

outlook and orientation, greater questioning of the goals of science, more complaints about work, colleagues, careers, and institution" (p. 233). These may be both cause and consequence of publication productivity.

It is unclear that the findings are applicable broadly to "lives in science," as the volume's title and discussion suggest. Compared to other fields of science, physics is characterized by unusually high consensus about research questions, methods, and contributions. This makes physicists an apt group for comparisons within their field, but findings may not generalize to sciences broadly, or to academia at large.

The study of *Lives in Science* would be enhanced by further consideration of certain aspects of organizational structure and behavior. The scientific reward structure both reinforces standards of success and represents a widespread area of "grievance," as portrayed. Underexplored, however, are particular "dark sides" of the reward process that provide latitude to control members, to disguise departmental power struggles, and to justify decisions that may be indeed be "particularistic," that is, based on "functionally irrelevant" characteristics, such as social/personal ties. An additional consideration is how the authority of faculty may differ in the elite, pluralist, and communitarian types of institutions. Research fundamentally defines the status of elite institutions and provides a significant source of external funding. The resulting authority of the faculty in settings with strong research emphases is an important aspect of institutional context, particularly in the sciences.

Nonetheless, the design, data, and argumentation of *Lives in Science* are clearly valuable for those concerned with scientific occupations and workplaces, the interaction between scientific careers and employing institutions, and the future of academic sciences, by types of settings.

Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life.
By Mario Small. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. Pp. 312.

Ray Reagans
MIT

In *Unanticipated Gains: Origins of Network Inequality in Everyday Life* Mario Small illustrates the importance of organizations in producing network-based inequality. Small argues that organizations play an underappreciated role in social capital research. Organizations are important because network connections often develop inside of organizations, and the broader organizational context in which a network connection develops can determine how much the connection is worth. Small contrasts his "organizational embeddedness" perspective with theoretical frameworks that have focused on network consequences as the expense of network origins or have adopted a rational actor perspective, where actors develop network connections in pursuit of the benefits those connections

can provide, and have ignored the broader organizational context in which network connections develop. He illustrates the value of his perspective with childcare centers in New York City. If you are wondering why childcare centers, finish the book, and you will appreciate the critical role these centers play in the lives of many New Yorkers.

As a parent with young children, it was easy for me as a reader to empathize with Iris and Naomi as they evaluated the merits of their childcare alternatives. While making the decision, each mother's primary concern was her child's well-being. Small demonstrates, however, that once a mother enrolls her child in a center, she often experiences significant improvements in her material well-being, especially if she is poor and develops at least one friendship at the center. Since the network connections of daycare enrollment were unanticipated, the material gains were unanticipated as well.

Most mothers didn't pick a childcare center with network connections in mind. The relationships that developed between mothers were a by-product of their involvement in a center. In chapter 3, Small discusses the numerous opportunities childcare centers provided mothers to develop meaningful relationships with each other parents and with the center, including parent drop-off or pick-up times, parties, fund raisers, fieldtrips, and spring cleaning. The activities are mundane, but it would be a mistake to dismiss the importance of the connections that developed from them. Indeed, in chapter 5, Small illustrates the emotional and social support that these connections provided. And yet, some mothers who developed a close bond limited their interaction to the domain of the center. Small calls these ties *compartmentalized strong ties*. I enjoyed reading chapter 4 and especially the section on compartmentalized strong ties. What kinds of mothers were more likely to be connected by a compartmentalized strong tie? Were some organizations more likely than other organizations to produce compartmentalized strong ties?

The second half of the book focuses on the centers in which the mothers' networks were embedded. Most centers did more than provide childcare. They provided information (e.g., nutritional and school system information), services (e.g., housing support and school entrance exam testing), and material goods (e.g., scholarships, meals, and toys). Childcare centers that maintained more collaborative and referral ties with other organizations could do more for their mothers. Indeed, the numerous resources available at a childcare center help to explain why simply having a child at a center could improve a mother's material well-being. The link between social capital and inequality is most apparent in these chapters. In chapter 9, Small articulates his vision of organizations as critical interfaces between individuals and a variety of important outcomes, including employment and healthcare.

There is much to like about *Unanticipated Gains*. Small integrates ideas developing in disparate literatures. He combines multiple ethnographies

with survey methodologies and statistical analysis. And there is a great deal more to the book than I could cover in my review.

There are a number of instances, however, when I worried about how Small characterized social capital research. For example, while some social capital researchers have adopted a rational choice perspective, the vast majority would emphasize the dynamics (i.e., social similarity and opportunity) Small discussed in chapter 3 in producing network connections. Another example is Small's treatment of trust. If a woman had to unexpectedly stay at work late or if she was running late and wanted to avoid being fined by the center, she might ask a mother she did not know to pick up and care for her child. Small maintains that this kind of behavior violates James Coleman's rational-actor-based model of trust. I am not so sure. While the women's behavior illustrated the importance of the center in their lives, their behavior did not undermine Coleman's framework. Coleman discusses intermediaries of trust, and the childcare center was an intermediary that made the women trustworthy. In particular, any mother who mistreated a child left in her care risked losing her good standing at the center. I would hope that any mother who felt compelled by extenuating circumstances to leave her child in the hands of a woman she did not know would weigh the potential benefits (e.g., continued employment or avoiding a fine) against the costs (e.g., harm to her child) and also consider the safeguards (e.g., damaging the stranger's reputation or standing at the center) she has at her disposal before making the decision.

Finally, Small contrasts his "organizational embeddedness" approach with social capital frameworks that have ignored the social context in which individuals operate. Social capital researchers have considered how contextual factors shape the value of network connections. For example, Ronald Burt has documented how the returns to being a broker vary with features of a person's job. Joel Podolny has shown how features of the market determine if a firm would be better off with status or by being a broker. Thus, instead of ignoring social context, social capital researchers have made context central to both their theorizing and their empirical analyses. These moments, and there are more than a few, unnecessarily undermine what is otherwise an excellent book.

The Culture of Punishment: Prison, Society, and Spectacle. By Michelle Brown. New York: New York University Press, 2009. Pp. 272. \$79.00 (cloth); \$24.00 (paper).

William G. Staples
University of Kansas

After years of visiting correctional institutions throughout the United States, reform-minded Michelle Brown has come to know well the stark