

Kraft, among others, pointed to women's subordinate status among programmers, and certainly, casual evidence from well-established operations such as IBM and defense department contractors give no cause for supposing that high-end computing was particularly favorable for women in the 1960s and 1970s.

Woodfield also cites postmodernist writers who praise the computer's potential for disrupting traditional hierarchies and releasing humans from the constraints of the body, ushering in a "post-gender world" of cyborg computer-human hybrids (p. 46). She does a superb job of demolishing such overheated speculations, showing that even when Softech programmers indulged in similar claims, they had no trouble compartmentalizing them from the social conceptions that actually governed their conduct. It is satisfying to see such vocal straw men knocked down so effectively, but it also makes one wonder if it is worth the effort.

Woodfield's book is best appreciated as further evidence that even in a technical field ostensibly governed by meritocratic criteria, gender bias can distort perceptions of merit and strongly influence the distribution of rewards.

Marketing Masculinities: Gender and Management Politics in Marketing Work, by **Lee V. Chalmers**. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001. 194 pp. \$62.50 cloth. ISBN: 0-313-31603-1.

LESLIE SALZINGER
University of Chicago
l-salzinger@uchicago.edu

Marketing Masculinities is a thoughtful exploration of the role masculinity plays in the delineation of "marketing" as a professional field. The bulk of the book focuses on three marketing departments. For each site, the author describes managers' struggles to define marketing as masculine—in order to claim that it is significant—and significant—in order to claim that it is masculine. In the process, she illuminates both the intrinsic indeterminacy of the boundaries between purportedly distinct areas of management, and the way in which masculinity becomes an organizational resource in the struggle

over what counts, and what does not, at work.

Chalmers frames the project in two fields: theories of the gendering of work overall, and historical studies of the role of masculinity in management. In the first of these arenas, she surveys the literature and allies herself firmly with those who see gender as an element in the construction of job definitions, as opposed to those who see jobs as preconstituted entities that are then filled by gendered occupants. In the second arena, she traces the evolution of management as a discipline, underlining its historical links to masculinity, and hence, masculinity's ongoing role as a fundamental terrain of struggle in management politics. Both discussions are insightful, clear, and concise, making the book an excellent resource for upper level undergraduates and graduate students looking for an intelligent guide to contemporary issues in the area of gender and work.

Early on, Chalmers explains that she studied marketing because its role and content are still under contention, making it a fruitful context in which to catch boundary fights as they occur and to watch for the role of gender within them. The bulk of the book is dedicated to discussing three such struggles. Chalmers interviewed the members of marketing departments in a computer systems firm, a ventilation equipment manufacturer, and an insurance company. In each case, she shows the way in which masculinity became a resource through which department members struggled to define the work as legitimate. One of the points she makes quite effectively along the way is that the actual content of the work done in these departments varies considerably, in part depending on the outcome of these gendered struggles.

The first case study, in computer services, is the most successful of the three. Here, members of the marketing department initially attempted to define their work as "product management." When this began to challenge the power of their superiors, they were pushed back into mere "promotional work." In response, the department's managers delegated "promotion" to junior staff in the department and focused themselves on what they now call "business management." Throughout these struggles, "promotional work" was always gendered feminine, understood as a service performed for others rather

than as an independent activity; this was the case whether it was actually being carried out by men or women. (This latter fact allows the author to argue convincingly that the gendering is a result of discursive struggles, rather than a reflection of the gender of job occupants.) In the same department, work done by those with the most seniority was reinterpreted as "management," discussed in terms of (the often explicitly) masculinized categories of technical potency, masculine honor, and entrepreneurial leadership. These attributions made it possible for senior members of the department to draw sharp lines between their work and that of their junior coworkers, and so to claim more power and status in the firm overall. The case study provides strong evidence for Chalmers's claim that gender does not simply allocate gendered people to preformed places.

Similar processes are evident in the other two cases. Although the way masculinity is used in each case is distinctive, in all three, masculinity proves to be the terrain on which struggles over work occur, with predictably problematic repercussions for the women involved. Again, Chalmers makes the important point that the problem is not that women are relegated to a consistent kind of work across the three cases, but that the language of masculine prowess or paternal power in which struggles are cast makes it difficult for women to compete with their male counterparts without casting their femininity into doubt in the process.

If the book has a weakness, it is in its account of how top male managers experience gender internally. Too often, masculinity emerges as if it were an external object, available for use by fully autonomous, highly bounded strategists. We are reminded only infrequently that powerful men are also subjects only by virtue of their own subjection to gender. This, of course, has different implications for them than it does for women and less powerful men. Nonetheless, their relationship to the category is never merely opportunistic. There are moments in the text when Chalmers seems fully cognizant of this, but at times her reliance on these men's own accounts of their corporate exploits overshadows this aspect of her story.

That caveat aside, however, this is a rewarding and illuminating book, one that makes a convincing case for the constitutive

power of gender, and for the varied forms this process takes.

Networks and Markets, edited by **James E. Rauch** and **Alessandra Casella**. New York: Russell Sage, 2001. 346 pp. \$39.95 cloth. ISBN: 0-87154-700-7.

MAURO F. GUILLÉN,
University of Pennsylvania
 guillen@wharton.upenn.edu

Among the social sciences, sociology and economics have devoted the most attention to developing an understanding of economic phenomena, including production, consumption, distribution, and exchange of goods, services, and money under conditions of resource scarcity. Economists have long focused their conceptual and empirical efforts on markets as the main mechanism of allocation and exchange, while sociologists historically concentrated their attention on the study of complex organizations and, more recently, on the social organization of production and consumption, especially from a network perspective. Over the last two decades, however, both economics and sociology have engaged in mutual trespassing, with the former making incursions into the study of organizations, social networks, crime, and the family, and the latter developing alternative conceptions of markets. Against this backdrop, *Networks and Markets*, with contributions from some of the leading exponents in the field, seeks to explore possible areas of agreement between the two disciplines.

It is important to note at the onset that while economics is largely about markets, sociology is not only about networks. Thus, this edited volume contains contributions from sociologists working within one of our discipline's most promising lines of inquiry about economic phenomena, but it is hardly representative of what sociology as a whole has to offer, that is, an analysis of economic behavior through the lenses of culture, social class, social movements, or complex organizations, to name but a few. The strength of the volume is that it seeks to establish a dialogue and to overcome the familiar disagreements between the two disciplines. The introductory chapter, by James Rauch and