Dalton Conley Becomes First Sociologist to Receive the National Science Board's Prestigious Alan T. Waterman Award

by Johanna Elner, Public Information Office and Lee Herring, Public Affairs Office

WASHINGTON, DC, MAY 25, 2005—The National Science Foundation (NSF), the independent federal agency that supports much of the nation's fundamental research across nearly all fields of science, recognized sociology professor Dalton C. Conley, New York University (NYU), as one of the country’s top young scientists. The 35-year-old Conley received the 30th annual Alan T. Waterman Award, named for NSF’s first director, at a formal, black-tie event at the U.S. Department of State in Washington, DC. It is the first time a sociologist has received this honor. Befitting the award’s historic significance, the ASA Council issued an official public statement shortly after NSF announced the award in late April (see <www.asanet.org/public/conleystate.html>).

Conley stated, “That Conley is the first sociologist to receive this honor is testament to the increased recognition of sociology within the scientific community. A vital segment of the discipline is engaged in the scientific study of human social organization and social behavior. This in turn, is of central importance to the development of basic knowledge to inform decision-makers, policymakers, legislators, and the public about how our social institutions affect national well-being. Conley’s empirical research demonstrates how certain social and economic conditions (i.e., levels of family wealth) are the basis of persistent racial differences in key areas of life—from educational success to the likelihood of relying on welfare—and are essential to understanding how race persists in determining wealth. Conley’s work clearly and creatively explain how income, gender, health, and birth order result in inequalities that create locking orders even within families.”

Established to commemorate NSF’s 75th anniversary, the annual Waterman Award has been bestowed on a sociologist for the first time in the same year the ASA celebrates its 100th anniversary as the nation’s professional association for the discipline of sociology, the Council statement noted. The award recognizes an outstanding young researcher in any field of science or engineering supported by NSF. In addition to a medal, the awardee receives a grant of $500,000 over a three-year period for scientific research or advanced study in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering, social, or other sciences at the institution of the recipient’s choice.

More than 200 senior-level science policymakers, scientists, and science press attended the elaborate event at which the Vannevar Bush Award and National Science Board (NSB) Public Service Award were also presented. Also in attendance were Conley’s parents (Ellen and Steve), Lawrence Wu, Chair of the NYU sociology department, and friends and associates of the event’s other awardees: Robert W. Galvin, retired CEO of Motorola, Inc., who received the Vannevar Bush Award; Ira Flatow, National Public Radio, who received an NSF Public Service Award; and the Committee on the Status of Women in Computing Research, which also received a Public Service Award. (See <www.asanet.org/public/conley.html> to access Bement’s award presentation statement.) The ceremony venue, the stately Diplomatic Reception Rooms, exhibit numerous significant artifacts and paintings of U.S. history.

See Conley, page 8
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The Executive Officer's Column
What Really Mattered to the Supreme Court
Over the years, ASA has submitted amicus curiae briefs to the U.S. Supreme Court to bring social science data and analysis to the attention of the justices. The most recent was in Michigan v. Grutter, the affirmative action case in which ASA provided sociological research on the impact of race (see <www.asanet.org/media/amicus.html>). Such “friend of the court” contributions are appropriate for scholarly associations when there is science that can add empirical context to legal arguments. The Court’s interpretations of constitutional concepts often have as much cultural and social meaning as they do legal meaning.

On March 1, 2005, the Supreme Court issued a significant four-four decision in Roper v. Simmons that ruled it unconstitutional to apply the death penalty to defendants under 18. In the ensuing public discussion, the decision was reported in the media focused on Justice Anthony Kennedy’s use of international law in the majority opinion to reflect the overwhelming sentiment against the death penalty for juveniles. This was despite the assertion by the majority that international views were not a controlling factor in the decision.

Why This Matters to Sociologists
The press gave short shrift to what was controlling in the case’s outcome and to the extremely powerful role of social and behavioral science in the majority opinion and in the critiques by dissenting Justices Sandra Day O’Connor and Antonin Scalia.

To help make our scientific work more relevant to the resolution of key social issues in the legal arena, I urge sociologists and students to read these opinions to see what social and behavioral science was useful, why it was important, and how it was interpreted on both sides. Let me guide you to the sociological highlights.

Concepts, Evidence, and Interpretations
The Court rejected imposition of the death penalty for offenders under 18 based on concepts it used in Atkins v. Virginia to prohibit the execution of a mentally retarded person: that is, capital punishment must be limited not only to offenders who are the “most serious crimes” but also to those whose “extreme culpability” makes them the most deserving of execution. What is culpability?

Using data from psychology and sociology in an amicus curiae brief by the American Psychological Association, the Supreme Court majority concluded that offenders under the age of 18 are not as culpable or blameworthy as adults by extending to 17-year-olds the reasoning it applied in barring capital punishment for juveniles 16 and under in Thompson v. Oklahoma. The Court said offenders under age 18 cannot reliably be classified among the worst offenders, because their susceptibility to immature and irresponsible behavior means their conduct is not as reprehensible as that of an adult; their relative lack of control over their surroundings means they are more susceptible to negative influences; and their youthful struggle to define their identity means that even heinous behavior cannot be evidence of an irretrievably depraved character. How do we determine culpability?

In this major section of its opinion, the Court explicitly relied upon “the scientific and sociological studies” provided by Roper and his amici. The Court concluded: “The differences between juvenile and adult offenders are too marked and well understood to risk allowing a youthful person to receive the death penalty despite insufficient culpability.” In short, the Court selected age 18 as the developmental dividing line based on the social and psychological evidence. It continued by concluding that this categorical decision was necessary because juries were not able to reliably determine an individual’s degree of culpability. “An unacceptable likelihood exists that the brutality or cold-blooded nature of any particular crime would overpower mitigating arguments based on youth as a matter of course, even where the juvenile offender’s objective, immature, vulnerability and lack of true depravity should require a sentence less severe than death.”

The dissent is equally interesting with regard to the interpretation of scientific data. Justice O’Connor did not challenge the basic data, agreeing that “[a]dolescents as a class are undoubtedly less mature, and therefore less culpable for their misconduct than adults.” But she firmly rejected the use of this evidence by the Court in the Roper case. There was no evidence presented, she said, that legislatures could not reach a reasonable conclusion “that at least some 17-year-old murderers are sufficiently mature to deserve the death penalty” or that juries could not make a decision about an individual’s degree of culpability. Disputing the use of the scientific evidence to support the Court’s age-18 cut-off for extreme culpability, she argued, “At most, the Court’s argument suggests that the average 17-year-old murderer is not as culpable as the average adult murderer.” By contrast, she argued other types of scientific evidence are definitive: “‘Mentally retarded’ offenders, as we understood that category in Atkins, are defined by precisely the characteristics which render death an excessive punishment. A mentally retarded person is, ‘by definition,’ one whose cognitive and behavioral capacities have been proven to fall below a certain minimum.”

Justice Scalia, on the other hand, challenges the scientific evidence itself by saying that what was presented was selective data, that is, the Court was “picking and choosing those [scientific and sociological studies] that support its position. It never explains why those particular studies are methodologically sound, none was ever entered into evidence or tested in an adversarial proceeding.” But, turning the table on himself, Scalia then argues that the Court has previously recognized the social science research of Kalven and Zeisel in The American Jury (1966) as evidence that behaviors can indeed make difficult individual judgments.

These fascinating, nuanced discussions should appeal to sociologists wanting to apply their research at the juncture of public policy and appellate courts.

---Sally T. Hillsman
Sociologists Receive Guggenheims

Two sociologists were among the 186 writers, scholars, and scientists of all disciplines awarded this year’s prestigious Guggenheim Fellowships in recognition of their distinguished achievement in the past as well as their exceptional promise for the future. The fellowships are for the advancement of professionals in the natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and the creative arts so they can undertake important research.

Sociologists Andrew Cherlin (The Johns Hopkins University) and Bruce Western (Princeton University) were chosen from among nearly 3,000 applicants from the United States and Canada for awards totaling more than $77,000. Decisions are based on recommendations from hundreds of expert advisors and approved by the Foundation’s Board of Trustees.

Cherlin, Grisvold Professor of Public Policy and Sociology, The Johns Hopkins University, will study marriage and family in early 20th-century America. He has published books and articles on topics such as marriage and divorce, children’s well-being, intergenerational relations, family policy, and welfare policy. He is the principal investigator of the “Three-City Study,” an ongoing interdisciplinary study of the consequences of the 1996 welfare reform law for parents and children. He is the author of a textbook in the sociology of the family, Public and Private Families: An Introduction.

Western, Professor of Sociology, Princeton University, will study the growth and consequences of American inequality. His research interests broadly include political and comparative sociology, stratification and inequality, and methodology. More specifically, he has studied how institutions shape labor market outcomes. Most recently, he edited Improving America: The Social Effects of Mass Incarceration, edited with Mary Patillo and David Weiman (Russell Sage Foundation, 2004).

United States Senator Simon Guggenheim and his wife, as a memorial to their son, established the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation in 1925. The Foundation offers fellowships to further the development of scholars and artists by assisting them to engage in research. In the last decade, nearly 30 sociologists have been named Guggenheim fellows, including ASA Past-Presidents Richard Alba and ASA Past-President Jill Quadagno.

Sociologist Brings Data to Federal Debate on Bankruptcy Reform Bill

In May, following President Bush’s April 20 signing into law the Bankruptcy Abuse Prevention and Consumer Protection Act of 2005, sociologist Robert Manning, professor of sociology at Rochester Institute of Technology, [left] testified before the Senate Banking Committee. Chaired by Sen. Richard Shelby (R-AL), and in a packed, standing-room-only Senate hearing room, the Committee heard testimony on the legal and regulatory requirements and industry practices related to credit card use with respect to consumer disclosures and marketing — but prior to the Bankruptcy Act becoming law — Manning [right below] had an opportunity in early April to inform an audience of about 40 U.S. House of Representatives Banking Committee members how the legislation was shortfalls of the legislation from the standpoint of establishing rational, research-based national policies. Manning is author of Credit Card Nation: The Consequences of America’s Addiction to Credit.

Manning testified before the Senate Banking Committee on regulation of credit card issues. Having testified several times before Congress on consumer finance and bankruptcy, Manning stated at the Senate briefing that the “decline in public social services and erosion of household income over two decades have contributed to soaring levels of consumer debt—double over the ten years.” The cost of credit card debt is exacerbating “social inequality as families struggle with rising employment instability, medical expenses...” [while] record profits of the banking industry reflect both the growth and consequences of consumer debt—doubling over the last ten years.” The cost of credit card debt is exacerbating “social inequality as families struggle with rising employment instability, medical expenses...” [while] record profits of the banking industry reflect both the growth and consequences of consumer debt—doubling over the last ten years.” The cost of credit card debt is exacerbating “social inequality as families struggle with rising employment instability, medical expenses...” [while] record profits of the banking industry reflect both the growth and consequences of consumer debt—doubling over the last ten years.” The cost of credit card debt is exacerbating “social inequality as families struggle with rising employment instability, medical expenses...” [while] record profits of the banking industry reflect both the growth and consequences of consumer debt—doubling over the last ten years.” The cost of credit card debt is exacerbating “social inequality as families struggle with rising employment instability, medical expenses...” [while] record profits of the banking industry reflect both the growth and consequences of consumer debt—doubling over the last ten years.” The cost of credit card debt is exacerbating “social inequality as families struggle with rising employment instability, medical expenses...” [while] record profits of the banking industry reflect both the growth and consequences of consumer debt—doubling over the last ten years.”
**What Happened When I Took My Sociological Imagination to the Dump**

“The third way in which the social scientist may attempt to realize the value of reason and its role in human affairs is as well known, and sometimes even practiced. It is to remain independent, to do one’s own work, to select one’s own problems, but to direct this work at kings as well as to publics.”

— C. Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination*

daniel knapp, university of oregon

As a graduate student, I absorbed many great sociologists’ teachings. But when it came my turn to teach undergraduates what sociology is and how useful it could be, my touchstone text for General Sociology was C. Wright Mills’ *The Sociological Imagination*. I required my students to write an acceptably accurate summary of Mills’ great work.

It was the late 1960s, and powerful social movements were sweeping the country. I agreed with Mills that applied sociology could be a useful activist style and thought that by using sociological methods, I could create knowledge that would lead informed “publics” to self-organize and change things for the better. So after only a half-dozen years in two universities, his summons helped propel me out of the academy. At 35, I retired from academe and went toward—What?

It took about four years to settle into a niche in the global and local appropriate technology (AT) movement. Appropriate technologists worldwide were rethinking and redesigning practical processes that were linked to social troubles. Before retiring from academe, I had taught extensively from AT journals and research reports. The approach was both progressive and conservative. AT’s practitioners often embedded themselves in communities for people to conserve resources or added value to materials; and created wealth, goods, and trade while preventing waste and reducing pollution on the wilderness.

**Plans to Mine Resources from the Dump Were Trashed**

My first contribution to the field, “Mine the Trash Cans, Not the Land,” was published in *Rain: A Journal of Appropriate Technology*. It compared and contrasted these two disposal systems for discarded materials: Capital-intensive wasting through incineration, landfilling, or both; and labor- and quality-intensive resource recovery (resource conservation) through reusing, recycling, and composting.

It was equally fascinating and frustrating to analyze the conflicts between these opposites. Politics aside, switching from destroying to conserving materials would be an immense physical task requiring behavioral changes on a culture-wide scale. This raised many questions about organization, capital, location, and other logistics, including who would do the work?

I took a low-paying job as co-director of a county AT agency in Oregon that compared and contrasted these two disposal systems for discarded materials: Capital-intensive wasting through incineration, landfilling, or both; and labor- and quality-intensive resource recovery (resource conservation) through reusing, recycling, and composting.

Urban Ore's Startup

Looking for an opportunity to develop my ideas, I migrated to Berkeley, California. Four days later I fortuitously found work scavengeing at the city-owned dump. Sweating from my labors, with thousands of seagulls wheeling overhead, and the smell of decomposing organics, I often gazed at the University of California campus uphill to the east. It helped to visualize myself as a scientist in a clean white lab coat, with the dump and its procedures as my living laboratory. Now I could actually recover materials and return them to commerce with no interference! It was a start.

The catch was that our little team of workers had to sell enough recovered goods to pay the bills. I could do as many studies as I could afford, and often did studies even when I could not afford them. The enterprise was incorporated in 1981 as Urban Ore. After a presentation I gave to the California Governor’s Office of Appropriate Technology, a staff person (who later became my wife) asked what a sociologist was doing in solid waste, a field dominated by engineers. My answer: recycling has all the technology it needs for full development, and now we must change people’s behavior.

**Social Change and Experiment**

The larger social change is to switch people’s disposal options, preferences, and habits away from the landfill and into our conserving marketplace. The ultimate goal was to sell materials back to the landfill, to end landfilling, and resource destruction by conserving everything that can be reused, recycled, or composted. The corporate purpose, “To End the Age of Waste,” is printed on every sales receipt as “Thank you for conserving resources... in both reframe our customers’ attitudes and give a pat on their ‘psychic back.”

Today, at a conceptual level, Urban Ore is a sociology experiment that worked. At a material level it is a functioning company, doing research and development 365 days a year adhering to the reuse part of the “reduce, reuse, recycle” disposal hierarchy. As part of an economy of commerce, we are a retail business that receives discards, sells merchandise, and feeds scrap into other recycling businesses. The economics of disposal are a major financial driver for us and for the other 56,000 recycling enterprises that have grown steadily into a $236-billion industry, according to a National Recycling Coalition’s 2003 study.

Urban Ore started small and capital-bereft, with only the right to salvage from the dump. Now we are a three-acre enterprise with a payroll of about $1 million a year. Our customers are a cross-section of the San Francisco Bay Area. We are a business providing disposal services for unwanted goods and a vast array of low-cost merchandise for sale.

The virtual dimension of Urban Ore is the sum of our varied studies and social interventions. In the early days we presented decision-makers with onsite insights fresh from the dump, usually at city meetings. Our information aided Berkeley voters in reversing the city council’s unanimous 1980 decision to build a capital-intensive and resource-monopolizing garbage incinerator. We helped write and pass a ballot initiative that postponed the incinerator. Later we collaborated on a second Berkeley voter initiative that set a 50% recycling goal and extended the burn ban. This initiative also passed convincingly after a raucous campaign.

Our most ambitious legislation passed in 1989, a county ballot initiative we co-authored, which added a surcharge of $6 per ton, raising with the Consumer Price Index, to materials wasted at the three county landfills. It raised the county’s recycling goal to 50%. Now a new agency worked to implement this goal, to pump the millions of dollars that this surcharge raised back into funding and capitalizing resource recovery. More than a decade later, *Nature D*, as it is known, has worked remarkably well: landfill volumes are down, resource recovery enterprises are up. Many Alameda County cities have exceeded the 50% recycling goal and are on their way to 75%.

Internationally, we have fielded a theory of zero waste, or total recycling, that shows how to divide the entire waste stream into 12 categories of recyclable commodities. We have worked with people from various governments and NGOs to design more than two dozen resource-recovery sites matched both to the 12 discard categories, and to the range of incoming load types and volumes.

In March 2005, I filed for Social Security. Unlike my colleagues who kept their professorships, I have not yet retired from my second sociological career as CEO of a for-profit materials-recovery corporation. When people ask me if I own Urban Ore, I nod and add, “It owns me, too.” I am the administration, so when things do not go right, there’s no one but myself to blame.

Now I can say from considerable experience that applied sociology can be very helpful to an academy. It is a social laboratory, I think, where I can test new ideas, and if they work, share them with others. I also think that applied sociology can be a valuable addition to any railroad; it can help create a new industry. The key was to use sociological insights and research methods as part of a strategy to create a business that could support my colleagues, staff, and me while we indulged our sociological habits of mind. Sociological habits of mind: identifying and writing technical reports, speaking, teaching, and organizing for social change. Resource recovery is a good fit for me.

Researchers often rely solely on the media to publicize their results. But they would do well to remember that a policy-relevant piece of research that attracts another equally important audience: the policymakers themselves.

A team of sociologists, led by Andrew Cherlin, Johns Hopkins University, and Linda Burton, Pennsylvania State University, recently learned this lesson when a press release about their December 2004 Sociological Review article, “The Influence of Physical and Sexual Abuse on Marriage and Cohabitation,” did not attract the anticipated amount of media coverage. Instead, their article garnered attention from nonprofit organizations, lobbying groups, and congressional staff, leading to its use in discussions about government-sponsored marriage promotion policy.

Both the ASA media office and the press office at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, the major funder of their research, issued releases in mid-January on their findings. When a press release about their December releases in mid-January on their findings, both the Senate Finance Committee staff wrote, “applicants must consult with domestic violence organizations when setting up a program.”

To be eligible for a [marriage promotion] grant, applicants must consult with domestic violence organizations that have demonstrated expertise working with survivors of domestic violence in developing policies, procedures, programs, and training necessary to appropriately address domestic violence in families served by programs and activities funded through the grant.

— Senate Finance Committee

ASR

I began looking for a position as an ASA Congressional Fellow. I sought the advice of previous fellows and current and former congressional staffers. While these informal consult-ants provided wide-ranging advice, nearly every one of them advised against taking a position with a minority party member (i.e., Democrat) of the House of Representatives. “They simply have no power to get anything done,” they uniformly stated. Yet, like an adolescent who proceeds to act precisely contrary to advice, I took a position in the Office of Congressman Mike Honda, a Democrat from California’s 17th District.

My decision to work for Congress-man Honda was not motivated by juvenile tendencies, or by lack of other options. I chose to work there, in Rep. Honda’s office for all of the “right” reasons: there I would be working in an office with a focus on human rights (a focus about which I was passionate), and working with people long respected as Congressmen: an individual and politician, and align myself with his stance on most issues. But what I have learned in my first three months as an ASA Congressional Fellow is that the advice that I chose not to follow rings true: it is tough to accomplish much as a minority member in the House.

Majoritarian Rule

The difficulty of being a Democrat in the current House stems both from the structure of the House and the way in which the majority party (i.e., Republicans) operates within this context. Where structure is concerned, the House is a "majoritarian" approach Congress, meaning that the majority party controls most aspects of the legislative agenda. The Speaker of the House, Dennis Hastert, presides over the House and appoints the chair of all committees and subcommittees. With control over all of the committees and subcommittees, the majority party determines which legislation comes to the floor for a vote and which does not. If, for example, a representative introduces a bill that is a legislative priority for Republicans, the Speaker, along with the Majority Leader (Tom DeLay) can urge the chair of the committee that has jurisdiction over that bill to expedite its movement through the committee and ensure that it comes to a vote.

The majority party’s dominance in the House extends beyond structure and into the very rules for legislative process. Unlike the Senate, where legislative process rules are relatively fixed, the House makes its rules anew each Congress, and can change and amend the rules. Since the majority party controls the rules committee, it can mold the rules of the legisla-tive game to suit their needs.

Two recent examples illustrate how the structure of the House, and the way in which the majority operates, can marginalize the minority party. In the 108th Congress (2004), Jim Sensenbrenner (R-WI) and other House Republicans nearly stalled major homeland security legislation because the bill did not include restrictions on immigration. In exchange for Sensenbrenner’s support of the homeland security bill, the House Republican’s leadership promised to take up a stand-alone bill that included Sensenbrenner’s immigration restrictions when the 109th Congress began in 2005. True to their word, the Republican leaders made sure that Sensenbrenner’s Immigration Act of 2003 (S. 408) passed under a voice vote, with none of the House Republicans voting against it. Then, in the 109th Congress, it was the emergency supplemental appropriations bill for the immediate protection of the emergency appropriations bill for Afghanistan and Iraq. The rapid movement of the supplemental legislation through the House and its inclusion in the emergency appropriations bill.
Philadelphia, from page 1

The Parkway and Museums
Walk to City Hall and bear right, pass in front of Mayor Rizzo's statue and take the Parkway, beyond the small Love Park notice. Robert Burns would only recently—and stupidly—snatched away from champion skateboarders). At Logan Circle, you will find the Free Library. With 6 million volumes and a unique Rare Books Department, it is one of the great U.S. libraries, check its free programs. Leaving the Library, one block to your left on 20th Street will take you back within sight of the graceful fountain by the second Alexander Calder. In front of you on the Circle is the Academy of Natural Sciences, founded in 1812, small, but with 6 million dinosaur replicas for kids; to the left, the dark red pile of the Catholic Cathedral; to the right, the small, but with lots of dinosaur replicas Natural Sciences Museum, look at the Schuylkill's Waterfalls, graced on the right by the Museum, look at the Schuylkill's Waterfalls, graced on the right by the Duchamps in the world and some of the most recently—and stupidly—snatched away from champion skateboarders). At Logan Circle, you will find the Free Museum, look at the Schuylkill's Waterfalls, graced on the right by the Duchamps in the world and some of the most

Galleries, renovated to house the Johnson Center City and the Reading Market
Walk two blocks west toward City Hall, to visit the most important building of the area. The burning of the Liberty Bell in 1776, one of the most famous paintings in the world, was prominently displayed by Daniel Burnham, you can take the kids to hear the world's largest pipe organ playing at noon and at 5 PM. Three blocks south on Broad Street, in on your right, you will see the historic Union Club, and continue past the old Academy of Music, the very modern Wilma theater by Holzmann, Pfeiffer, on your left, and the Merriam on your right, toward the brand new rather flashily, but acoustically perfect Kimmel Center for the Performing Arts, home of the Philadelphia Orchestra, by the fashionable architect Rafael Viñoly. Tours are free everyday except Monday, at 1 pm.

If you cross Broad going east, retracing your article to Locust Street, you will find the Library Company of Philadelphia, at number 1314, the first subscription library in the country. Founded in 1731 by Ben Franklin, of course. From there, turn left on 12th Street, cross Market, walk one block, cross Filbert; you are about to enter one of our most cherished living monuments, the Reading Terminal Market. Walk around, taste, drink, enjoy! From Wednesday to Saturday, you can buy pretzels and soppy pie from Amish and Mennonite farmers. The market is open every day except Sunday, and you can also find jewelry, somewhat unusual clothes, organic soaps, and kitchen tools you never have ever wanted at old Foster's Gourmet Cookware. Citizens managed to save this beloved shopping and eating place from destruction by the Convention Center, and you will find it now on 12th Street, south of the Convention Center, near the 12th Street stop.

Independence Hall, Society Hill, and a Little of South Philly
The National Historical Park, the “most historic square mile in the U.S.” is obviously a “must see” for your kids (just make them go!). The Park is on both sides of Market, between 6th and 5th, and it contains one of the most extensive collections of American art in the country, including Norman Rockwell paintings. Across the street, the Balch Institute of Ethnic Studies still houses artifacts, collections and a very important library, even though it has merged with the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

Independence Hall, Society Hill, and a Little of South Philly
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locals call "Italian." It is a great outdoor food market, open every day except Sunday afternoons, with a bustling street of stalls and shops between Christian and Federal and a lively demonstration of the city’s changing ethnic composition. You can also walk west on South Street from Head House Square and take the historic dividing line between Society Hill and Philadelphia’s formerly black neighborhoods (where W.E.B. Du Bois did his research for The Philadelphia Negro), a nightly Mecca for young people, it is quiet during the day. It has some fun shops in a neighborhood of excellent BYOB restaurants, and a great store for used books, the Book Trader at 5th.

Old City, North of Market

Every guidebook will send you to Elfreth’s Alley on North Second Street, the world’s oldest continuously inhabited street in the United States, of which the residents are indolently proud (Lewis Mumford derided their exaggerated love for these "mean little houses," but they are really cute, there is one you can visit and see, and the Franklin house must have been!), Your kids will love Fireman’s Hall, at 147 North Second, where the Franklin fire company was a volunteer fire company. I love Old City with its old cast-iron buildings, its little streets, its old factories (converted into super-expensive lofts, alas), its working cafes, and social eclecticism. It has great new cafés (try Le Petit 4’s pastry shop at 160 North Third) and truly interesting stores. The latter you can find in every neighborhood. It is truly one of the country’s best, with Egyptian and Mayan holdings and temporary exhibitions that are worth the trip. And our superb Fairmount Park, the largest urban park in the world, with its grandiose old villas, Japanese Tea House, Memorial Hall, and two superb River Drive. Other things to know about include: Temple University’s urban archives, the Charles Blockson Afro-American American Collection, the concert at Rock Hall, the dance performances, and the excellent student theater; the remnants of grandeur, industrial and bourgeois, amidst the devastation of North Philadelphia: the Freedom Theater; Edgar Allan Poe’s house, the Octavia Hill Association; the Wagner Museum of Science; the Taller Puertorriqueño on vibrant North 9th, the main artery of the barrio. I also have not mentioned the authentic working-class neighborhoods, Port Richmond, Pennslyvania to the south, or the house of John Coltrane and that lovely South Street.

You can spend a lot of time here, but I have only begun to scratch the surface of Philadelphia! But I cannot omit the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, at 3200 South Street, a beautiful university, and hip University City. It is truly one of the country’s best, with Egyptian and Mayan holdings and

Carpenter Hall

as a huge and rather ugly statue of Ben Franklin made of pennies. Cross Third Street toward Betsy Ross’ House—the much married lady probably did not live in this one, but in one just like it in this neighborhhood, it is well worth a visit, especially with the kids. At 235 4th Street, going under the big bridge, you will find, beside the Painted Bride Art Center, the oldest Methodist church in continuous use in the world, St. George, with its museum and lovely garden. Opposite St. George is Catholic St. Augustine, rebuilt in 1847 after the original was burnt down in the frightening anti-Catholic riots of 1844. I left beautiful Christ Church for the end. It is on Second Street, just off Arch, but it is reachable from Third, through the uneven cobblestones of lovely Church Street. As you go, stop at Old City Coffee on your left, which was for many years the only place with decent espresso in Philadelphia... how times change! At the Rectory, rest in the peaceful garden off Market Street, and enter the magnificent interior. It is the most historic shrine in America, but to me it symbolizes a sort of utopian view of America, a graceful and simple and unsanumming, against the somber and hierarchical mood of much grander European churches. Christ Church’s interior, where George Washington and Betsy Ross came to worship on tables that are sun-drenched, white drawing room. It is one of the places I prefer in this remarkable city.

Rittenhouse Square and Traditional Shopping

You can spend a lot of time here, but my description is brief. Seven blocks south from the hotels, on Pine, beginning at 13th, you will find our charming Antiques Row, all the way to Pine and 9th. Between 9th and 8th admire the first hospital in the United States, Pennsylvania Hospital, and its delightful medicinal herb garden.

Second, you should go toward Rittenhouse Square: walk to Broad Street, turn left, go to the famous old hotel Bellevue at the corner of Walton and Broad, which has a few pricey shops and bars, and then go north where you will find the Mexican restaurant, the Glass-enclosed atrium is huge, although it has now become an urban cliché. Daffy’s, the big discount store at Chestnut and 17th is a lot more fun and full of real personal shopper designed clothes. Return to Walnut Street and turn right. Walnut, 17th and 18th Streets are the domain of fancy restaurants and elegant stores. The latter you can find in every big city, but we are grateful they have not all moved to the suburbs. Walking west on Walnut, you will soon arrive at Rittenhouse Square, one of Penn’s original squares, a green island of批复 surrounded by open-air cafés and hotels (the Rittenhouse booths Lacroix’s restaurant, considered "sub- line" by connoisseurs). At 130 South 19th, the very European café La Colombe, has exceptionally good coffee, better than in Italy [although some say that Café Hausbrandt, close to the hotels at 207 S 15th Street, is better perhaps: what it does have is Internet access from 7 am to 10 md]. Off Rittenhouse Square, at 19th and Locust, is the famous Curtis Institute of Music, where you can inquire if the students are offering any concerts (they are free in season) and the Art League is one block South. In the streets adjacent to Rittenhouse, around Elfreth and Walnut, at Pine and 22nd, and all the way to the Schuylkill River, are some of the prettiest urban sights in the United States.

I have only begun to scratch the surface of Philadelphia! But I cannot omit the University of Pennsylvania Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, at 3200 South Street, a beautiful university, and hip University City. It is truly one of the country’s best, with Egyptian and Mayan holdings and

Teachers Teaching Teachers, An ASA Pre-Conference

The focus of this special ASA pre-conference course, “Teachers Teaching Teachers,” will be on graduate teaching assistants and first-time instructors, bringing experts in the field of teaching and learning together with approximately 25 participants to Philadelphia for more than seven hours of presentations, workshops, discussions on teaching issues, and small group mentoring. The pre-conference course will be held on August 12, the day before ASA Annual Meeting begins, from 8:30 am to 12 noon and 2 to 6 pm. In addition to the pre-conference, participants can attend many events on teaching during the ASA meetings.

The pre-conference course includes two panels, “How Do They Do It? Successful Teaching Strategies,” featuring award-winning teachers, and “Getting a Job” with sociologists who have expertise on the topic. Participants will be able to select four workshops from a number of topics; these workshops will be held throughout the day. Other presentations on strains in Teaching: What Works/What Doesn’t” and brief presentations by noted sociologists will round out the day. Each participant will be offered the opportunity to continue working with a teaching mentor after the pre-conference.

Participants will select from a number of concurrent workshops led by experts; topics will include: creating a course from scratch, managing classroom dynamics, “Should You Take a Stand? Controversial Issues in the Classroom,” teaching the large class, ethical issues in teaching and academia, assessment in the classroom, teaching styles/multiple intelligences, evaluating teaching performance, writing and presenting on teaching and learning, and other topics.

Those interested in participating should sign up in the ASA conference pre-registration period. Information will be on the ASA website, the ASA Section for Teaching and Learning in Sociology web page, and from Jeanne Ballantine, Sociology, Wright State University, Dayton, OH 45435, e-mail jeanne.ballantine@wright.edu or Greg Weiss, Sociology, Roanoke College, Salem, VA 24373-3574, e-mail weiss@roanoke.edu. Materials and refreshments will be offered by the registration system.

The “Teachers Teaching Teachers” pre-conference is organized and sponsored by the American Sociological Association and the ASA Section on Teaching and Learning in Sociology. The pre-conference is co-sponsored by section members and leaders in ASA from around the country and from all types of institutions, from community colleges to research universities.
Contemporary Sociology Comes to UC-Irvine

by Christine Byrd, University of California-Irvine

Faculty at the University of California-Irvine (UCI) will co-edit the journal Contemporary Sociology for three years beginning in January 2006. In collaboration with UCI’s School of Social Ecology and the School of Social Sciences, the journal will be co-edited by Valerie Jenness, David Smith, and Judith Stepan-Norris.

Recognizing that Contemporary Sociology is a site for lively discussions and exchanges as well as a place to consider the larger issues in the field, the UCI team plans to continue features such as themed symposia and “author meets the critics” exchanges. They are preparing to develop a series of discussions to systematically highlight the ways in which sociology can inform public debate and public policy.

The team will draw heavily on the wealth of talent within the Department of Sociology, which includes 23 faculty, and the Department of Criminology, Law and Society, with its 22 faculty (six of whom also hold courtesy appointments in sociology).

In choosing the editorial board, the co-editors plan to select members representing a diverse range of geographic locations, subfields, backgrounds, and home institutions. Jenness, Smith, and Stepan-Norris worked together previously on the editorial team for Social Problems (1999 to 2002). As co-editors of Contemporary Sociology, each will assume responsibility for processing books in his or her area of expertise.

About the Co-editors

Valerie Jenness

Jenness is Professor and Chair of Criminology, Law and Society and a professor in the interdisciplinary Department at UCI. Her research focuses on the links between deviance and social control (especially drug laws), gender, and social change (especially social movements). She has published numerous articles on the politics of punishment, AIDS and civil liberties, hate crimes and hate crime law, and multiple social movements in the United States. She is currently working on a multi-year study of prison violence, including rape.

Jenness has a multitude of editorial experiences, including serving as an associate editor for Social Problems, as well as being advisory editor for the journals Criminology, Social Problems, Gender & Society, Research in Political Sociology, Sensory & Culture, and Race, Sex and Class.


Jenness has been recognized with awards from the Gustavus Myers Center for the Study of Bigotry and Human Rights in North America, the Society for the Study of Social Problems, the Third World Specific Sociological Association, and the University of California. Jenness has previously served as Research to the U.S. Congress and the National Academy of Sciences.

David Smith

Smith is a Professor of Sociology and a Professor of Planning, Policy and Design at UCI. As a comparative sociologist, his research interests include international trade and exchange in the world-economy (and its implications for economic growth and development), global industrialization and “commodity chains”—especially in the Pacific Rim region. He is also involved in analyzing the dynamics of technological dependence, and technology transfers, in Third World cities and development, and global urbanization.

Previously, Smith was editor of Social Problems, and served on the editorial board of the ASA Rose Monograph Series. He is currently a member of the system-wide University of California Press Editorial Committee, and serves on the editorial and advisory boards of two journals of the World Journal of System Research, Research in Political Sociology, and Urban Studies.

With a grant from the National Science Foundation, Smith is currently researching globalizing in the network of world cities and the analysis of city-to-city connections with case studies of particular urban areas. Recently, he was involved with several research projects doing on-site research in South Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia, and China. Smith is the author of Third World Cities in Global Perspective (Westview Press, 1996). He is co-editor of the forthcoming Nature, Raw Materials and Political Economy (Elsevier, 2005), Labor Versus Empire: Race, Gender and Migration (Routledge Press, 2004), State and Sovereignty in the Global Economy (Routledge, 1999), and A New World Order? Global Transformations in the Late Twentieth Century (Greenwood Press, 1993). His research has been published in American Sociological Review; Social Forces; Population Research and Policy Review; Review of International Political Economy; American Behavioral Scientist, Science, Technology and Human Values, Urban Studies; Urban Affairs Quarterly; and International Social Science Journal.

Judith Stepan-Norris

Stepan-Norris is a Professor of Sociology at UCI and Associate Director of UCI’s Center for the Study of Democracy. Her research has focused on American unions affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO) from its founding in the mid-1930s, when union political activities were at a peak. Her recent research focuses on how workers’ participation in highly democratic, militant, and radical union local politics impacted their political actions in their neighborhoods.

Another project (with Rick Grannis) investigates kinship patterns of the American elite, and asks whether the American Revolution marked the end to the power and privilege of families descended from aristocratic lineages. She is also investigating the revitalization of the U.S. labor movement by focusing on AFL-CIO’s Summer program, and its role in union victories as well as its consequences for recruiting labor activists.

Stepan-Norris has served as an associate editor for Social Problems and an editorial board member for both Marriage & Family Review and the ASA Rose Monograph Series, Sociological Perspectives and Sociological Inquiry. She is the co-recipient of the Max Weber Award for a Distinguished Book, Distinguished Assistant Professor Award for Research, Incentives, and the Studies Award for Distinguished Publication, and twice received the Award for Distinguished Scholarship in Political Sociology.

Conley, from page 1

“As a Waterman awardee, Conley will join a long line of distinguished scientists,” said ASA Executive Officer Sally T. Hillman, “but he will blaze at least one trail in this path by being the first sociologist and only the second behavioral/social scientist to have received the award. The Association also feels a certain sense of validation, because ASA recognized Conley’s scientific promise early in his career by awarding him the ASA’s Outstanding Dissertation Award in 1997.” Conley had recently received the dissertation award for his research on “Being Black, Living in the Red: Wealth and the Cycle of Racial Inequality.”

“Dalton Conley is one of the most creative and productive sociologists at work today,” said R.A. (Sandy) Cohen, President of the Social Science Research Council. “His work is reshaping how sociologists think about large-scale economic processes and also building bridges to economics, public health, and vital policy debates.”

“Sociology is among the hardest sciences of all—harder than the proverbial rocket science,” Conley stated upon receiving the award and after thanking his relatives, friends, and the NSF and NSBF. “Imagine a science where you can’t do controlled experiments—the staple of most bench science,” perhaps implicitly explaining why this is only the second Waterman Award recognition of a social scientist. Commemorating with zoologists and paleontologists, whom he said “share the difficulty of having to piece together observational data without experiments,” Conley explained that sociologists are forced to “impute causal processes, not just describe or classify the world” all while accommodating the multiple levels of analysis that constantly and integrally interact.

An additional theme in sociologists’ professional lives is "the complication of real contingencies," and by virtue of the fact that you study the "many of the topics we study (e.g., gender and sexuality, race and class, family life) are, by design, the most politically charged and most personally sensitive topics one could address. That doesn’t make research easy. When you’ve got all those together then you’ve got yourself the nail-biter of research."
The Intersection of Sociology and Bioethics

by Joseph E. Davis, University of Virginia, Raymond DeVries, St. Olaf College, and John H. Evans, University of California–San Diego

In March, 30 scholars from around the United States, as well as Canada and England, gathered in Washington, DC, for a two-day conference to explore the relationship of sociology to the field of bioethics and to the ethical questions raised by technological developments in medicine. The first day of meetings were held at Georgetown University and included several formal presentations, semi-structured discussions, and an evening dinner and keynote speaker. The second day was organized as a four-session “mini-conference” within the annual meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society (ESS) and was open to all ESS meeting attendees. Originally designed as a conference for 20 participants, organizers underestimated the level of interest in this area of inquiry. The conference quickly grew to 30 scholars from sociology departments, bioethics centers, and medical schools, and registration had closed for reasons of space and available funding.

Sociological Origins

The conference’s organizing premise was that sociology has an important contribution to make to bioethics. It is little remembered now, but bioethics began as an interdisciplinary conversation that included a number of well-known sociologists, such as Renee Fox, Douglas Callahan, and Robin Williams. Over the years, however, as the field developed and was institutionalized, it came to be dominated by philosophers and forms of argumentation drawn from analytic philosophy. Sociologists, along with scholars from other disciplines, moved to the periphery, a move that has impoverished bioethical debates. Despite marginalization, sociologists have nonetheless made important contributions. Conference organizers, mindful of these contributions, sought to build upon them, recognized that sociology has theoretical and methodological tools that can fruitfully deepen and expand the agenda of bioethics. At the same time, they recognized the general lack of communication between scholars who are working on bioethical questions from a sociological perspective. For example, those who are located in medical schools and bioethics centers are typically engaged in “sociology in bioethics.” Working within the dominant biomedical framework, they call attention to the importance of sensitivity to cultural and social nuances in ethical reasoning and decision-making. Those outside of a medical setting, by contrast, are often engaged in a “sociology of bioethics,” studying ethical dilemmas in medicine through, and in an effort to further, sociological understanding of health, medicine, and the professions. The relationship between these two types of scholarship has been often discussed. The conference, then, aimed to press the question of how sociology can effectively and institutionally contribute to the field of bioethics and bring differently situated sociologists into conversation with one another.

By all accounts, the conference made significant progress. The discussions were fruitful, and bioethicists participated in a provocative paper by “guest” bioethicist Leigh Turner, McGill University, who challenged standard social science critiques of bioethics as unfair and, most telling, empirically unfounded. In the same session, Barbara Katz Rothman, City University of New York, weighed in with a self-described “cranky critique” of her own, arguing that as sociologists are drawn into discussions of ethical issues, it is “essential that we do not allow the terms to be established by those who call upon us to speak.” During his keynote address, bioethicist pioneer Daniel Callahan, founder of the Hastings Center and one who has long decried the marginalization of the social sciences in bioethics debates, offered a number of suggestions for sociologists who want to engage the field, including thoughtful proposals on the “is/ought” problem. The ESS panels concerned the “Ethics of Research,” “Constructing Ethics at the Margins of Life,” “Sociology of Bioethics,” and “Responsible Subjects: Consent and Misconceptions.”

In the wrap-up session at the end of the conference, participants called for future meetings of the group and the creation of additional avenues for communication. They are also pursuing various avenues for publishing some of the exemplary conference papers. If interested in being a part of future communications with this nascent group, contact John Evans at jevans@ucsd.edu.

The conference was made possible by two grants from the Center on Religion and Democracy at the University of Virginia.

International Sociological Association World Congress

The International Sociological Association (ISA) is holding its World Congress of Sociology for the first time in Africa. The theme of the July 23-29 16th Congress is “The Quality of Social Environments in a Globalising World.” Durban provides with an opportunity to encounter a society in transition, in a context highly cognizant of the importance of social science in reconstruction and development. With its superb facilities and infrastructure, Durban has a proven track record of hosting international events and conferences.

ISA’s goal is to represent sociologists everywhere, regardless of school of thought, scientific approach, theory, or methodology. The association represents the social science of the world. Its members come from 109 countries. ISA is a member of the International Social Science Council and a professional association with UNESCO and special consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

For more information, see <www.ucm.info/isa/3a5>.

2005 Regional Sociological Associations’ Award Winners

Eastern Sociological Society

Candace Rogers Award: Sangeeta Parashar, University of Maryland-College Park

Rose Laub Censer Award: Salvador Vidal-Ortiz, CUNY Graduate Center; Honorable Mention: Minjung Kim, SUNY-Albany

Komarovsky Book Award: Richard Alba and Victor Nee for Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and Contemporary Immigration, Honorable Mentions: Vivek Chibber for Locked in Place: State Building and Late Industrialization in India; Jerry A. Jacobs and Kathleen Gerson for To the Time Divide: Work, Family and Gender Inequality.

Mariano Luis Small for Villa Victoria: The Transformation of Social Capital in a Boston Barrio

2004-2005 Robin M. Williams, Jr., Lectureship Acknowledgement: Jack Levin, Northeastern University

2005-2006 Robin M. Williams, Jr., Lecturer: Vincent Parrillo, William Paterson University

Meztli Award: William A. Gamson, Boston College and Caroline Hodges Persell, New York University

North Central Sociological Association

Graduate Student Paper Winners: Judson Everitt, Indiana University; Jeffrey Dixon and Janice McCabe, Indiana University; Ryotaro Lemura, Indiana University

Undergraduate Student Paper Winners: Rachel K. Beck, United States Military Academy; Hyeylin Kim, University of Notre Dame; Toshia Smith, Saint Mary’s College

Southwestern Sociological Association

Distinguished Paper: “Civic Engagement and County Economic Growth in Appalachia During the 1990s,” by Carson Mencken and Christopher Bader, Baylor University

Award for Distinguished Contributions to Teaching: Rose Weitz, Arizona State University

Award for Distinguished Contributions to Practice: Kari M. Norgaard, University of California-Davis

Award for Distinguished Graduate Student Paper: Yvonne A. A. Fraura, University of California-Irvine, for “Resettlement and Risk: Women’s Community Work in Lesotho”

Award for Distinguished Undergraduate Student Paper: Nicole Kemper, Jessica Crowe, and Elizabeth Budd, Santa Clara University, for a collaborative research project, “Community Service Organizations and the Experiences of Student Volunteers: Applied Sociology in Action”

Pacific Sociological Association

Award for Distinguished Contribution to Sociological Perspectives: Karin Elizabeth Peterson, University of North Carolina-Asheville for “Discourse and Display: The Modern Eye, Entrepreneurship, and the Cultural Transformation of the Patchwork Quilt”

Award for Distinguished Contributions to Teaching: Rose Weitz, Arizona State University

Award for Distinguished Contributions to Practice: Kari M. Norgaard, University of California-Davis

Award for Distinguished Graduate Student Paper: Yvonne A. A. Fraura, University of California-Irvine, for “Resettlement and Risk: Women’s Community Work in Lesotho”

Award for Distinguished Undergraduate Student Paper: Nicole Kemper, Jessica Crowe, and Elizabeth Budd, Santa Clara University, for a collaborative research project, “Community Service Organizations and the Experiences of Student Volunteers: Applied Sociology in Action”

Southwestern Sociological Association

Charles S. Johnson Award: Valeria I. Polsky, California State University-Long Beach

Martin S. Levin Distinguished Service Award: Abiobt L. Ferriss, Emory University

Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award: Idee Winfield, College of Charleston

The Odum Award, Best Graduate Student Paper: Carissa Froyum, North Carolina State University, “Making Meaning of Sexuality: Low-Income African American Teens and Their Beliefs in Sexuality”

The Odum Award, Best Undergraduate Paper: Scott Jacques, University of Georgia, for “The Management of Predation Among Young, Middle Class Drug Dealers”

New England Sociological Association

New England Sociologist of the Year Award: Alexander Lizias, Regis College

Midwest Sociological Association

Social Action Awards: Access Works; Resource Center of the Americas

Distinguished Service Awards: Carla Howery, American Sociological Association; Peter Kivisto, Augustana College

President’s Special Awards: Betty Havens (posthumously); Eric Reed, University of Iowa

Student Paper Competition Winners Graduate Division: First Prize: Jun Xu, Indiana University, “Why Do Minorities Participate Less? The Effects of Immigration, Education, and Electoral Process on Asian American Voter Registration and Turnout”

Second Prize: Catherine Bolzendahl and Sigrun Olafsdottir, Indiana University, “Public Solutions or Private Problems? Understanding U.S. Support for Family Policy in a Comparative Perspective”

Third Prize: Valerie Lewis, University of Notre Dame, “Social Energy Theory Ex-Planation”

Undergraduate Division: First Prize: Hyeylin Kim, University of Notre Dame, “Class, Culture, and Conflict: African American - Korean American Conflict in South LA”

Second Prize: Devan Starks, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, “School Attainment: Pathways through Academic Achievement and Depression to Delinquency”
Whose Science Is behind the Science in Qualitative Methodology?

Robertta Spalter-Roth's March 2005 Footnotes article, “Putting the Science in Qualitative Methodology” (p. 6) is a welcome report of a 2003 National Science Foundation (NSF) workshop on the “Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research” (see Ragain, Nagel and White, 2004). Sociologists might pay attention any time NSF shows interest in qualitative inquiry. However, Spalter-Roth’s report and the NSF workshop require comment on several grounds, each of which turns on the means of fostering a science, research, qualitative, and methodology.

In her summary, Spalter-Roth asks if qualitative research is scientific, if so, how can it be strengthened and properly evaluated? She notes that there has been concern from NSF about the lack of uniform standards for evaluating qualitative proposals. The workshop participants agreed because NSF funds rigorous research, qualitative proposals should not be submitted at an early stage, and if it is, the stance of grounded theory should be the avoided. Research applications should include statements on the possible impact of the researcher’s presence on the study. They should also offer discussions of replicability, data analysis, data archiving, and the procedures that will be used for interpreting confirming evidence.

The science in NSF seems to be a positivist science based on traditional notions of validity and reliability. NSF’s qualitative research is scientific, if it conforms to these criteria. A positivist methodology becomes the vehicle for writing and evaluating grant applications.

It is as if these guidelines were written in a time warp. Over the last decades the field of qualitative research has become an interdisciplinary field in its own right. Qualitative inquiry is now a name for a research paradigm that began in the early 1970s in the academy (Schwandt, 2000). The interpretive and critical paradigms that underlie these qualitative paradigms, are central to this movement. Complex literatures are now attached to research methodology. Research methodologies of inquiry, interpretive paradigms, and criteria for reading and evaluating inquiry itself.

Indeed, this movement encompasses multiple paradigmatic formulations. It also includes complex epistemological and ethical criticisms of traditional social science research. Within this space, grounded theory has become a dominant interpretive model. Few today speak of data, reliability, validity, or disconfirming evidence. The movement now has its own journals, scientific associations, annual conferences and world-wide followings.

Today the field of qualitative research is defined by a series of essential tensions, contradictions, and hesitations. The methodological conservatism or fundamentalism embodied in the educational and social sciences of the Bush administration has inscribed narrowly defined governmental regimes of truth (Lincoln and Sorell, 2004). In its criteria for evaluating qualitative research, it seems that NSF wants to reproduce the same narrow model of truth. The transformations in qualitative research that were taking place in the early 1970s continue to gain momentum. The danger of value-laden inquiry based on a God’s eye view of reality are judged by many to be over. Today, many agree that science is moral and political. Further, today we know that men and women write culture differently, and writing is not an innocence practice. Experimental, reflexive ways of writing first-person ethnographic texts have become commonplace. Critical personal narratives have become a central feature of counter-hegemonic, decolonizing methodologies (Mutsa and Swadener, 2004, p. 36).

Sadly, none of this literature is evident in the NSF report, or in Spalter-Roth’s summary. This is unfortunate because it creates the impression that somehow the social sciences of the social sciences is out of touch with these developments that are now three decades old.

References


Norman K. Denzin, University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign, n-denzin @uic.edu

On the Creation of “Public Interest Sociology”

Few agree on what falls within the definition “public sociology.” In order to avoid a definitional row, one can circumscribe the field by examining what public sociologists actually do planning, program development, evaluation, policy analysis, and research. Planners write plans that are placed on shelves and often forgotten; program developers create programs that seldom function in the manner in which they were intended to function; evaluation research often is considered to be second-rate and is often ignored, except by the program’s enemies; policy analysts may be influential as staff aids, or they may be a “voice in the wilderness” and policy researchers often take months, or even years, to produce conclusions that others see as impractical or trivial. In all of these positions, public sociologists are marginalized to the policy process.

So we must view public sociology from a new point of view. Public sociology is not merely sociology. Rather, it is a political social science. This is not to say that effective, we must become involved critical, and therefore the difficult, brand of sociology “public interest sociology.” The public interest sociologist must not be conceived in terms of starting out as an idealist. Instead, it should be seen as social justice. John Rawls has indirectly defined social justice as fairness. He argues that the primary subject of justice is the basic structure of society. It is by this means in the way in which the major social institutions distributes fundamental rights and determines the division of advantages. Such since sociologists are trained as researchers or subcommittees. Here, government interest sociologist would be to study social justice, that is we would need to create a public interest sociology think tank to examine, for example, the civil liberties, economic opportunities, and social conditions of our society as well as how our society affects other nations. The perspective would be analogous to that of the public interest attorney. These attorneys serve the public interest by representing disconfirming evidence. The public interest sociologist, too, could represent certain underrepresented groups and publishing our studies. Or, we could examine the individuals, groups, or structures that promote or hinder attainment of social justice. Also with the purview of public interest sociologist is the extent to which the public is under-informed on specific topics.

A model for the functioning of such a research institute might be the conservative Heritage Foundation. The Foundation serves as a resource bank and an academic network for its in-house staff and 1,000 scholars who provide ideas and information for congressional testimony and conferences. The Foundation serves as a clearinghouse, a conduit, and a catalyst for conservative intellectuals and activists. Instead of producing grand theory, the Foundation concentrates on producing short issue analyses for legislators, as well as broader policy studies. We could form such a think tank by soliciting grants and funding from one person. Since the think tank is established we would take our policy papers and begin our second job— as lobbyists.

An ideal place to conduct such lobbying is in legislatures, where power is decentralized and specialization is common. In Washington most problems are dealt with in congressional committees where governmental experts join with legislators and lobbyists to form “subcommittees.” These legislative actions are at the heart of the expert, the interested, and the engaged. However, public interest lobbying has a weakness. They are long on programs, issues, and ideologies; however, they are short on vote-getting ability. That is, they lack the sheer political muscle of organized labor or corporate groups. There is an old political saying that money means—campaign contributions. Therefore, the third job of public interest sociologists would be to create such an action committee. It is unlikely that such a committee could raise large amounts of money. However, with much of the money we could have an impact on carefully selected state legislative races. By electing sympathetic legislators we can influence the policy process, and we might also be able to effect congressional redistricting in 2012. Some members of this lobbying action committee would be a necessity to elect sympathetic legislators. This may appear alien, or even worse, “merely practical,” to academics. However, if you are upset with the drift of our country, you should ask yourself one question: Do we have a choice?

George C. Klein, Oakton Community College, klein@oakton.edu

Institutionalizing Public Sociology

There has been considerable discussion in Footnotes and ASA generally about public sociology (i.e., efforts to “bring sociology to bear on the real world beyond the academy,” as ASA Past-President Michael Burawoy most simply defines the field). Relatively little of that talk, however, has focused on how exactly to begin turning that idea into practice institutionally. If public sociology is to become more than a fleeting debate that recedes with the passing of the ASA presidential torch, our discipline’s departments and professional societies must begin institutionalizing public engagement. To this end, below I present some very practical ways entering faculty and/or students to begin institutionalizing public sociology in their respective department or society.

What Departments Can Do

• Initiate public sociology email lists to facilitate intra- and inter-departmental discussion on how to advance public sociology in the department, the university, and beyond.
• Develop a workshop or series of workshops to train graduate students and faculty in the various ways public sociology can be practiced. Such workshops could discuss getting published in popular media, networking with community organizations for research and/or teaching, and educating legislators on how to work with local, state, or national media producers and artists to engage in visual sociology.
• Establish a volunteer departmental committee of students and faculty interested in advancing public sociology. Such a committee could develop a public sociology workshop, create a departmental resource list for doing public sociology, and facilitate joint ventures between the depart- ment and local video documentar- ians, filmmakers, cartoonists, artists, photographers, journalists, web designers, etc. There is little reason why sociology must be limited to the printed word in books and journals too few read.

What Professional Societies Can Do

• Our professional societies could establish awards for quality sociology that measurable relates with the media (e.g., popular magazine, conferences, sales, subscriptions), or that success- fully reaches the least-advantaged publics.

What Professional Societies Can Do

• Our professional societies could establish awards for quality sociology that measurable relates with the media (e.g., popular magazine, conferences, sales, subscriptions), or that success- fully reaches the least-advantaged publics.
Another Centennial

Much is being made, at least within the ASA, of the fact that this year marks the centennial anniversary of America's pre-eminent professional association of sociologists. That is understandable, proper and predictable. However, there is another centennial of an event of enormous significance to our society and science that seems to have been forgotten or at least so much as a footnote. I refer to the Niagara Movement.

Exactly 100 years ago this July a small but potent group of African-Americans filled with righteous anger over rampant racism in America gathered on the Canadian side of Niagara Falls to declare war on American apartheid and racism in America. See the Annual Meeting insert for more information.

Using the Energy of Interactive Sessions

Editing ASA's Social Stratification Courses Syllabus. This section presented (one of several teaching guides in the ASA Resource Materials for Teaching) often comes with an invitation to present a workshop at the annual meeting on teaching about inequality. The first two times, I formed a panel of contributors to the teaching guide. We had some very fine presentations and I enjoyed meeting and hearing from the contributors. The third time I decided to try something different. I was working with a co-editor and decided that we would co-lead a discussion rather than form a panel. We would still invite all the contributors to join us informally.

We had a few of the usual logistic difficulties. Our room was down a long hallway and hard to find. The room was set up with microphones up front for a two-person panel and many rows of chairs in a deep narrow room. We rearranged the chairs into a long oval as people came in. In spite of the location and the competition of a beautiful sunny San Francisco afternoon, the room continued to fill with increasing interest in the teaching workshops. I opened the session with a few key themes that emerge in several of the teaching guides and some practical ideas that could be taken home, offering a few handouts of ideas, and then websites where more could be found as the handouts ran out. But after setting the tone, we turned to the growing group for their own ideas and struggles in these key topic areas. Sociologists are never hard to get talking and soon the room was buzzing with ideas as one participant after another built on previous ideas, offered alternatives, or raised new questions.

The discussion could likely have continued all afternoon but about ten minutes short of our allotted time, I ended the session and gave them their assignment. To gather in the room who had offered ideas that intrigued them, or who were working on similar topics, and to exchange cards and emails. The room was once again buzzing with animated mingling participants—some distributing the collection, some seasoned instructors, some graduate students seeking new ideas, some offering new handouts. The very patient people coming for the next session managed to chase everyone out of the room, but I hope the dialog and indeed continue through email and contacts long after.

The evaluations of the session noted the limitations (need for more handouts, more space, more coordination) but a strong refrain of affirmation threaded throughout them all. Some said it was by far the liveliest and most useful session they had attended in long time. Many noted that they were taking away much more practical material than from a typical session. A couple said they wished all sessions could be conducted like this. I wonder if more could be.

I am sure that many went on to inspiring and informative talks, others to useful workshops. But I also suspect that others went on to sessions where they heard papers read that they themselves could read back home in a good journal or online in less time. Some no doubt block out on to talks which the paper reading took too much time, so that there was no time even for a conclusion let alone discussion. Others probably squatted at regression coefficients buried somewhere in PowerPoints, presentations, thinking that they would have to wait for the article, or read the handout on the airplane, to get point.

What's Left for the Minority?

The fact that Republicans did not push for the rule change shows that the minority cannot simply do anything it wants. The minority does have some recourse. Because there is no equivalent to the Senate filibuster in the House, the minority lacks a key mechanism for blocking legislation. Thus, the tools that exist for the minority party rest largely outside of the formal political process. When trying to overcome majority control, Democrats turn to the public. While the majority might not listen to democratic gripes about legislation or procedural malfeasance, it does yield to media scrutiny and public opinion. By shining enough light on a particular issue, the minority can pressure the majority. What made it difficult for Republicans to enact their legislation was that they did not have a majority at the House, Democrats had won the elections. Republicans had lost elections.

Although this plea has been made before, perhaps it is time again to call for serious consideration of bringing those diverse perspectives into a single place, and that make the most of the legislative process. Imagine a world that is increasingly dominated by electronically mediated communication. It is not hard to imagine that speakers at your best ideas and learning experiences at the meetings, but if you don’t mind, I’ll get back to the study the coeffi-
cients when I get home.

Scott R. Sernau, Indiana University-South Bend, sernau@iusb.edu

MAY/JUNE 2005 FOOTNOTES
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Call for Papers

Conferences

Association for Human Sociology Annual Meeting, October 26-30, 2005, Tampa, FL. Theme: “Nonviolence and the Struggle for Social Justice 2005.” For information about sessions related or unrelated to the theme by April 15, 2005 contact David M. Billig, Chair, Department of Sociology and Social Work, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN 47809, (814) 232-4241, davidbillig@ius.edu.

Latino Conference on Hip-Hop: From Local to Global Practice, October 21, 2005, Lehman College, Bronx, NY. This conference exploring the subject of religion and its historical relations to politics, culture, and society. We especially encourage proposals for articles with a interdisciplinary and transnational perspectives. Please submit a 1- to 2-page abstract summarizing your article by March 15, 2006, to frh06@lego.org.

Social and Preventive Medicine

The Fulbright Scholar Program invites applications for up to 10 junior scholars. Contact: Pam Poston and Jan Moody, Department of Social and Preventive Medicine, Box 201302, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 43210-3313. Fax: (614) 292-6687; email: pposton@stat.osu.edu/2005fellowships.htm. The Fulbright Scholar Program is “The World’s Largest Educational Exchange Program.” A completed doctorate or equivalent is required by the application deadline. Applications are due November 15, 2005. Applications must be sent to the Institute for Advanced Study, School of Social Science, Einstein Drive, Princeton, NJ 08540. For more information, email ias@ias.edu, or visit http://ias.princeton.edu/

Radical History Review is accepting 25-30 grants in Dynamic Data Driven Applications Systems (DDDAS). These grants are intended to stimulate and support multidisciplinary research and educational projects that span and advance these integrative approaches to enable DDDAS. Investigators must clearly describe how, by employing the DDDAS concept, their proposed efforts will lead to new and/or improved algorithms and measurements. The research scope in every proposed project must be driven by a specific application domain and must indicate how the DDDAS concept advances the specific application or systems science. Please contact: Conference Chair, DDDAS Symposium on the poster program of this conference, visit <www.ushivconference.com>. For more information, email <feedback@ushivconference.com>.


September 30-October 1, 2005. Alenos de Toulouse, a conference inhibition commemorating the bicentennial of his birth. The conference Bamboue Rare Manuscript Library. For more information, visit <www.library.yale.edu/europe/beinecke/beineke.html>

October 13-14, 2005. Pennsylvania State University’s 12th Annual Symposium on Social and Preventive Medicine, Lebanon, PA. Theme: “Early Disparities in School Readiness: How Do Families Contribute to Successful and Unsuccessful Transitions into School?” Contact: Carolyn Scott, (814) 863-6806; email: cscott@psu.edu. For more information, contact <www.pubs.psu.edu/events/symposiums/>.

October 22, 2005. Michigan Sociological Association Meeting, University of Michigan. Theme: “Social Inequalities Persistence and Solutions.” For more information, visit <users.temagnet.net/ahgill/Program.htm>, or email ahgill@umich.edu.

Funding

The Fulbright Scholar Program is offering grants to U.S. citizens to teach in 140 countries for the 2006-2007 academic year. Application deadlines for the awards are as follows: May 1, 2005, for the U.S. and Canada; April 15, 2005, for Europe, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Israel, and Russia. August 1, 2005, for Fulbright travelers and Fellows. Applications are due in October for the November 3, 2005, U.S./Germany International Education Administrators program. Rolling deadline for Fulbright Senior Specialist Programs. For more information, visit <www.cies.org>, or email: apprequest@cies.org.

The Independent Institute is pleased to announce the 2005 Oliver W. Garvey Fellowship Competition. The essay topic for 2005 is taken from a quotation by sobel-lawson.com: "The social policy of Fehrenbacher. A. "The great aim of the struggle for liberty has never been to destroy the institutions which need not be technical or demonstrate that they are inefficient. They need be serious in content, tone, and style. Any student 35 years or younger enrolled at a recognized college or university anywhere in the world and involved in the study of social policy, teacher, assistant professor or higher, 35 years or younger eligible. Student essays must not exceed 3,000 words. Teacher essays may not exceed 5,000 words. Essays are due May 1, 2005. For more information, visit <www.independent.org/indpol/garvey/>. And Stata continues to be one of the strongest data-management and graphics packages available.

The United States Institute of Peace invites applications for the 2005-2006 Senior Fellow- ship and the 2006-2007 Peace Scholar Fellowship Competition in Latin American Studies. Both of these fellowships are open to academics, practitioners, and policy-makers who are based in the United States and are engaged in research and scholarship on Latin America, Caribbean, and the Andes. These fellowships are awarded annually to scholars and practitioners from a variety of professions, including university and college faculty, journalists, diplomats, writers, policy analysts, historians, executive officers, NGOs, policy consultants, and lawyers. The host institutions, 21st century, and related topics. The Institute is especially interested in topics addressing problems of the Muslim world, post-war reconstruction and reconciliation, and oncussion and terrorism and political violence. Application must be submitted by September 15, 2005. For more information and an application form, visit <www.usip.org>, or contact the Jennings Randolph Program, U.S. Institute of Peace, 1210 17th St NW, Suite 1000, Washington, DC 20006; 202-429-3685; fax (202) 429-6065; e-mail: program@usip.org.

Competition

The Social Science Research Council (SSRC), the Japan Foundation for Global Partnership (CGP), and the

Mixed models

Both logistic and joint models have been used to analyze multivariate longitudinal data. Both models can include a variety of longitudinal models for the different responses. However, joint models can be more efficient when the responses are strongly correlated. One advantage of joint models is that they can be used to improve the precision of the parameter estimates. One disadvantage of joint models is that they can be difficult to implement and they can be computationally intensive.

The main difference between logistic and joint models is that logistic models can only handle binary data, while joint models can handle a variety of data types. Logistic models can also be used to estimate the effects of covariates on the response variable. Joint models can be used to estimate the effects of covariates on both the longitudinal and the binary responses.

Mixed models are a class of statistical models that combine the features of both logistic models and joint models. Mixed models can handle both continuous and categorical data, and they can be used to estimate the effects of covariates on both the longitudinal and the binary responses.

Mixed models can be used to estimate the effects of covariates on both the longitudinal and the binary responses. Mixed models can be used to estimate the effects of covariates on both the longitudinal and the binary responses. Mixed models can be used to estimate the effects of covariates on both the longitudinal and the binary responses.
The Wilson International Center for Scholars

The Wilson International Center for Scholars announces the opening of its 2006-2007 Fellowship competition. The Center awards annual residential fellowships to men and women from any country with outstanding project proposals on national and/or international issues. Topics are broad, and the fellowships are not limited to public policy; they may extend to the historical and/or cultural frameworks of ideas and practices of contemporary import. Fellowships are offered for offices, access to the Library of Congress, Windows-based computers, and research assistants.

The application deadline is October 1, 2005. For eligibility requirements and application guidelines, please contact the Center. If you wish to download our application, visit our Web site at www.wilsoncenter.org.
Are you helping the world to grow together?

Air travel, telephone, internet: for citizens of the world, our planet is steadily growing smaller. Despite this, the risk of misunderstandings is becoming more acute. In every country there are groups of people with their own cultures and religions – a situation that can all too often lead to conflicts.

For more than 20 years, we have dedicated our efforts to promoting understanding between the peoples of this world. We support those who come up with ideas, initiate projects and display the determination needed to make the distinctions between population groups better understood and accepted – not to cause them to disappear.

This year again, an international jury will select the best theoretical and practical ideas, the originators of which will receive the BMW Group Award for Intercultural Learning. Prizes valued at 5,000 Euro are presented in two categories, for instance to schools, academic graduates or various institutions. If this interests you, please forward your project documentation to us by 15th September 2005.

For more information, go to www.bmwgroup.com/award-life

BMW Group