

But perhaps MTNs are not as communitarian as Flores-Yeffal wants us to believe. In fact, she gives enough accounts of anonymous generosity and civil ethics. All things considered, I think I'm going to keep the rich evidence and accounts of her research, but will not stay within the limits of her theoretical framework.

Documenting Desegregation: Racial and Gender Segregation in Private-Sector Employment since the Civil Rights Act. By Kevin Stainback and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2012. Pp. xxxiv+378.

Robin Stryker
University of Arizona

When I interviewed Al Golub, former deputy executive director of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), he told me he regretted that the EEOC failed to continue its short-lived early 1980s outreach to the social science academic community. Former EEOC Chief Economist Marc Rosenblum corroborated. Having held a series of conferences to exchange information and seek advice from academics—mostly economists—around the country, the EEOC considered, but ultimately declined, initiating a program of soliciting and funding enforcement-relevant academic research, including that pertaining to evaluating the agency's enforcement efficacy. Al died before Kevin Stainback and Donald Tomaskovic-Devey completed *Documenting Desegregation*. But he would have seen the book—appropriately—as an exemplar of what can be accomplished through communication and knowledge networks linking the EEOC to the academy.

Linking multiple subfields, including stratification, organizational, political, and economic sociology, and law and society, *Documenting Desegregation* provides a treasure trove of knowledge for scholarly and policy communities. The book methodically describes countrywide trends and variability—by time period, region, industry, occupation, and local labor market—in race and gender desegregation and resegregation from 1966, two years after enactment of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, through 2005. The EEOC made this and other research possible by allowing select scholars access, pursuant to confidentiality agreements, to the entire history of EEO-1 forms. These contain data that Title VII-covered private employers report to the EEOC and pertain to more than five million workplaces. The authors also draw on Current Population Survey data.

Documenting Desegregation is of widespread interest; it is necessary reading for any social scientist or policy maker interested in organizations or inequality. A short review cannot do justice to its nuanced analyses and

voluminous findings. Part 1 focuses on macro societal movement away from the relatively uniform pre-1964 Civil Rights Act regime of white male privilege. Part 2 focuses on emergent variability in local inequality regimes by industry, organization, and local labor market context. The book provides thorough, careful delineation of post-1966 trends and variability in workplace occupational segregation—surely a fundamental “dependent variable” for sociological analysis.

Though unique and valuable, EEO-1 data exclude very small employers and are limited in that they use highly aggregated occupational categories, lack indicators of human capital, and do not include workplace-specific putative explanatory factors from law or politics. Using the data to conduct thoughtful and careful detective work, Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey make ample use of their considerable demographic talents. They control for change in segregation resulting from shifts in labor-market demographics, sector, and industrial structures, so as to isolate change that plausibly could be associated with variability in law and political actors and pressures internal or external to organizations. They investigate similarities and differences between race and gender desegregation trajectories in professional, managerial, and skilled-craft jobs and among segregation, patterns of isolation from equal-status contact, and patterns of access to high-quality jobs.

Among key findings, desegregation is patterned by historical periods reflecting variability in external social movement and political pressures, law enforcement uncertainty, and stringency. The 1960s through 1972—a period of substantial Civil Rights movement pressure, legal uncertainty, and race-focused enforcement—produced substantial black-white desegregation, especially for men. From 1973 to 1980—a period of relatively stringent enforcement and an active women’s movement—white women made substantial gains, as did to lesser extent black men and women. It is worrying, however, that black and white women were resegregating. Consistent with enforcement-undermining political change, especially with respect to race discrimination, the post-1980 era saw race desegregation stall. White women continued to gain through about 2000. Minorities and women fared especially well in professions, where educational credentials arguably are most central. Countering myths of widespread reverse discrimination—and given white males are a declining share of the labor force—desegregation gains for women and blacks often expanded white males’ access to high-quality jobs.

Documenting Desegregation is not without faults. First, the authors have no direct data on local variability in employer preferences. Yet they are quick to infer backward from variability in the race and gender demographics of local labor-force distributions to variability in employer preferences.

Second, the authors sometimes overlook or poorly describe key court decisions, judicial doctrine, and likely implications. Philadelphia plan-style affirmative action involved goals and timetables, not quotas. The Supreme Court's *Albemarle Paper v. Moody* ruling not only endorsed back pay, it equated *Griggs v. Duke Power's* "job-relatedness" standard for testing's permissibility with stringent requirements for test validation. *International Brotherhood of Teamsters v. United States* not only pertained to class-wide relief, it protected whites' seniority by closing the door on the "present effects of past discrimination" doctrine previously relied on to prove discrimination. More generally, early litigation contesting the relevance of cognitive testing to blue-collar jobs is given short shrift, although that litigation and its resolution facilitated the movement of blacks into blue-collar jobs, especially in the South. Throughout the book, issues pertaining to burdens of proof and what is required for legal proof of discrimination are somewhat mangled.

Finally, and although the authors do a wonderful job relating their arguments and findings to other empirical studies of law and labor market outcomes, they do not exploit fully the relevant scholarship on law and social change. Had they done so, they could have considered how their findings might bear on theories of law, politics, and the economy more generally, or on the likely impact that other types of rights legislation intended to benefit the disadvantaged might have on race, gender, and other inequalities. In fact, the causal mechanisms they suggest are instantiations of what Lauren Edelman and Robin Stryker laid out as general institutional and political mechanisms by which law shapes economic stability and change ("A Sociological Approach to Law and the Economy," in *Handbook of Economic Sociology*, ed. Smelser and Swedberg [Princeton University Press, 2005]).

Overall, none of the book's shortcomings detract from its tremendous descriptive achievement, or from the plausibility of its key explanatory arguments. Rather, Stainback and Tomaskovic-Devey have given us a foundational book that will inform and inspire scholars while providing analytic starting points for potential antidiscrimination enforcement for years to come.

Assimilation and the Gendered Color Line: Hmong Case Studies of Hip-Hop and Import Racing. By Pao Lee Vue. El Paso, Tex.: LFB Scholarly Publishing, 2012. Pp. viii+200. \$67.00.

Nitasha Sharma
Northwestern University

Pao Lee Vue's *Assimilation and the Gendered Color Line* is a welcome contribution to studies of assimilation, popular culture, and the field of