ share of GDP. These arguments are fine examples of new knowledge about core questions in economic sociology, and they all show the power of economic sociology to address issues once of broad public interest. Congratulations and thanks to all three authors for their work.

Thanks also to my fellow committee members Harland Prechel and Adam Goldstein for their expertise and effectiveness in our deliberations. The opportunity that prize committees offer of excellent discussion with well-informed interlocutors about emerging work in the field makes this sort of work a pleasure. So I encourage all of you to agree eagerly if you’re ever asked to help out with this or any other prize committee.

Lyn Spillman
University of Notre Dame
**ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Members’ Awards, Honors, Appointments**

Thomas Burr has received tenure and been promoted to Associate Professor in the Department of Sociology, Illinois State University, Normal.


Adam Goldstein (UC Berkeley) received The Organizations, Occupations and Work 2013 Thompson Award for best graduate student paper for his paper titled “Revenge of the Managers: Labor Cost-Cutting and the Paradoxical Resurgence of Managerialism in the Shareholder Value Era, 1984-2001.”

Chandler Johnson, Ph.D. Stanford, will become Assistant Professor at the BI Norwegian Business School in Oslo in Fall 2013.

Michael McQuarrie (currently at UC Davis) will join the faculty of the London School of Economics in Fall 2013.

Gina Neff’s book, *Venture Labor: Work and the Burden of Risk in Innovative Industries* (2012, MIT Press) won the 2013 Best Book Award from the Communication and Information Technologies Section. The book examines the work cultures of the dot-com era, the ways in which young people made sense of the risks of start-up work, and the relationship of both of these to structural changes in the U.S. economy.

Aaron Pitluck is completing a two year research fellowship with the Political Economy Research Group at Central European University (Budapest), and will be returning to Illinois State University.

Harland Prechel and Theresa Morris received the 2012 Outstanding Article Award from the American Society of Criminology for their article “The Effects of Organizational and Political Embeddedness on Financial Malfeasance in the Largest U.S. Corporations: Dependence, Incentives and Opportunities.” The article was published in the 2010 issue of *American Sociological Review* (75: 331-354).

Emily Ryo, Ph.D. Stanford, will become Assistant Professor at the University of Southern California Law School in Fall 2013.


Dan Jun Wang, Ph.D. Stanford, will become Assistant Professor at the Columbia Business School in Fall 2013. He will hold a courtesy appointment in the Department of Sociology.


Dissertations

Reyes, Victoria.
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Sociology,
Princeton University
www.princeton.edu/~vreyes vreyes@princeton.edu

“Global Borderlands: A Case Study of Subic Bay Freeport Zone, Philippines”

Abstract

My dissertation examines what I call "global borderlands" - semi-autonomous geographical locations where international exchange occurs. They are specific, territorially defined locations where distinct international, state, and sub-national legal orders overlap, and include sites such as overseas military bases, special economic zones, tourist resorts, embassies, cruise ships, headquarters of international organizations, and international branch campuses. Within these spaces legal authority and applicability is ambiguous – laws often differ depending on the identity of the criminal and the context of the crime. This dissertation is a case study of the Subic Bay Freeport Zone and uses data from Philippine and U.S. legal cases and government documents, in-depth and informal interviews, nine months of ethnographic observations, and statistical information to examine four particular contexts in which asymmetries exist between foreign visitors, local workers, and local visitors: (1) social organization, (2) legal frameworks, (3) work, and (4) consumption.

Recent articles


Gusava, Alya (with Akos Rona-Tas) and Bruce Carruthers have articles in the 2013 special issue of the Journal of Comparative Economics dedicated to Law in Finance (41 [2], May). Rona-Tas and Guseva, “Information and Consumer Credit in Central and Eastern Europe” and Carruthers, “Diverging Derivatives: Law, Governance and Modern Financial Markets.”


**Recent books**


**Abstract:** Could the terrorist attacks on the Twin Towers have been avoided? What about the recent global financial crisis? Behind these apparently very different events it is possible to identify a common element of organizational myopia—a syndrome that severely limits the capacity of organizations to foresee the effects of their own decisions and to recognize signs of danger or opportunity. Based on several case studies, *Organizational Myopia* explores the barriers that impede organizations from identifying an effective response to the problems which they have to confront. Using real-world cases, the author investigates the mechanisms that generate myopia in organizations at the individual, organizational and interorganizational level in contexts that are complex, uncertain, ambiguous and changeable. This book will help readers understand how to limit the origins of myopia and therefore increase the capacity of organizations to anticipate and contain unexpected events.


**Abstract:** The financial crisis of 2008 laid bare the hidden network of relationships in corporate governance: who owes what to whom, who will stand by whom in times of crisis, what governs the provision of credit when no one seems to have credit. This book maps the influence of these types of economic and social networks—communities of agents (people or firms) and the ties among them—on corporate behavior and governance. The empirically rich studies in the book are largely concerned with mechanisms for the emergence of governance networks rather than with what determines the best outcomes. The chapters identify "structural breaks"—privatization, for example, or globalization—and assess why powerful actors across countries behaved similarly or differently in terms of network properties and corporate governance. The chapters examine, among other topics, the surprisingly heterogeneous network structures that contradict the common belief in a single Anglo-Saxon model; the variation in network trajectories among the formerly communist countries including China; signs of convergence in response to the common structural breaks in Europe; the growing structural power of women due to gains in gender diversity on corporate governance in Scandinavia; the "small world" of merger and acquisition activity in Germany and the United States; the properties of a global and transnational governance network; and application of agent-based models to understanding the emergence of governance.


**Abstract:** I attempt to understand a series of social movements and political events that dominated the political landscape in the 1980s but are not often connected to the collapse of federalism into ethnic warfare in the years that followed. I locate attempts to either remove or reinstate societal control of market processes as the key variable explaining the trajectory of social movement activity until 1988, when infighting among ethnic groups began to seriously disrupt the united front against market reform. Adapting Polanyi's thesis of the "double movement" to explain the link connecting market reform, social movements, and nationalism appears to offer a more complete account of how the political events of the 1980s directly influenced the more well-known political catastrophes of the 1990s.

**Massey, Doug, Len Albright, Rebecca Caseiano, Elizabeth Derickson, and David Kinsey.** *Climbing Mount Laurel: The Struggle for Affordable Housing*

Abstract: Climbing Mount Laurel takes advantage of the opening of an affordable housing complex in a South Jersey suburb of Philadelphia to undertake a quasi-experimental analysis of neighborhood effects. My coauthors and I replicate MTO’s finding of significant improvements in health and neighborhood safety, but unlike MTO we find strong neighborhood effects on employment, earnings, and children’s educational outcomes.


Abstract: Several decades after the emergence of configurational theory as a key perspective in organization studies, this edited volume charts the revival and evolution of a configurational perspective on organizations, both in terms of the use of set-theoretic methods such as Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) and in terms of configurational theorizing that has emerged from the use of such methods. The volume brings together more than 20 leading scholars applying set-theoretic methods in a range of prominent fields in organization studies. Additional chapters discuss the state of the art of configurational theory and methodology, specifically with regard to crisp and fuzzy set methods. This volume provides both inspiration and practical advice on how to conduct configurational analysis and offers an agenda and template for future research in the configurational tradition.


For decades, the banking industry seemed to be a Swiss watch, quietly ticking along. But the recent financial crisis hints at the true nature of this sector. As Simone Polillo reveals in Conservatives Versus Wildcats, conflict is a driving force. Conservative bankers strive to control money by allying themselves with political elites to restrict access to credit. They create new financial instruments in order to consolidate and reproduce their wealth over time, turning money into an instrument of exclusion, and couching their practices in ideologies of sound banking. Barriers to credit, however, create social resistance, so rival bankers—wildcats—attempt to subvert the status quo by using money as a tool for breaking existing boundaries. For instance, wildcats may increase the circulation of existing currencies, incorporate new actors in financial markets, or produce altogether new financial instruments to create change. Using examples from the economic and social histories of 19th-century America and Italy, two decentralized polities where challenges to sound banking originated from above and below, this book reveals the collective tactics that conservative bankers devise to legitimize strict boundaries around credit—and the transgressive strategies that wildcat bankers employ in their challenge to this restrictive stance.

Call for papers

Call for Chapters: Work and Family in the New Economy (Series: Research in the Sociology of Work)

Editors: Samantha K. Ammons, University of Nebraska-Omaha, USA and Erin L. Kelly, University of Minnesota, USA.

This volume will focus on innovative research examining how the nature of paid work intersects with family and personal life today. This
collection of cutting-edge research will be instrumental in shaping the next wave of work-family scholarship.

Submission deadline: October 1st 2013

To read the full call for articles visit: http://www.emeraldinsight.com/tk/RSW1300

All submissions should be sent to Samantha K. Ammons: sammons@unomaha.edu

If you have any questions please contact the volume editors at: sammons@unomaha.edu or kelly101@umn.edu

Conferences


(A detailed description of the mission of the conference can be found at http://www.thebhc.org/annmeet/call2014.html)

The organizers invite papers and session proposals that address both the micro and macro levels of the virtues and vices of business in historical perspective. In keeping with longstanding BHC policy submissions need not be directly related to the conference theme. The 2014 Program Committee consists of: Ed Balleisen, Duke University (chair); Chris McKenna, University of Oxford; Andrea Schneider, Society for Business History (Germany); Per Hansen, Copenhagen Business School (BHC President), and Jan-Otmar Hesse, University of Bielefeld.

The committee will consider both individual papers and entire panels. Individual paper proposals should include a one-page (300 word) abstract and one-page curriculum vitae (CV). Panel proposals should include a cover letter stating the rationale for the panel and the name of its contact person; one-page (300 word) abstract and author’s CV for each paper; and a list of preferred panel chairs and commentators with contact information. Graduate students and recent PhDs (within 3 years of receipt of degree) whose papers are accepted for the meeting may apply for funds to partially defray their travel costs; information will be sent out once the program has been set. Everyone appearing on the program must register for the meeting.

The BHC awards the Herman E. Krooss Prize for the best dissertation in business history by a recent Ph.D. in history, economics, business administration, the history of science and technology, sociology, law, communications, and related fields. To be eligible, dissertations must be completed in the three calendar years immediately prior to the 2014 annual meeting, and may only be submitted once for the Krooss prize. If you wish to apply for this prize, please send a letter to the Krooss Prize Committee expressing your interest along with a one-page CV and one-page (300 word) dissertation abstract. After the Krooss committee has reviewed the proposals, it will ask semi-finalists to submit copies of their dissertations. Finalists will present summaries of their dissertations at a plenary session of the 2014 BHC annual meeting in Frankfurt and will receive a partial subsidy of their travel costs to the meeting.

The K. Austin Kerr Prize is awarded for the best first paper delivered by a new scholar at the annual meeting of the BHC. A “new scholar” is defined as a doctoral candidate or a Ph. D. whose degree is less than three years old. If you wish to participate in this competition, please notify the BHC program committee in your proposal. Proposals accepted for the Krooss Prize are not eligible for the Kerr Prize.

The CEBC-Halloran Prize in the History of Corporate Responsibility is awarded for a paper presented at the annual meeting of the BHC that makes a significant contribution to the history of corporate responsibility. Corporate responsibility is understood to embrace the many ways in which the firm relates to the political realm and the wider society.

The deadline for receipt of all proposals (papers, panels, and Krooss Prize competition) is 15
September 2013. Please send them to BHC2014@Hagley.org. Acceptance letters will be sent by 1 December 2013. Presenters are expected to submit abstracts of their papers for posting on the BHC website. In addition, presenters are encouraged to post electronic versions of their papers prior to the meeting.

The Oxford Journals Doctoral Colloquium in Business History will be held in conjunction with the BHC annual meeting. This prestigious workshop, sponsored by BHC and funded by the Journals Division of Oxford University Press, will take place in Frankfurt Wednesday March 12 and Thursday March 13. The colloquium is limited to ten students. Participants work intensively with a distinguished group of BHC-affiliated scholars that includes at least two BHC officers. The colloquium will discuss dissertation proposals, relevant literatures and research strategies, and employment opportunities in business history. This colloquium is intended for doctoral candidates in the early stages of their dissertation projects. If you are interested in being considered for this colloquium, please submit to Roger Horowitz by 15 November 2013 to BHC2014@Hagley.org a statement of interest, a CV, a preliminary or final dissertation prospectus of 10-15 pages, and a letter of support from your dissertation supervisor (or prospective supervisor). Questions about the colloquium should be sent to its director, Pamela Laird, Pamela.Laird@ucdenver.edu. All participants receive a stipend that will partially cover the costs of their attendance at the annual meeting. The colloquium committee will notify all applicants of its decisions by 15 December 2013.

Call for Submissions to the 2013 AOM Professional Development Workshop (PDW) titled “Trust between Individuals and Organizations”

Scheduled: Friday, Aug 9 2013 12:00PM - 3:00PM at WDW Yacht and Beach Club Resort in Cape Cod D (Lake Buena Vista, Florida)
Organizer: Oliver Schilke; U. of California, Los Angeles

Facilitators: Reinhard Bachmann; U. of Surrey; Sharon Belenzon; Duke U.; Steven C Currall; U. of California, Davis; Chris P. Long; Georgetown U.; Roger C Mayer; North Carolina State U.; Bill McEvily; U. of Toronto; Keith Murnighan; Northwestern U.; Michele Williams; Cornell U.; Lynne G Zucker; U. of California, Los Angeles

You are invited to submit discussion questions (segment 1) and/or work-in-progress papers on trust (segment 2).

(1) The first segment starts with a panel discussion, in which leading scholars present their views on the hotly debated issue of whether organizations are “able” to trust. The goal of the panel discussion is to make explicit divergent assumptions, and to develop a richer repertoire of arguments for and against organizations as social actors with trusting abilities. Subsequently, the workshop breaks into groups that will discuss questions previously submitted by workshop participants. A requirement for registration for the PDW is to submit at least one discussion question in advance pertaining to current issues in the study of trust between individuals and organizations (see below for details on how to submit). Questions may relate (but are not limited) to: • Dynamic evolution of trust over time • Relationships between interpersonal and interorganizational trust • Trade-offs between methods of trust research • Difficulties in the measurement of trust • Detrimental consequences of (interpersonal or interorganizational) trust • Substitutes for trust • Underexplored sources of trust • Context-specificity of trust • Distinct types of trust • Interactions between trust and distrust • Avenues to trust repair

(2) After a short break, the second segment of the program consists of a paper development workshop, in which the facilitators provide in-depth feedback on work-in-progress trust research previously submitted by workshop participants. These papers should ideally be close to submission to a scholarly management journal and must not exceed 40 double-spaced pages.
Registration requirements: For segment 1 (discussion): Submit at least one discussion question by email to trustpdw@gmail.com no later than August 2, 2013. For segment 2 (paper development): Submit your working paper by email to trustpdw@gmail.com no later than July 19, 2013. You will then receive a code that will allow you to register for the PDW. Remember that you can register for segment 1, segment 2, or both. Please see the official workshop announcement at http://program.aomonline.org/2013/Session_Details.asp?print=true&SubmissionID=10882

Reenvisioning the History of Sociology: Recognizing Social Theorists, Reconceptualizing the Social World
A Symposium featuring Doctoral Students & Early Career Sociologists
Sponsored by the ASA History of Sociology Section

We are very pleased to announce the preliminary program for a History of Sociology Symposium to be held in conjunction with the American Sociological Association’s Annual Meeting in New York City. In the Fall, we issued a Call for Papers, seeking contributions to a Symposium discussion about the role of sociology’s history, in relation to its present and future. In response to our call, we received 23 excellent paper submissions from graduate students and early career sociologists. Our submitters hail from Latin America, Europe, and Asia, as well as North America. We are now in the process of finalizing what promises to be a very exciting and dynamic program.

The Symposium will be held on August 10, 2013 in the Wolff Conference Room at The New School for Social Research, which is located in Union Square. We are particularly grateful to Jeffrey Goldfarb and Vera Zolberg, as well as the New School administration, for all their help in obtaining space at the New School. Given the quality of our paper submissions, we are planning for a full-day symposium, with breaks for coffee and lunch. Coffee and bagels will be available at 8:30 a.m., and the Symposium will begin at 9.

Panel themes include the following:
- Recognizing Social Theorists and Methodologists - a panel focusing on ways that the history of sociology helps us see a place in sociology’s canon for previously-marginalized groups, figures, and perspectives;
- Reconceptualizing the Social World - a panel focusing on ways that the history of sociology helps us to theorize the social world anew;
- Reframing the Sociological Field - a panel focusing on ways that the history of sociology helps us to see new possibilities for the discipline of sociology;
- Reenvisioning the History of Sociology - a reflective discussion, focusing on common themes in the Symposium, and drawing conclusions about the ways that the history of sociology can be most effectively deployed in supporting new developments in sociological theory and methods.

Please join us at the New School for what we hope will be an engaging and thought-provoking discussion! Co-Organizers: Michael Bare (University of Chicago) & Laura R. Ford (Cornell University)

ASA, NEW YORK CITY, AUGUST 2013

Economic Sociology: Section Sessions, other relevant sessions

Session 1 (Sun. Aug 11, 10:30 to 12:10pm): "Intimate Lives in Market Times"
Organizer: Allison J. Pugh, University of Virginia
Presider: Allison J. Pugh, University of Virginia
Paper 2. “Intimacy/Economy in Family Business: ‘Nothing But’ Business or ‘Connected Lives’ Frames in Advice Articles.” Nina Bandelj, University of California, Irvine; Paul James Morgan, University of California-Irvine; Elizabeth Alexis Sowers, UC Irvine
Paper 1. "The Circuit of Reproductive Labor: Sexual Labor and Mothering in Contemporary China." Man Chuen Catherine Cheng, University of Toronto

Paper 2. "Public Sociology in the Context of Economic Restructuring." Ann Doris Duffy, Brock University; Norene Pupo, York University; June Shirley Corman, Brock University

Paper 3. "Relational Work in Intermediated Ties: The Dynamics of Guanxi in Hospital Care in China." Cheris Shunching Chan, University of Hong Kong

Paper 4. "Conflict of Interest Policies and the Diffusion of Stimulant, Antidepressant, and Antipsychotic Medications." Marissa King, Yale University; Peter S. Bearman, Columbia University

Session 2 (Mon. Aug. 12, 8:30 to 10:10am): "Putting Economic Sociology Into Practice"
Organizer: Donald W. Light, Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics, Harvard University and UMDNJ-SOM
Presider: Donald W. Light, Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics, Harvard University and UMDNJ-SOM

Paper 1. "Bankers in the Ivory Tower: The Financialization of Governance at the University of California." Charlie Eaton, UC Berkeley; Adam Goldstein, University of California Berkeley; Jacob Habinck, University of California - Berkeley; Mukul Kumar, UC Berkeley; Tamera Lee Stover, UC Berkeley; Alexander Roehrkasse, roehrkasse@berkeley.edu; UC Berkeley

Paper 2. "Public Sociology in the Context of Economic Restructuring." Ann Doris Duffy, Brock University; Norene Pupo, York University; June Shirley Corman, Brock University

Paper 3. "Relational Work in Intermediated Ties: The Dynamics of Guanxi in Hospital Care in China." Cheris Shunching Chan, University of Hong Kong

Paper 4. "Conflict of Interest Policies and the Diffusion of Stimulant, Antidepressant, and Antipsychotic Medications." Marissa King, Yale University; Peter S. Bearman, Columbia University

Session 3 (Mon. Aug. 12, 10:30 to 12:10pm): "Work, Labor and Employment"
Organizer: Gina Neff, University of Washington
Presider: Angele Christin, Princeton University


Paper 3. "Starting Over in the New Economy: Age Disparities in the Reemployment Outcomes of Displaced Older Workers." Brian Serafini, University of Washington (Presenter); Michelle Lee Maroto, University of Alberta


Session 4 (Sun Aug 11, 8:30 to 10:10am): "Comparative/Global Economic Sociology"

Paper 5. "The Circuit of Reproductive Labor: Sexual Labor and Mothering in Contemporary China." Man Chuen Catherine Cheng, University of Toronto

Paper 2. "Public Sociology in the Context of Economic Restructuring." Ann Doris Duffy, Brock University; Norene Pupo, York University; June Shirley Corman, Brock University

Paper 3. "Relational Work in Intermediated Ties: The Dynamics of Guanxi in Hospital Care in China." Cheris Shunching Chan, University of Hong Kong

Paper 4. "Conflict of Interest Policies and the Diffusion of Stimulant, Antidepressant, and Antipsychotic Medications." Marissa King, Yale University; Peter S. Bearman, Columbia University

Session 2 (Mon. Aug. 12, 8:30 to 10:10am): "Putting Economic Sociology Into Practice"
Organizer: Donald W. Light, Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics, Harvard University and UMDNJ-SOM
Presider: Donald W. Light, Edmond J. Safra Center for Ethics, Harvard University and UMDNJ-SOM

Paper 1. "Bankers in the Ivory Tower: The Financialization of Governance at the University of California." Charlie Eaton, UC Berkeley; Adam Goldstein, University of California Berkeley; Jacob Habinck, University of California - Berkeley; Mukul Kumar, UC Berkeley; Tamera Lee Stover, UC Berkeley; Alexander Roehrkasse, roehrkasse@berkeley.edu; UC Berkeley

Paper 2. "Public Sociology in the Context of Economic Restructuring." Ann Doris Duffy, Brock University; Norene Pupo, York University; June Shirley Corman, Brock University

Paper 3. "Relational Work in Intermediated Ties: The Dynamics of Guanxi in Hospital Care in China." Cheris Shunching Chan, University of Hong Kong

Paper 4. "Conflict of Interest Policies and the Diffusion of Stimulant, Antidepressant, and Antipsychotic Medications." Marissa King, Yale University; Peter S. Bearman, Columbia University

Session 3 (Mon. Aug. 12, 10:30 to 12:10pm): "Work, Labor and Employment"
Organizer: Gina Neff, University of Washington
Presider: Angele Christin, Princeton University


Paper 3. "Starting Over in the New Economy: Age Disparities in the Reemployment Outcomes of Displaced Older Workers." Brian Serafini, University of Washington (Presenter); Michelle Lee Maroto, University of Alberta


Paper 5. "Leaving the Herd: The Deviant Roots of Self-Employment." Mare-David L. Seidel, University of British Columbia; Henrich R. Greve, INSEAD; Dennis G. Ma, University of British Columbia
Economic Sociology roundtables (Sun., Aug. 11, 12:30-1:30pm):

Table 01. Firms and Consumers

Table President: Elizabeth H. Gorman (University of Virginia)


Paper 2: “Where do Corporate Innovation Schemas Come from? Making Sense of Firms' Discourse about Social Media.” Shailla Miranda (University of Oklahoma), Jama Summers (University of Oklahoma), Inchan Kim (University of Oklahoma)


Table 02. Culture

Table President: David Orzechowicz (University of California-Davis)


Table 03. Money and Finance

Table President: Kevin J. Delaney (Temple University)

Paper 1: “From Silicon Valley to Wall Street: Following the Rise of an Entrepreneurial Ethos.” Jennifer TyreeHageman (University of California-Davis)


Paper 3: “Durable Circuits, General-Purpose Currencies: Opening the Sociology of Money to the Analysis of Time.” Simone Polillo (University of Virginia)

Table 04. Networks

Table President: Ko Kuwabara (Columbia University)

Paper 1: “Decoupling as a Strategic Response to Institutional Pressures: SIC Decoupling in Korean Business Groups, 1987-2000.” Grimm Noh (Yonsei University), Margeum Kim (Yonsei University), Sunhyuk Kim (Korea University), Dongyoub Shin (Yonsei University)

Paper 2: “Differences in Firm Size and Regional-Ownership of Business on Organizational Commitment.” Katie Leigh Halbesleben (Baylor University)


Table 05. Political Economy

Table President: Adam Goldstein (University of California-Berkeley)


Paper 3: “Kink in the Logistics Supply Chain: Interorganizational Relations in the Port Economy.” David D. Jaffe (University of North Florida)

Table 06. Urban and Regional Space

Table President: Michael McQuarrie (University of California-Davis)

Paper 1: “Neighborhood Integration and Mortgage Foreclosures.” Elena Vesselinov (City University of New York-Queens College)

Paper 2: “Unemployment and Regional Mobility: First Results from a Factorial Survey Approach.” Martin Abraham (University of Nuremberg-Erlangen), Katrin Auspurg (University of Konstanz), Sebastian Werner Bähr (University of Erlangen-Nuremberg), Corinna Frodermann (University of Konstanz), Stefanie Gundert (Institut für Arbeitsmarkt und Berufsforschung), Thomas Hinz (University of Konstanz)

Paper 3: “Malls as Labor Market Intermediates: The rise of Minority Women's Employment Revisited.” Erez Aharon Marantz (University of California-Irvine), Alexandra Kalev (Tel Aviv University), Noah Lewin-Epstein (Tel-Aviv University)

Table 07. Making Markets

Table President: Thomas Edward Janoski (University of Kentucky)


Paper 2: “Markets as Stories.” Sophie Muetzel (Social Science Research Center-Berlin)


Table 08. Work

Table President: Joan S.M. Meyers (State University of New Jersey-Rutgers)

Paper 1: “I Am My Own Boss: The Opportunities and Constraints of Economic Action.” Nicholas Joseph Occhiuto (Columbia University)
**Paper 2:** "Relational Work and the Competitive Mechanism in Funeral Markets." Jim McQuaid (Boston University)

**Paper 3:** "Unemployed Tech Workers' Ambivalent Embrace of the Flexible Ideal." Carrie M. Lane (California State University-Fullerton)

---

**Table 09.** Post-socialism  
**Table Presider:** Jane R. Zavisca (University of Arizona)

**Paper 1:** "New model of state intervention in the competitive industry (the case of Russian retail trade)." Vadim Radaev (Higher School of Economics)

**Paper 2:** "Recasting Dualism: Labor Dispatch, State Boundary-Draw, and Recent Trend in the Chinese Employment System." Lu Zhang (Temple University)

**Paper 3:** "Returns to Education and Labor Market Sorting in Transition Economies: The Case of Slovenia, 1993-2007." Britni Leia Adams (University of California-Irvine)

---

**Table 10.** Ecologies of change  
**Table Presider:** Michael J. Handel (Northeastern University)

**Paper 1:** "An Ecology of Market Categories." Elizabeth Pontikes (University of Chicago), Michael Hannan (Stanford University)

**Paper 2:** "Network Complementarities: Entrepreneurial Performance of Founding Teams in Late Imperial Russia." Brandy Lee Aven (Carnegie Mellon University), Henning Hillmann (University of Mannheim)

**Paper 3:** "The Education Premium for Employment: Is it the Same Everywhere?" China Layne (State University of New York-Albany)

---

**Session co-sponsored by Sections on Law & Global and Transnational Sociology (Mon Aug 12 2013, 4:30 to 6:10pm):**

**Session Organizer:** Terence C. Halliday (American Bar Foundation)

**Presider:** Terence C. Halliday (American Bar Foundation)

**Paper 1:** "Accounting for the Financial Crisis." Matthias Thiemann (Columbia University)

**Paper 2:** "Ambiguity and International Financial Governance: The IMF, Exchange Rate Policy and Emerging Market Currency Crises." Tod Stewart Van Gunten (Juan March Institute)

**Paper 3:** "Law & Society Approach to Corruption: Beyond Neoliberalism in the Study of Informal Economies." Marina Zaloznaya (Northwestern University)

**Discussant:** Jens Beckert (Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies)
Section Officers

Chair, Vicki Smith, University of California, Davis
Chair-Elect, Nina Bandelj, University of California, Irvine
Past Chair, Woody Powell, Stanford University
Secretary-Treasurer, Leslie McCall, Northwestern University

Council Members

Tim Bartley, The Ohio State University, 2014
Jens Beckert, Max Planck Institute, 2014
Adam Goldstein (Student Member), University of California, Berkeley, 2013
Alya Guseva, Boston University, 2013
Greta Krippner, University of Michigan, 2013
Yuval Millo, London School of Economics, 2014
Monica Prasad, Northwestern University, 2013
Sarah Quinn, University of Washington, 2015

Webpage Editor

Craig Tutterow, University of Chicago
http://www2.asanet.org/sectionecon/

Newsletter Editor

Jennifer Haylett, University of California, Davis

Section Committees

Nominations Committee:
Chair: Alya Guseva, Sociology, Boston University
Tim Bartley, Sociology, Ohio State University
Monica Prasad, Sociology, Northwestern

Membership Committee:
Chair: Emily Barman, Sociology, Boston University
Brandy Aven, Tepper School of Business, Carnegie Mellon
Consultant: Alya Guseva, Sociology, Boston University