

JENNIFER L. GLASS: Good afternoon. And on behalf of the ASA, welcome to the 2013 Award Ceremony and Presidential Address. My name is Jennifer Glass, and I'm the current ASA Vice-President. I'll be your emcee for tonight. I hope all of you are enjoying New York City and the 108th annual meeting of the American Sociological Association. But first, please join me as we take a moment to remember those sociologists who passed away and whose legacy we will always remember. Thank you. We now turn to the presentation of the 2013 ASA Awards by our Awards Master of Ceremonies, Dr. Robin Wagner-Pacifici of the new school for Social Research. Please welcome, Robin.

DR. ROBIN E. WAGNER-PACIFICI: Thanks, Jennifer. The ASA Dissertation Award honors the best PhD Dissertation from among those submitted by advisers and mentors in the discipline. Please welcome, Wendy D. Roth, as she highlights the award and the dynamic work of this year's recipient.

WENDY D. ROTH: Thank you. This year's committee selected two worthy recipients for the 2013 ASA's Outstanding Dissertation Award, Larissa Buchholz, for the *Global Rules of Art* and Daniel A. Menchik, for *The Practices of Medicine: Knowledge Application and Authority Acquisition in Professional Work*. Larissa Buchholz, currently a junior fellow at the Harvard Society of Fellows wrote the *Global Rules of Art* while at Columbia University under the sponsorship of Gil Eyal and with Diane Vaughn and Peter Bearman as committee members. Her dissertation is a path breaking study of the emergence of a global field in the visual arts. And an examination of the different ways that artists become valued worldwide in a theoretically and methodologically sophisticated analysis that focuses on the micro, meso and macro levels, Buchholz applies and extends Bourdieu's theory of *The Field of Cultural Production* from a national to a global scale. Daniel A. Menchik, Asst. Professor at Michigan State University receives the award for *The Practices of Medicine: Knowledge Application and Authority Acquisition in Professional Work*. He completed this work at the University of Chicago under the supervision of Andrew Abbott, Edward Laumann and David Meltzer. Menchik asks, what are the conditions under which we provide and revoke physician's privileged authority and how do they come to practice in the way that they do? Developing an innovative ethnography of multiple nested venues, Menchik focuses on physician's tasks rather than their institutional setting. And he illustrates how local logics and needs tend to drive the use of medical knowledge. His important work shows that studies of physicians' practices, including evidence-based medicine will benefit from attention to these local and distant influences.

LARISSA BUCHHOLZ: Thank you very much. I appreciate--this is a great honor. And it is also very meaningful for me in terms of the processes that led to that. Let me tell you a little bit about the background. I was born in Dresden and after the fall of the Wall, I really valued the opportunity to travel behind the so-called Iron Curtain. As an undergraduate, I was just motivated to volunteer at the House of World Cultures in Berlin, which was originally founded during the Cold War. And just a week after I started there in 2001, 9/11 happened. And as everyone might imagine, this institution turned rapidly into a hotbed for debates among social scientists and intellectuals from all over the world, most agreeing that a clash of civilization thesis was too simple. Added to this was a conference series that addressed global

issues in the arts for the first time in a substantial way. So being there at that time felt literally, like intellectual history in the making. And I was tremendously inspired to pursue questions of global cultural issues myself. I was very privileged that doors opened to me after the fall of the Wall and what drew me in this particular project on the global rules of art to Bourdieu's work was also how he shows that valuing cultural expression, free from political and economic constraints, is a unique historical achievement, the idea of valuing culture for its own sake. And it is my hope that others for whom opportunities are still more limited, such as artists facing repression in China might benefit from research that addresses the conditions and the constraints for cultural autonomy in the global context. I would like to express my sincere appreciation for everyone who has supported me in my intellectual development and work since then. Special thanks go to Ulf Wuggenig, my first sociological mentor who supported me when I started to develop this global field approach back in 2004, which has quite moved since then. I also wish to thank Javier Auyero for his excellent support during my time at Stony Brook as well as Diane Barthel-Bouchier, Michael Schwartz, James Rule, Daniel Levy, who worked great and former mentors there as well. At Columbia, great thanks are due to my wonderful adviser, Gil Eyal, as well as the incredible Diane Vaughn. I also thank Peter Bearman for his invaluable feedback and Harrison White, the late Charles Tilly, Fabian Accominotti, Shamus Khan, who gave helpful feedback for earlier related papers. Warm thanks are also due to Mustafa Emirbayer who can't be here today unfortunately. He gave important feedback for improving the final draft. And lastly, I wish to thank my most generous mother and my father, whose really pioneering and relentless spirit as a researcher, hundred seventy-five papers in six languages are hard to live up to, but also whose concern of this -- for all the issues in his work really set high standards, thank you.

DANIEL MENCHIK: Thank you. This project was possible because of many brave doctors and hospital administrators. And especially those medical device companies whose work usually receives more speculation than close study. I thank them for their trust and their openness. I also want to thank the two co-chairs of my committee, Andy Abbott and Ed Laumann who modeled what scholarly life could be. Also David Meltzer, my third committee member, for ensuring that I got the medicine right. The NIH and the NIA for funding training programs at Chicago and finally, the other faculty and the students there who made it such an intellectually intense and exciting place to do Sociology. Now, although there are many more that I can and I should thank, my time is short. But I should also say that I'm very grateful to the ASA Committee for the honor and for reading so many dissertations, a true sign of their professional commitment. I'm humbled by this award and thank you very much.

DR. ROBIN E. WAGNER-PACIFICI: The Jessie Bernard Award is given annually in recognition of a body of scholarly work that has enlarged the horizons of sociology to encompass fully the role of women in society. Please welcome, Bandana Purkayastha, as she presents this year's recipient.

BANDANA PURKAYASTHA: As you have heard, the Jessie Bernard Award recognizes a scholar whose work significantly expands our understanding of gender and particularly our understanding of women in

society. And it is my absolute pleasure to announce this year's winner, Kathleen Gerson. Who worked beginning from one of her earliest books that I read, *Hard Choices*, published in 1985 to her recent book, *The Unfinished Revolution* in 2011, sort of set the standards and the trends which we are still trying to follow. She shows us why through these books and numerous other pieces of scholarship. She shows us why amidst all of these changes in the poorest industrial workplace, men and women still end up making constrained gendered work-life choices. Please welcome, Kathleen Gerson.

KATHLEEN GERSON: Thank you so much for being here. Those of you who know me will roll their eyes when I say that I'm rarely at a loss for words. Normally true but this time -- this occasion comes close to making me feel that way. As we all know, everyone in this room, we can't do this work alone. And I feel so grateful and humbled in such gratitude to all the people who've helped me along the way. So at the risk of providing a very long list with not enough specificity in the names, the first thing I want to do is simply thank all those people who've helped me to this humbling and exciting place to be. First, of course, to the Jessie Award committee whose recognition I can't put into words of how much it means to me. Next, of course to my mentors at Berkeley where I began more decades ago than I care to remember but when this field barely existed, and it certainly didn't exist as we think of it today. It was sex roles in those days. Those people helped me find my sociological voice. Helped me learn how to combine the unique with what we all shared, to stand on the shoulders of the giants. And I think most of all, to make -- help me make risky choices without knowing what the consequences would be but knowing that this is what I wanted to spend my life doing. I move on to my colleagues at NYU, where they have stretched my sociological imagination beyond anything I could have imagined, and been able to do that within the most supportive home I could have ask for, for over three decades. Next, to my wonderful graduate students, and I say this in all truth that I've learned every bit as much from you as you have learned from me. And to my many colleagues, coauthors, research assistants over the years, again it could not have been done alone. And it is with you that has made my work not simply worthwhile but pleasurable and fun along the way, not just the outcome that mattered but the process of getting there. Some people have said that all sociological work is autobiographical but mine, probably comes closest to anyone they know. And for that, I have to thank my family, particularly my spouse, my partner in life, I think there's a better word for it, John Mollenkopf, and my wonderful daughter, Emily who can't be here tonight. They have not only been there to support me but they've taught me by their own example that it's possible to integrate love and work and equality all in one package. A package that I hope, we as sociologists can help everyone, all human beings strive for. To the ASA, first of course for recognizing Jessie Bernard and by using her example to make it how clear the importance of the work that gender scholars do. And how it's not simply a work about gender but about the human condition, the social condition and how we come to see all human beings as those who are worthy of being considered whole and equal. Finally, I suppose to all those path-breaking gender scholars who came before me, who worked with me and who are yet to come. It is certainly a cliché but no understatement to say that I stand on the shoulders of giants and I only that we can pass the torch to all of those to come, to continue this

important work. There are certainly a lot yet to be done. It has been a life long privilege of mine to be a member of this pioneering community. Not just a privilege but an inspiration and an inspiration that I get every morning when I wake up and I face the work that I have to do and ask myself, how is it that we all work so hard, and this is it, we do it, because the things we work on matter to us, they have meaning to us and I think that they can contribute to making the world a better place. So just a very general comment here, the Gender Revolution is one of the most profound, all-encompassing and I think liberating revolutions that we are fortunate to be living through. I think it's -- applies for any era and not just our own. And it's been my enormous good fortune to live and work in these times. I take pride in sociology's contributions to recognizing the importance of gender, to addressing the roots of inequality and to providing a roadmap of change for the future. And that's a future for all of us, not just women, not just gender scholars but for all of humanity when we can't see ourselves as humanist who are fully embracing with what that possibility means. So for all of these reasons, I can't express in words the degree of honor that I feel in accepting this award, the degree of humility that I feel, of gratitude. And I -- and in my sociological optimism amid the very real and deepening challenges we face, I express a great hope for the future for women and men alike. And I look forward to what sociology can do to bring that future about. Thank you.

DR. ROBIN E. WAGNER-PACIFICI: The Public Understanding of Sociology Award is given annually to advance the public understanding of scholarship in Sociology, Sociological Research and among the general public. Please welcome, Elizabeth Clifford, as she presents this year's recipient.

ELIZABETH J. CLIFFORD: This year, we award Ruth Milkman for her exemplary contributions to advance the public understanding of Sociology. She's a Professor of Sociology at the City of New York Graduate Center, an Academic Director of the Murphy Institute for Worker, Education and Labor Studies. Ruth Milkman provides a model of the engaged public sociologist. She has done through a combination of traditional and public scholarship. Her research has covered a wide span of issues related to inequality including work on labor violations, union membership, women and work, immigrant activism and paid family leave. She has authored or co-authored nine books including *Working for Justice*, *The L.A. Model of Organizing and Advocacy*, and written numerous articles, chapters, reviews and policy reports. Throughout her career, she has been instrumental in helping academics bring their research to the policy forefront. It is because of this tireless work and the impact she has had on fighting inequality in our society, that we honor Ruth Milkman with this year's Public Understanding of Sociology Award.

RUTH MILKMAN: Thank you, Elizabeth. I'm deeply humbled to have been chosen for this award. All my adult life, I have aspired to contribute to the mission that recognizes, namely, The Public Understanding of Sociology and to be honored by this body, the ASA for having done something along those lines is very gratifying to me. This award means a lot to me also because of the way it challenges the hierarchy of status that still dominates our profession. And I want to explain what I mean by that through a short story that's very deeply seared into my memory. The setting is a committee meeting at UCLA where I taught

for 21 years before returning to New York a few years ago. At this meeting, one of my former colleagues smirked that a highly accomplished -- a highly accomplished individual who wanted to join our department was, "One of those change the world types." I was tempted to reply, "Do you think the world is just fine the way it is?" But for once, I didn't do that. I decided to try to be strategic and so instead I pointed out that alongside, this candidate's outstanding commitments to changing the world, the Public Understanding of Sociology, if you will, he had a long list of impressive academic accomplishments and that worked. I prevailed in that particular conversation but today, I will be unstrategic and proudly confess to being one of those change the world types myself. As -- oh, well, thank you. As someone -- we all know this. Once famously put it, the point is not only to understand the world, we do want to do that but to change it. And if my work has played even a tiny role in doing that, it's been worth all the blood, sweat and tears not to mention unpleasant faculty meetings. So let me just use the rest of my brief time with you to thank a few of the people who've influenced me the most over the years. First, my late mother from whom I inherited my own commitment to social justice. She's not around to share this moment but really, there's no one I owe more too. My 21 year old son, Jonathan Lax is here tonight. And I'm proud to say that he too is a budding change the world type. Though, I think he's unlikely to follow me into Academia. I also want to thank two of my teachers from long ago. First, Peter Evans, from my undergraduate days at Brown, and Michael Burawoy, from when I was a graduate student at Berkeley. Both of them taught me a huge amount back in the day and both have since become treasured friends. I'm also very indebted to my many graduate students, both at UCLA and now at CUNY, virtually, all of them change the world types. I think -- I can't think of an exemption. Maybe there's one somewhere who've kind of kept me alive both politically and intellectually all these years. And finally, I want to call out to a few of my colleagues at CUNY. I don't -- I am not sure if they're in the room or not but, Stephanie Luce, Penny Lewis and Frances Fox Piven. Frances is an earlier recipient of this award and all three of them with whom I work closely now are daunting models of publicly engaged, teaching and scholarship, with whom I feel completely privileged to work. And finally, thanks to those who nominated me for this honor and to the committee that made the selection and to all of you for being here and for listening. Thanks very much.

DR. ROBIN E. WAGNER-PACIFICI: This next award, this Annual Award honors the intellectual tradition of Oliver Cox, Charles S. Johnson and E. Franklin Frazier. Please welcome, Deborah K. King as she presents this years recipient.

DEBORAH K. KING: In his 1897 essay, W.E.B Du Bois wrote about the paradoxes that the black intellectual must negotiate in conveying knowledge of the other across the color line. Today we honor a master's story teller about race, Elijah Anderson, as the 2013th recipient of the Cox-Johnson-Frazier Award. Let me highlight only a few of his many achievements. For over three and a half decades, in four solo-authored books, *A Place on the Corner*, *Streetwise*, *Code of the Street*, and most recently, *The Cosmopolitan Canopy* plus several edited volumes, 50 plus articles and counting. Elijah Anderson's sustained commitment to the analytical prowess and the narrative artistry of ethnography has produced

thought provoking and illuminating accounts of how people especially African-Americans and the urban poor, understand and conduct their lives under the shattering impacts of deindustrialization, drug wars, gentrification, the growing wealth gap and the enduring, is somewhat morphed manifestations of racial discrimination. As one recommender, rightly observed, few can boast of studying race in urban America as carefully, thoroughly and as sensitively as Elijah Anderson. And another edit, or of honoring the humanity of black Americans or what Du Bois would refer to as the soul of beauty of black Americans especially those community collaborators in his studies. Elijah Anderson has also been instrumental in the professional development and success of generations of ethnographers, educators and scholars. His former graduate students, young scholars of color and other colleagues wrote highly of him as a generous and dedicated mentor and as a contentious and constructive critic. Let me just make one last observation, the Dr. Anderson Scholarship, and impactful conferences have provided compelling accounts of what is at stake in the most important social justice battles of our time. His work resounds well beyond the walls of the academy, as community residents, media commentators and public officials have relied on his insights in shaping both politics and policy. Much like the men for whom this award is named, his life work reflects the spirit of outstanding scholarship, mentoring and social justice that animates this award. Please join me in honoring the 2013 recipient of the Cox-Johnson-Frazier Award, Elijah Anderson.

ELIJAH ANDERSON: I'm humbled, I'm humbled. And the men Frazier, Cox, Johnson, these are giants that we all stand on their shoulders. I was born in Mississippi Delta enduring the Great War. And my grandma, she was the midwife when I was born and she was very religious. She was a village doctor. And she named me Elijah. I got a brother named Joseph, too. He was deep into the Old and the New Testament. But the story that Wilkinson would tell was in the warmth of other sons, is -- it's part of my story, the Great Migration. My daddy fought at World War 2. Although if you watched Steven Spielberg's movie, in Saving Private Ryan, you don't see any black people. Then he was over there in France and in England and these places and told me one day, over beer, you know, I almost didn't come back. I said, "I'm glad you did come back, Daddy." He said, "The white people treated me so well in England." They got up off the bus seats and let him ride the bus and he said, "They were so polite to me. I enjoyed that so much." And I said, "Well, Daddy the US Army was saving them over there." He said, "I don't mind, but they were so polite." And almost stayed and we did come back and we moved from the Mississippi Delta to South Bend, Indiana. He worked in the factory for many, many years, Studebakers. My momma, she worked as a domestic -- and at first, I was a street kid and first thing I knew, I was in the Indiana University in Bloomington where I met Irving Zeitlin, became a mentor of mine. And later, maybe around the same time, Sheldon Stryker, who is here tonight. And I met Frank Westie who became a big mentor of mine. And from there, I went to the University of Chicago and there, I met Morris Janowitz, who was trying to reconfigure the Chicago school and many other colleagues that you all know. I won't name them all, but Gerald Suttles was a very important influence for me. And later Howard Becker, from Northwestern, major influence. And from there, I went Swarthmore College and I taught there for a

couple of years and then I was recruited by Penn. Renee Fox was instrumental in that quick recruitment, so was Erving Goffman, Debbie [inaudible], Philip Rieff. And these people became mentors of mine at Penn. And later, I went to Yale. And sometimes it feel like I'm on my own, but we have people like Julia Adams and others who have been very, very helpful, as well, in terms of just being people who support and, Sonny Morris and all that. And my work in many ways has been a kind of telling up my own story but through sociology. Flannery O'Connor has a wonderful book out called *Mystery and Manners*. And in those books, she points out the significance of ones own story. How ones own story is the one true thing. And even though we may not admit it, may not knowledge it, but often times we're in someway telling that story as we write, as we think to the questions we ask. And from people like Howard Becker and others -- as an ethnographer, I've been deeply inspired. But the big issue that comes in mind when I combine all of these mentors and teachers is this goal to apprehend, comprehend, to understand and then represent accurately social life. And this is what I've been doing over the years of my career. I must also thank my mama who is a master sociologist. She has taught me everything I know. My daddy, my wife has been very, very helpful, Nancy Anderson, and all that. And even my two children, Caitlin and Luke. So, without further do, I just want to say thank you for this. I'm humbled. Thank you.

ROBIN E. WAGNER-PACIFICA: The award for excellence in reporting of social issues, honors individuals for their promotion of sociological findings and a broader vision of society. Please welcome, Joshua Gamson and he presents this year's recipient.

JOSHUA GAMSON: Hi, everybody. This year's ASA Awards for Excellence in the reporting of social issues, honors Ira Glass and the producers of *This American Life*. I have to warn you, they're not here. They were here earlier for a panel. Some of you were there. It was excellent. Each week, *This American Life* combines Glass' long standing interest in social issues with the story format in a revelatory sociological way. Using immerse of reporting and intimate interviews to show the back stage of social life. The sociological imagination, the connection between Biography and History, between individuals and social structures, animates every show. For these accomplishments and many others, we are delighted to honor Ira Glass, and the team from *This American Life* with this award. Ira Glass, as I said, wasn't able to make it to the ceremony. He has been kind enough to provide remarks in the way -- the manner to which we're accustomed. And in the meantime, I will accept this award on his behalf, please don't tell him. So, please join me in congratulating Ira Glass and listening to him one time through.

IRA GLASS: Thank you, ASA for this award. I'm Ira Glass. It's a great honor to be getting an award from people who are uniformly better educated than any of us who work on the radio show. What we do on our program, obviously, is not sociology. If anything we have it very easy compared with what all of you do. Usually, we just drop in on people's lives for a few days or a week as compared with the years that some of you spent. We don't need to grapple with statistics. I've literally never heard anyone say Chi-square in our office in 17 years of production. We can put music underneath our words as we speak. This makes us seem immeasurably more profound. [inaudible]. You should try it. If I stop this music on

and then I talk, right now it just seemed like some guy babbling on, right? I'm just talking -- going on like a person and then you start at the music again -- hold on. And now I talk, I literally seem smarter. Finally, last difference between what we make and what you guys make. The difference, I think is that we make at this heart is an entertainment, you know. We document and we describe the world, but not with the rigor and seriousness that you all do. With just to say that we are people who make candy. Getting an award today from people who make nourishing, thoughtfully made meals. Meals with lasting value, meals that add to the sum of what we understand. Okay. That's what this meant for. I know I'm starting to break down a little bit, but you understand what I'm saying, though. So, it's so nice to be taken seriously. We at the radio show are all touched that you think we are making some kind of contribution. We're honored to be awarded.

ROBIN E. WAGNER-PACIFICA: So, now I want some music. The distinguish career award for the practice of sociology honors outstanding contributions to sociological practice through the work facilitated or served as a model for the work of others. Work that has significantly advanced the utility of one or more specialty area in sociology. Please welcome Deborah Holtzman as she presents this year's recipient.

DEBORAH HOLTZMAN: Thank you. It is with great pleasure that I present the 2012 distinguish career for the practice opposite side sociology award. As I said in the program, I cannot think of anyone more deserving of this award than Prof. Donald W. Light. Prof. Light's work which expands over four decades is in an area near and dear to my heart which is public health. Through his many prestigious appointments his contributions to health policy and health equity both in the United States and abroad have been extraordinary. His accomplishments in these areas epitomized every aspect of what this award honors. Work that has served as a model for others, work that has advanced specialty areas in sociology ad work that has been widely recognized outside the discipline for it's impact in advancing human health and welfare. Please join me in welcoming Donald W. Light to the podium.

DONALD W. LIGHT: Oh, this is such a wonderful afternoon. So many distinguished, marvelous sociologists contributing to making this a better world. And I feel really humbled to be among them today. Especially since commercial interest are compromising higher education and several academic disciplines, particularly in some other countries. But sociology stands out with its powerful critics of social and justices. I'm indebted to my chairperson and dean and to many friends and colleagues who have helped in multi year campaigns against barriers to access and institutional corruption. This includes the organization of women, the American association for retired persons and the [inaudible] Legal Defense Fund which knowledge and particularly successful long term campaigns described in the award statement. Also to our cap plan and the center for Bio Ethics at Harvard. The curing campaign concerns prescription drugs as the fourth leading cause of death in the United States. Largely and due to the failure of the FDA and the medical profession to protect patients from harmful drugs when there are

usually safer alternatives. I'm especially grateful to my wife, Nancy and to our children Peter and Holly. Without their support, this advocacy would not be possible. Thank you very much.

ROBIN E. WAGNER-PACIFICA: The distinguish contribution to teaching award is given to honor outstanding contributions to the undergraduate and or graduate teaching and learning of sociology that improve the quality of teaching. Please welcome Rebecca Bach as she presents this year's recipient.

REBECCA BACH: Good evening. I'm pleased to announce that we have two recipients this year of the distinguish contributions to teaching award. I will be announcing them in alphabetical order. Our first recipient is Rose M. Brewer, professor and Morris Alumni distinguish professor of Africa -- excuse me, Afro American and African studies, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. Brewer is recognized for a significant contribution to transforming the undergraduate curriculum into crating an inclusive classroom. Over the past 25 years, Brewer has been instrumental in the movement to incorporate immerging scholarship of gender race in class into the curricula of sociology and the liberal arts more broadly. Her 2007 book with Walda Katz-Fishman and Lisa Albrecht, the critical classroom, education for liberation and movement building will continue to influence teaching and learning in classroom throughout the world. Our second recipient is Jay R. Howard. Jay is professor and dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at Butler University. Howard is selected for a career of outstanding contributions to the scholarship of teaching and learning. Howard has played a leadership role in developing resources for teaching scholars on both the knots and bolts issues of stimulating classroom discussion and developing affective writing assignments, as well the broader pedagogical issues of the undergraduate liberal arts education. Howard's scholarship on the teaching of the introductory course as showcase in his recent book with Nancy Greenwood, First Contact, Teaching and Learning Introductory Sociology. Please welcome both of them.

ROSE M. BREWER: I know that teaching is a calling for me and I'm honored and pleased to receive this ASA award. Teaching moves me and into the source of great challenge and possibility. I believe in the critical sociological tradition of engagement. I am and activist scholar who presses my students to understand the world as they were to change it. I give much appreciation to all who have taught me. And there have been many from that first time I was thrown into an undergraduate classroom as a graduate student at Indiana University. To my current work in the department of African-American and African studies, teaching many sociological graduate students at the University of Minnesota. I like to left up my parents who are no longer with me, all of my students, my son Sundiata who is here today and my wonderful teacher colleagues, Bernice McNairy Barnett, Walda Katz-Fishman, David Pillow, Lisa Albrecht, Anita Gonzalez and Jerome Scott, thank you all so very much. Thank you.

JAY R. HOWARD: Maybe I should start talking while the music is playing. I've been fortunate throughout my career to be a member of communities that have prioritized teaching and learning. This was true in my undergraduate days at Indiana University South Band where faculty took an interest in me a first generation, non traditional student. And in my graduate school days at the University of Notre Dame

where my efforts in teaching were affirmed and encouraged. I've been part of both Indiana and Butler Universities, two institutions that value teaching and learning. At IU, I became part of a group that brought together award winning teachers from all eight campuses. As the old marketing pitch went, IU is one university with eight front doors. However, at Columbus where I work, we weren't an independent campus, so, we didn't qualify as a front door. We call ourselves IU's basement window. So, from IU's basement window early in my career, Keith Roberts, my nominator for this award, thank you Keith, gave me some good advice. He told me, "Don't put all your eggs in the local campus basket. Inevitably, there will be times when you don't feel appreciated. You need professional organizations to provide some balance don't affirmation. So, I followed Keith's advice and immerse myself in the North Central Sociological Association and of course the ASA. I was silly enough to volunteer to charity NCSA teaching committee as a second year assistant professor. And the year or two later, volunteered to run to what was then the ASA section on undergraduate education council. And to my surprise, I found myself in both roles. A little hint for graduate students and junior faculty, these are voluntary organizations. They need free labor. And I know myo9u valued teaching and learning even if you can't admit to your dissertation director. So, I encouraged you to volunteer to become a part of the ASA section on teaching and learning. If you teach, you belong. Join those communities that value teaching and learning. Finally, I want to say thank you to the members of all those communities who shaped me and particularly to my wife, Brenda who is here with me today. It takes a community or perhaps I should say, it takes communities, plural, to raise a teacher.

ROBIN E. WAGNER-PACIFICA: The distinguish book award is presented annually for a single book or monograph published in the three preceding calendar years. Please welcome, Jeffery Olick as he presents this year's recipient.

JEFFEREY OLICK: Each year, the distinguish scholarly publication award committee reads and evaluates more than 60 nominated books. And great many of them, excellent works a scholarship and quite a few are worthy of significant distinction. But this year, one book stood out as particularly meritorious. Capitalizing on Crisis, The Political Origins of the Rise of Finance by Greta Krippner, shows how and why political leaders embrace financialization as a solution to the problems of inequality. And how doing so, they politicized the significant source of conflict in American society. It tells a remarkably insightful story about a remarkably complex and exceptionally complex process. And as such, represents the best of contemporary American sociology. It is such a great pleasure on behalf of the committee and the association to present the distinguish the scholarly publication award to Greta Krippner for Capitalism --Capitalizing on Crisis, The Political Origins of the Rise of Finance.

GRETA R. KRIPPNER: It's quite an honor to receive this award from the American Sociological Association. I receive this award feeling more than a little guilty, however. As anyone who has written a book or any academic product for that matter knows our work is really collective in nature. And yet, we receive recognition as individuals. I'm continually astonished that so much of the intellectual work that we

do in our profession, we do anonymously or nearly anonymously and often without thanks or gratitude. The comments casually tossed out at a seminar that plants a seed, but then grows into the core of an argument. That said to blind [inaudible] your comments that changes the angle or vision on a problem in a fundamental way. These contributions critical, though they are, go up into the ether at moments like this one. I do today, however, have the privilege of directly acknowledging a few individuals who made this work possible. And unfortunately given our strict time limit, I can only mention a few individuals. There are many who will go unnamed and my apologies to those -- to those -- to those folks. I first need to recognize the formative role of four remarkable scholars, Jink Collins, Eric Wright, Fred Black and the late Giovanni Argee. All of whom supported an unconventional project from its early beginnings as a dissertation at the University of Wisconsin. At the other end of this book, very long projectory< i also want to acknowledge my wonderful, stimulating and supportive colleagues at the University -- at the University of Michigan. I simply can't imagine a more conducive place to write this book and I am deeply grateful to be at an institution that shares my values as a scholar so fully. Finally, on a moiré personal note, it's difficult to conceive that a brief 150 pages could take nearly 10 years to write and encompass so much suffering and so much joy. I'm grateful that my partner Sandro Levitski and our daughter, Asmay are here today to see me receive this award and your doubt of where of [inaudible]. Maybe she's been doing her best to disrupt this ceremony for the past 20 minutes. Apologies to the previous speakers. I hope it's not too disruptive. Sandy and Asmay have helped to contain this suffering and share the joy. And everyday they make books and book prices seem small and unimportant. Thank you.

ROBIN E. WAGNER-PACIFICA: The W.E.B. Du Bois career award of distinguished scholarship honors scholars who have shown outstanding commitment to the profession of sociology and whose cumulative work has contributed in important ways to the advancement of the discipline. Please welcome, Cornelia B. Flora as she presents this year's recipient.

CORNELIA B. FLORA: One of Joe Feagin's sociological heroes is the activist sociologist W.E.B. Du Bois. Feagin's sociological research is focused on what Du Bois, himself regarded as a prominent problem of the 20th Century, the problem of the color line. It continues into the 21st Century. Joe is committed to dissecting the sociological dynamics of white racism with an heir to the institutional and social structural context in which racism emerges. His concepts, systematic racism and systemic -- sorry, systemic racism and systemic sexism, influence sociologists world wide. Most of his extensive scholarship uses race, class, gender lenses. Students -- student engagement and mentoring are integral part of this scholarship and a significant theoretical and empirical contribution to field of racial -- racial ethnic relations, the new urban community sociology, sex and gender and equality, race, gender and class analysis and the sociology of education. Joe is a 1999-2000 president of the ASA. His impact on the field of sociology is enormous. Not only because of the quantity of his work, but because of his intellectual and socio-political importance. I introduce to you, Joe Feagin.

JOE R. FEAGIN: It is an especially a great honor for me to receive an award named after the prominent sociologist W.E.B Du Bois. I consider Du Bois not only to be one of the greatest sociologists of this or any other era, but also to be one of the greatest Americans of all time. It was Robert K. Merton, the first recipient of this award, who reinforced that statement that's already been cited twice tonight, that we all stand on the shoulders of giants, like Du Bois, before us. I would add to that famous line that we also stand on the shoulders of giants around us in the present. I would like to thank the teachers from whom I have learned much and especially the many colleagues and students from whom I've learned to even more over nearly four decades. Thank you for helping make my sociological research and teaching ever sharper and more relevant to the progressive societal change that this society so badly needs and thus, to make this award possible. Thank you very much.

JENNIFER L. GLASS: It's my great pleasure to be able to introduce our president this year, Cecilia Ridgeway. Cecilia is a fellow Texan. Born in Edinburgh, Texas but educated at the University Of Michigan and receiving her PhD from Cornell University. A child of the 60s, friends and colleagues remember Cecilia participating in student protest and wondering at a very early stage in her career, how durable inequalities like gender and race persist even as other institutions morph and change around them. As a woman at the forefront of the changes brought by the Women's Movement of the 1970s, Cecilia was an early pioneer in a professoriate that was not openly friendly to women and still close to them at its highest echelons. Cecilia's first position after receiving her PhD was at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee an urban branch of the larger UW system. I'm reminded of the many other strong feminist scholars who later made names for themselves and their research, but started their careers without the pedigreed support of the IV League or larger RO1 public universities behind them. Paula England, Nancy Folbre and Jesse Bernard herself, whose named award Cecilia with later win. That was the career ladder for many women until the past couple of decades. But I'm pleased to report that the cream does rise to the top and sometimes meritocracy does work to recognize those in the trenches with unusual ability and persistence. In Cecilia's case, I believe it was a fierce intellectual curiosity and willingness to persevere in asking the important questions about the interactional basis of inequality that pushed her to the top of our discipline. In 1985, she moved to the University of IOWA joining the vibrant group of researchers involved in the center for the study of group processes and their inquiry into status characteristics and their operation in creating and sustaining stratification by race and gender. She was a central figure in building the socio-psychological strength of the Sociology Department at the University of IOWA. Then later, was key to the transition of Stanford's Department when its founding members began to retire and she moved there in 1991. As sociologist Ed Lawler commented, building and sustaining strong academic programs and departments requires perspective, good judgment, persistence and much patience. Cecilia has a heavy dose of all those qualities. Since 2004, Cecilia has helped the Lucie Stern Professorship in the Social Sciences at Stanford University. But Cecilia views her work as a kind of activism too. Uncovering the processes by which people are oppressed and the mechanisms underlying oppression is empowering for the oppressed and necessary for change. In 2004, she said, "We were not

going to understand gender inequality or other inequalities unless we understood the interpersonal processes that mediated and enacted institutional structures and larger patterns of inequality." For that work, Cecilia has received numerous honors. In 2005, she won the Cooley-Mead Award for Lifetime Contribution to Distinguished Scholarships in Social Psychology. In 2008, she was selected the SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer for career contributions to feminist research. In 2009, she won the ASA's Jessie Bernard Award for Distinguished Career Contribution to the Study of Gender and in 2009, was selected a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. That's a lot to get out. As her former student and colleague Shelley Correll states, "As a colleague and mentor, Cecilia is gentle with her guidance, scrupulous in her integrity and one heck of a leader. She loves music, dancing, food, wine and rye, witty conversation. She has an insatiable intellectual curiosity leading to a broad interest in sociological research on topics far field from her own. What's more, Cecilia is not the least bit overbearing or pedantic, you are invited to teach her to join in the intellectual gaiety to help produce it." So, let me tell you a little bit about Cecilia's wide ranging in interest. They've carried her to every part of the world. She's been to Australia, Lamu Island, the Galapagos and the Amazon, where she reportedly slept on a riverbank and thwarted knife wielding attackers. For years, Cecilia regularly under took Alaskan treks that involved being bush piloted into the wilderness and dropped somewhere very, very cold. But today, she is here with us. So, please join me and making this a very, very warm welcome to the 2013 President of the American Sociological Association. Professor Cecilia Ridgeway.

CECILIA L. RIDGEWAY: Thanks. Thank you. I mean, thanks so much for both what Jennifer said and also for the honor of your presence and the honor that you've given me and having such an exciting set of colleagues to work with throughout the discipline, so I'm grateful for that. I'm also, by the way, cognizant that you can only sit on that seat so long, and would like me to move along. So, I will -- I'll do that. But I do want to talk about something that I think matters or I wouldn't have, you know, raise the topic. And that is -- I want to talk about why status matters for inequality. As sociologists, we want to do more than just describe inequality. We want to understand the mechanisms by which inequality is actually made. And potentially, of course, if we know the mechanisms, maybe we can unmake it. To do this more effectively and particularly to find the mechanisms is sustain, obdurate patterns of inequality. I argue that we need to open up the traditional setting of inequality. We need to first of all, better incorporate cultural as well as material processes. We need the more thoroughly integrate group difference-based inequality, like, race and gender rather than treat them as side topics and -- from economic inequality. And we need to look across levels of analysis. You've seen that micro or macro on the screen way too often, I realized. But we need to look across levels of analysis to find links between micro and macro processes that mutually sustain durable patterns of inequality. Well, I'm going to make a case for these points that I've been pushing on you throughout the meetings by examining a relatively neglected form of social inequality which is social status, because it seems to me that this illustrates each of these issues. My goal is to show why status matters by showing how status access an independent force in the making of inequality based on gender, race and class. We're all familiar with Max Weber's classic set of distinctions

-- resources, power and status as basis of inequality. We move along here. I think I'm getting myself behind. Contemporary accounts of stratification, right? I don't think that worked, right? I didn't get there. Oops. Never mind. All right. I actually meant to be further long. There. I think I have to point this thing right, that's an issue. Sorry about that. We're all familiar with Max Weber's classic analysis, right? But contemporary accounts of stratification and sociology have focused primarily on resources and power, but what about social status? That's inequality based on differences in honor and a scheme in respect. Now, it's often been treated as a side topic in American Sociology. Possibly because it's considered the weakest or the least causally significant of Weber's triad, that is in contrast the resources in power. Status has not been seen as an independent mechanism by which inequality between individuals and groups is actually made. This I argue is a major misjudgment that has greatly limited our ability to understand how stratification actually works in an advanced industrial society like our own. At a micro-level, it limits our understanding of what is at stake in social inequality. When we think about inequality as a mere struggle for power and resources, we forget how much people care about their sense of being valued by others in the society to which they belong. The public acknowledgement of their worth, this is status. People care about status quite as intensely as they do money and power, people often want even money as much for the status that it brings as its exchange value. An airport shoeshine man once asked me what I did. When I told him, he said, "My daughter wants to go to Stanford and be a physician. What I do is just for her. I want her to be somebody." Now, what's that about? Power? I don't think so, not so much. Money? Yeah, it's a little bit about money. But above all, it's about the public recognition of his daughter's social worth. It's about social status. Clearly, we cannot understand the fundamental human motivations that enter into the struggle for precedents that lies behind inequality if we do not also take into account status. At a more macro-level, treating status as a side topic has specifically limited our ability to understand how status-based social differences such as gender and race are woven into organizations of resources and power. It's even limited our ability to fully understand how class itself is reproduced through organizations of resource and power, but we know a little more about that. Our focus here on this more macro aspect of why status matters, but as I do so, I want to keep in mind the micro aspect of how important status is as a motivation for individuals. Excuse me. I believe there are two reasons why status processes have been difficult to digest for standard sociological accounts of stratification. One is that status, in contrast of resources in power is based primarily in cultural beliefs rather than directly upon material arrangements. That if status is based on widely shared beliefs about the social categories or types of people that are ranked by society as more esteemed and respected compared to others. These cultural beliefs work their effects on inequality primarily, and this is the second reason why it's been hard to digest, they work their effects primarily at the socio-relational actor level of-of everyday social relations by shaping people's expectations for themselves and others and their consequent actions in social context. Both the culturalists and the micro level aspects of status processes, contrast with the materialist in structural level perspectives of most analysis of stratification. Yet, to understand how patterns of inequality actually persists in an obdurate way despite on going turbulent change on technology, social

institutions, economic change, how do these patterns keep going, right? To understand that, right? We have to understand the relationship between cultural status beliefs on one hand and material organizations of resource and power, on the other hand. This is a problem that actually my own research on status and the resilience of gender inequality forced me to confront. And what follows -- I'll first outline three broad reasons why status matters for the larger structure of inequality. Then I'm going to shift to how it matters by describing three specific processes by which status independently creates material inequalities between people from different social groups. And then finally to illustrate the impact to these specific effects, I'm going to offer examples from recent research that demonstrate them for gender, race and class inequality. Okay. So, why? Why do cultural status beliefs about social difference matter? Well, three fundamental reasons. First, as Tilly pointed out, several years ago. Inequality that is based purely on the organizational control of resources and power is inherently unstable. It gives rise to a constant struggle between the dominant and subdominant individuals, it's an entail, to persist, that is for inequality to become durable inequality, control over resources and power has to become consolidated with the categorical difference between people such as race or gender or lifestyle, right? Now, why does this consolidation stabilize the inequality? It does so because it transforms the situational control over resources into a status difference between types of people that are evaluatively ranked in terms of how diffusely better they are. Research shows that status beliefs develop quickly among people under conditions in which a categorical difference is at least partially consolidated with material inequality. Specifically, status construction studies have shown that when control over resources in a social setting is correlated with a salient categorical difference among those present, like, say race, people quickly link the appearance of mastery in the situation that the resources create with the associated difference between the types of people and in this way, people form status beliefs that the type of people who have more resources, say the whites, are actually better than the types with fewer resources. Furthermore, and this the nasty part. Since -- or one of the nasty parts. An even more nasty part, let's say. Since both the advantaged and disadvantaged groups experience the apparent superiority of the advantage type in the context, the resulting status beliefs that the -- that the context encourages and take on, are shared by the dominants as well we sub-dominants. In other words, the sub-dominants see it and think, "How can I deny it?" Right? And that legitimates the inequality. Contemporary status beliefs assert that people in a particular category, say, whites or man, or the middle class, are not only more respected but also presumed to be more competent especially at what counts most in society. They're more competent than people in the contrasting categories. Right? Okay. Now, this presumption of greater competence implies that higher status people have fairly won their better jobs and their higher incomes on the basis of superior merit. And the -- their -- in that way, it provides an especially powerful form of legitimation in an ostensibly meritocratic society such as our own. By transforming mere control of resources into more essentialized differences among types of people, status beliefs fuel perceptions of difference. That is status processes make us focus on and exaggerate social differences and this is the second basic reason why status beliefs matter for inequality. The categorical differences that are recruited to become status

differences to stabilize inequality can be amplifications of pre-existing differences, like say, sex or ethnicity, but they can also be differences constructed entirely for the purpose of asserting the status superiority of the richer and more powerful people as in the case of class based manners and lifestyle as of course both Bourdieu and Weber pointed out. In this way, status processes are deeply implicated in the making of obdurate patterns of inequality based on social differences. Few sociologists of course, would actually deny that status stabilizes resources and power inequalities. But that in itself does not make status an independent and you may say, "Well, that doesn't make it an independent source, just a reactive force," right? That in itself doesn't make status an independent source of material reality. However, the development of status beliefs about different categories of people also has a third effect that in my view is the most important of the three. It's also a whole lot less recognized amongst us in sociology. Once widely shared status beliefs form about a social difference, they constitute that difference as an independent dimension of inequality with its own sustaining dynamic. That is when a difference becomes a status difference. That difference becomes a separate factor that generates its own material inequalities between people above and beyond those available because of their personal control of resources. Consider the following example, say men in a given society acquire an advantage in resources and power compared to women. That fosters the development status beliefs that men are better. Once that gender status beliefs develop however, they advantage men because they are men and not because they're rich or more powerful. A male leader for instance with the same structural position and access to material resources as a female leader, right, wields more influence than she does because others assumed he is a little more capable in the job than she is. These gender status beliefs give men an advantage even over women who are just as rich and just as powerful as they are. As a consequence, status beliefs about differences such as gender or race or class based lifestyle give those differences an autonomous dynamic that can continually reproduce inequalities and material outcomes on the basis of those differences. This autonomous dynamic operates primarily at the social relational level of self other expectations and people's behaviors and social relational context. And yet it is the key, as I will argue later, to how status based social differences are written into material organizations of resources especially in a society that values, thinks it values meritocracy and enacts legal constraints on explicitly discriminatory organizational rules. The development of cultural status beliefs about group differences then partially disaggregates those differences from direct control of resources and power and it gives those differences as status distinctions independent causal force. This in turn creates a kind of reciprocal causal interdependence between cultural status beliefs about social groups, on one hand and material inequalities between those groups on the other hand. This interdependence has an element of dynamic tension. Control over resources by the status advantage group is never complete and changing material conditions push back against the cultural status beliefs potentially modifying or eventually eroding them. And yet once established, widely shared status beliefs have huge resilience so that they become a powerful independent force for the perpetuation of patterns of inequality based on the social difference. In the rest of my remarks, I'm going to move down from this way high abstract level I'm talking on now

and describe more specifically how cultural status beliefs acting through micro processes at the social relational level independently create material inequalities based on the basis of the social difference. That means I'm going to turn from why status matters to how it matters. But first, in order to do that, we need to know a little more about status beliefs themselves. Now, status is an inherently multilevel form of inequality. In that, it involves both hierarchies of an -- of esteem and influence on -- among individuals, right? And hierarchies of social esteem between groups and society. Decades of expectations, states research however, has demonstrated that status processes among actors are -- are largely driven by widely shared status beliefs about the worthiness and competence of people in the social groups to which the actors belong. So, status beliefs about group difference are the key to status processes at both the individual and the group level and that's why I'm focusing on them. Social psychological research on contemporary American stereotypes clearly documents the existence of widely shared status beliefs in contemporary America. This research shows that status beliefs are a central component of the widely known stereotypes of virtually all the social groups by which inequalities are patterned in our society. This includes gender, race, age, occupation, education, class categories, like, blue collar versus middle class or rich versus poor. In these stereotypes, the perceived competence and agentic capacity attributed it to people in one group compared to the contrasting group is directly and powerfully linked to their relative status. The higher status, the more competent. The lower status, the less competent. These stereotypes and the status beliefs that they contain, right? Are consensual in this society. Not that people agree with them, but that every -- virtually, everyone shares them as cultural knowledge about what most people think. Even if they don't think themselves, they think most others think them. Finally, and importantly the presumption that most people, most other people think this way, that most people, hold these beliefs, gives these beliefs force in social relations, because individuals expect others to judge them according to these beliefs. They have to take status beliefs into account in their own behavior whether or not they personally agree with them, like them, want to go along with them. They feel the force of them in everyday behavior. How then do these widely shared status beliefs shape social relations in ways that are independently consequential for material inequality? I'm going to just describe three processes that have these effects. What I call status biases in judgments and behavior, associational reference biases and reactions to status challenges. I'll start with status biases. For status beliefs to bias people's judgment and behavior, they have to become implicitly salient to the actors, that sort of pop up on the radar for them a little bit. Not necessarily consciously, most often, unconsciously, but they have to just loom up a little bit, come up on standby. And whether or not this happens, depends on the social context that people are in, but it depends in ways that we can systematically specify. Research shows that status beliefs about a difference become salient in context in which, guess what? People differ on the social distinction, say, a mixed sex or a mixed race or a mixed class setting. But they also become salient in context, whether or not people differ in which the social difference is culturally understood to be relevant to the goals of the setting such as for instance, a gender or race or class type setting. When status in place were implicitly salient, they bias people's expectations for their own and the

other's competence and their suitability for authority in the situation. These implicit biases are stronger. The more relevant the social differences perceived to be to the goals of the setting. So these biases are stronger in gender or race or class type institutional settings. For instance, at least -- elite universities for class and race and engineering classrooms for gender. Biased expectations for competence and authority are important because they have self-fulfilling effects on people's behaviors and outcomes in the situation. By suddenly shaping behavior, status beliefs create inequalities between otherwise equal men and women, whites and non-whites, middle class and working people. Inequalities emerge for instance in assertive versus differential behavior. In actual task performance, how well you do in the setting, in attributions of ability, in influence and in situational awards, awards that are passed out in the situation. These implicit status biases shape both the supply side and the demand side of people's everyday efforts to achieve the resources and positions of power by which we gauge inequality on -- material inequality. Status biases affect the confidence and energy with which people put themselves forward in the situation. Do you speak up? Are you a little freaked out and hold back? They simultaneously effect whether or not you speak up or not, others' willingness to pay attention to you, to listen to you and to positively evaluate what you're saying in the situation. The status advantaged speak up eagerly and are sure they have something important to say. While the status disadvantaged hesitate and think -- no one -- this will be dumb, right? The same idea sounds better coming from the advantaged than the disadvantaged. And the advantaged seem to themselves and others to be somehow the type for leadership. As a result, the local high-rise of influence and prominence that develop over multiple encounters occurring in many contexts take on systematic, regular, structurally shaped forms, right? These rarely noticed status biases repeat over and over again through the many goal-oriented encounters that -- taking place in consequential organizational environments such as schools and work places and health organizations. The cumulative result is at that -- those more privileged status groups, men, whites, the middle class are systematically tracked into more privileged positions; positions with more resources and power contributing as an independent force to the patterning of material inequality based on gender, race and class attributes. Through the same implicit cumulative processes, men, whites and the middle class are also apparently, revealed to be simply better at valued social tasks. I'm sorry, they're just better, right? At valued social tasks than are women and people of color and the working class. Justifying and legitimating the resource and power inequalities between the groups. Although we participate everyday in these social relational effects of status beliefs, we rarely see how they involve us in the production of who is better and more deserving of resources advantage. And it's because we do not see this production or our involvement in it, that status legitimizes inequality in an apparently meritocratic society. A second means by which status beliefs about group difference create material inequalities is by introducing systematic biases in who people prefer for association and exchange. People's first reaction to group difference is to prefer people like themselves but when the -- a difference becomes a status difference, both the high and the low status members recognize that the higher status group is more socially respected. And since the status of those with whom you associate affects your own status, this

creates systematic incentives for actors to associate with high status others. You all know this, remember high school. Consequently -- or how about ASA? That's better. A more close to home example. But their effect then of course, is that status belief intensify the in-group bias of high status group member to see every reason to prefer that people like themselves. Those little clusters of high status people talking to themselves and paying no attention to anybody else. See, every reason to prefer people like themselves -- not only for sociability but to recommend and hire for jobs. It counts. But the same status beliefs blunt the in-group bias of low status group members who become torn between sticking with their own group or favoring those and others. Should I stay with my friends and talk? Should I try to talk to those high status people? The effects of status based associational biases on actual patterns of association are complex of course because they depend on structural constraints in the environment that shape who's available for association. You can't associate with someone who's not available, right? At the very least however, these biases undermine associational solidarity among those from lower status group and that has consequences. Grayson and colleagues for instance found that even controlling for the socio-economic neighborhood of -- neighbor -- excuse me, the socio-economic nature of neighborhoods. White still preferred -- in economic equal neighborhoods, white still preferred all white over racially mixed neighborhoods but blacks preferred mixed overall black neighborhoods. I would argue that's a status effect. In organizational context, associational biases also feed the process of cloning by high status actors. As Kanter pointed out long ago, the inherently uncertain conditions of exercising power encouraged powerful organizational actors to favor socially similar others they feel they can rely on. The extent that these high powerful actors or members of high status, gender, race and class groups -- the people that they network with and the ones they promote in the organization will also be disproportionately from the same high status groups but organizational actors from low status gender, race and class groups have divided interest between supporting those from their own group and try to network with higher status actors who can foster them in the organization. Polls -- even contemporary polls for instance, show that women often prefer to work for male bosses. The systematic result again is to direct people from higher status group smoothly towards positions of power and resources while creating network barriers for those from lower status groups. Okay, so the third process here, reactions to status or resistance to status challenges. The third mechanism by which status beliefs create material inequalities derives from the implicit motives that status beliefs create for people in high status groups to defend their valued sense of group position. I like the light all shining on me, right, to defend that position. When individuals from low status groups engage in behavior perceived to challenge that, right, to the high status position, they frequently encounter -- these low status people who try to challenge them, frequently encounter a hostile backlash reaction from others especially high status others. White women, as many studies have shown, white women who engage in assertively dominant behavior are compared to similar acting white men, dislike this domineering. They're more likely -- studies have show to be sabotaged by their colleagues on a task and also more likely to be judged as less hireable. As Laurie Rudman who has done many of these studies show and her colleagues show, these backlash responses are not caused by

the perception that these women are not appropriately warm but rather that, these women are challenging the gender status hierarchy by acting too dominant. Livingston and his colleagues have shown that African-American men who act assertively dominant elicits similar backlash reactions. Bobo who has argued a great deal of racial prejudice in contemporary US, can be understood as a defense of racial group position. Behaviors perceived -- I don't know specific studies of backlash for challenges the class hierarchy but I bet if we ran them, we'd find them. While status bias and associational bias produce relatively unthinking biases in favor of the status privilege and against the less status privilege defense of the status hierarchy results in more intentionally hostile constraining reactions to put in place lower status individuals who are perceived to go too far. Tilly argued some years ago, that inequality in groups and society -- between groups, excuse me. Inequality between groups and society is maintained by a combination of exploitation and opportunity hoarding by the highest -- high ranking group. As scholars have noted though, this tells us much more about the interest of dominant groups, the why question then the how question of exactly how those dominant groups do it. How do they do exploitation and opportunity hoarding? I argue that status bias, associational bias and resistance to status challenges are culturally driven interpersonal processes that act a subtle but powerful mechanism by which exploitation and opportunity hoarding are actually accomplished by privileged gender, race and class groups. I think we ignore them at our peril. Thus far, I've talked about the effects of status beliefs as if they were equivalent, right? For gender, race and class and in some important ways, this is the case but it's also not at all the full story due to structural and cultural differences in the nature of these distinctions in the American context. In the paper version of this talk, I'm going to discuss this but I won't do so here in the entrants of your patience and time. Instead, now I'm going turn to some examples, some recent research that illustrate how status matters. That illustrate the process that show you mattering from material inequality and I'm going to have examples based on gender, race and class. The gender and class examples particularly highlight the effects of status biases and associational biases while the race example illustrates the consequential effects of reactions to status challenges. Okay. So, for gender I'm going to draw on my own work -- guess what, I'm going to draw on my own work to illustrate how status processes can help answer a fundamental question about, how gender inequality persist in the modern context where institutional and legal and market processes work against it. A wide range of research demonstrates that assumptions about the gendered characteristics of ideal workers for jobs and about the lesser value of women's work are stamped into the very structures and practices and procedures of the labor force and employment organizations. These gendered workplace structures in turn drive are the major sources and causes of inequality and wages, inequality and authority and even -- I would argue, the household division of labor. But how are gendered assumptions written into and stamped into workplace structures and procedures in the first place? The root mechanism I argue is the operation of gender status biases and gender associational biases working in the room at the social relational level as the new job definition, new -- the new evaluation system for pay, he new authority structure or the new way of working is created. Nelson and Bridges for instance showed that several widely used

organizational pay setting systems were developed in interpersonal decision making context in which dominant actors who were largely, white males denied women and other low status actors, a significant voice in the proceedings. They both gave them lesser access to the actual setting, that's an associational bias and once they were there, they also listened to them less. That's a status bias, right? So they get -- denied them, representation and voice in the setting. The result is, the pay practices that they developed were infused with gender status biases, what counts most, who's more competent and systematically whose worth more. Systematically disadvantage the pay for female dominated jobs. Once created, implicitly gendered organizational structures and procedures spread through institutional processes and persist through bureaucratic inertia. The cutting edge of gender inequality however, lies at sites of innovation where new types of work -- work and jobs are not a steady thing, it's constantly changing especially in the modern world. So this sites of innovation where new types of work and also new types of living are created outside the work world. Such sites tend to be small interpersonal settings and the outside largely of established organizations. Think of the students that initially started Google, right? Both the uncertainty of the task -- while we're doing something new and different here and we're going to try to do something, nobody's ever done it, so it's kind of uncertain. We're not sure what is either, so the uncertainty of the task and also the interpersonal -- we're all here in the garage, right? The interpersonal nature of the setting increases the likelihood that the participants will implicitly draw on interpersonal frames of reference to make sense of the setting. And as they do that, there's the convenient cultural frame of gender, right there to help them organize their new ways of working and as they draw on that frame to help make sense of their uncertain new setting. They implicitly, typically, unintentionally reinscribe cultural assumptions about gender status and gender difference into the new activities and procedures, who's going to do what, what's an important task, the new activities and procedures and forms of organization that they create in effect, reinventing gender and equality for a new era. In this way, I argue gender status processes, acting through cultural beliefs that shape interpersonal events function as a general mechanism by which gender inequality is rewritten in the new organizational forms and practices as they emerge allowing that inequality to persist in modified form over social and economic transformations in society. Okay. Example two here, right? Which deals with class. My example of how class based status processes shape material outcomes focuses on what I called gateway interactions. These are interpersonal encounters that take place in organizations such as educational work place or health institutions that mediate people's access to the valued life outcomes by which we judge in equality, like say a good job, income positions of power and health. Encounters with school officials are an example or a job interviews, visits to the doctor's office, these are all gateway encounters. Class based status beliefs are especially likely to become salient in gateway encounters when the participants differ in class background. And when that happens, the status biases that are revoked, status biases about competence that become introduced can have consequential material effects. [inaudible] for instance describe how a middle class physician expecting, presuming less confidence from a working class diabetes patients prescribes a simpler, something you can follow. A simpler but unfortunately less

effective, treatment regime than as suggested for the middle class patient. In the institutions in which gateway encounters occur, the dominant actors, doctors, educators, managers, professionals are overwhelmingly middle class. As a result, the work place, cultures and practices of these institutions are infused with the implicit but distinctive assumptions in values and taken for granted knowledge of the middle class. That in itself is an example of how class status as status not merely control of resources and power becomes embedded in organizational structures and power and noticed that that's analogies for the way gender gets stamped into the organizational procedures of organizations as well. Well, this is class being stamped into it. But in gateway encounters, the implicitly class nature of the social rules that govern the encounter have a further effect. They create a context in which the implicit interactional rules are better understood and more familiar to middle class petitioners, job applicant, patients, students more familiar to middle class petitioners than working class ones. This knowledge difference only reinforces to presume confidence differences evoked by status bias. So, the fumbling of the working class person who's a little less familiar with the rules only reinforces the middle class presumption that this person isn't really that confident. All right. La Rough is an example, and the visits to the pediatrician that she observed with middle class and working class parents and children. With the confidence of a class status equal middle -- the middle class mother prepped her son to not only answer the doctor's questions but to ask him questions in return, ask the doctor question. The boy did this and soon established a friendly banter that allowed the doctor to learn more about the child's eating habits and when he was taking his medications which he wasn't. The doctor found that up. With richer information, the doctor was able to offer more effective treatment. The working class mother in contrast seemed intimidated and hesitant in the face of the doctor's status superiority. Both she and her son gave minimal answers to the doctor's questions. It did not volunteer information. The outcome of this constrained, uneasy interaction was that the doctors knew less about the child and gave the mother limited feedback about anything she could do to improve his health. For working class people then, consequential gateway encounters are cross class status bias context that often invisibly frustrate their efforts to achieve the valued life outcomes that they want same as anyone else, the valued outcomes that are mediated in these encounters. Third example, with race. For an example of how racial status processes matter for power and resource inequality. We need look no further than contemporary political developments. They've coincided with events that could be perceived as challenges to the established racial status order of the U.S. Substantial recent immigration patterns and projections in the popular press, that whites will soon lose their position as the demographic majority have coincided with the election of an African-American president. Research on reactions to status challenges suggested at least some whites are likely to react to these events with status motivated political efforts to reassert their own privileged racial status position. Two recent internet experiments by Willer and colleagues clearly illustrate the status challenge reaction. In the first study, the researchers showed participants in one condition graphs depicting a declining white income advantage over, you know, whites, non-whites declining income advantage over non-whites. After exposure to this racial hierarchy threat, whites but not -- non-whites in the sample reported significantly greater support for

the Tea Party and they reported higher levels of symbolic racism. This is in comparison to a control group that saw a -- saw a grasp protecting -- depicting the simple persistence of white income advantage. In the second study, the researchers told all the -- all the participants that whites were rapidly declining portion of the population would soon be a minority. That was a racial hierarchy threat. And after that racial hierarchy threat, the participants were again asked their views about the Tea Party but that movement was described for half the participants is backing among other things, actions directed at the racial order such as immigration controls, welfare cuts and things like that. For the rest of the participants, the Tea Party was simply described in libertarian free-market terms. Reacting to the racial status threat, whites identified significantly more with The Tea Party when an included racial order policies than they did in the purely libertarian condition. The views of non-whites were unaffected, all right. These results suggest that white's perceptions of challenges to the racial status position do in fact increase their support for political organizations they perceive as upholding the traditional racial status hierarchy. This in turn has potential consequences for evolving power relations between racial groups. There's hope. I'm ending. Okay. So I'm saying then, that to understand the mechanisms by which social inequality is actually made in society. I argue that we need to more thoroughly incorporate the effects of status along side those of resources and power and this is particularly the case if we want to understand the mechanisms behind durable, obdurate patterns of inequality. Ones that seemed to be with us and that we struggle to change over generations. These durable obdurate patterns of inequality and clear examples of those are ones that are based on gender, ones that are based on race in American society and ones based on class-based lifestyle, better people. As a basis for social and equality, status is distinctive and that it is based in cultural belief rather than directly on material arrangements and also distinctive because it works its effects primarily at the actor level -- basically out of sight. Works its effect out of sight primarily at the actor level of everyday social relations rather than at a larger structural level where we're more used to looking for these things. The ways in which status is distinctive present challenges for integrating it into our standard accounts of stratification. But the difficulties we encounter in incorporating status also illuminate all we have been missing and our efforts to understand the foundations of social inequality. It is status after all that drives group differences as organizing access of inequality in contrast to just individual differences in resources and power. And it is widely shared cultural status beliefs at the macro level that shaped everyday social relations at the micro level that bond, that weld group difference to positions of resources and power in society's consequential institutions and organizations. It's also such micro-macro status processes that implicitly subvert the resistance of the disadvantaged and legitimate the structure of inequality. It's time we took status more seriously. Thank you.