Toby Parcel // it’s a girl :O

* Stolzenberg (1975). Occupations, Labor Markets and the Process of Wage Attainment
  + 5.6 (80—89) 1997 0.5
* Farley (1977). Trends in Racial Inequalities: Have the Gains of the 1960s Disappeared in the 1970s?
  + 4.4 (78—87) 1991 0.1
* Siegel (1971). Prestige in the American occupational structure
  + 6.6 (75—84) 1999 0.2
* Edwards, Reich & Gordon (1975). Labor market segmentation
  + 7.1 (80—89) 1995 0
* Kaufman, Hodson & Fligstein (1981). Defrocking dualism: A new approach to defining industrial sectors
  + 3.1 (83—92) 1998 0
* Tolbert, Horan & Beck (1980). The Structure of Economic Segmentation: A Dual Economy Approach
  + 9.0 (82—91) 1997 0.4
* Cain & Treiman (1981). The Dictionary of Occupational Titles as a Source of Occupational Data
  + 3.4 (81—90) 2005 0.3
* Hodson (1978). Labor in the Monopoly, Competitive, and State Sectors- of Production
  + 5.5 (80—89) 2004 0.1
* Hodson (1984). Companies, Industries, and the Measurement of Economic Segmentation
  + 3.2 (84—93) 2001 0.1

Inform her that I’ll be recording the conversation. If she wants anything redacted, or not to be quoted, just let me know.

These works experienced a decline to 10% their average lifetime citations for at least a decade. This phenomenon happens to only about 1/5 cited works which make it to the top 2% in any given decade.

I reached out to you based on your citation record. You cited each of these at least twice in my dataset of 73 Sociology journals, and are among the top 15 authors in terms of coverage of these dead.

Questions:

* For each work, can you explain their fall?
  + An intellectual shift? Politics of the field?
  + Are they obvious to you? Do any of these not have explanations?
* What is your personal relationship to these works now?
* Would you cite them // why or why not? Should they be cited // why or why not?