Footnotes

Nominations Committee 1983 Slate Announced

The Committee on Nominations' candidates for President-Elect, Vice President-Elect, Council and the Committee on Publications in the Association's 1983 election have now been determined. The slate of nominees for election to the Committee on Nominations and the Committee on Remains incomplete and will be announced in the January FOOTNOTES.

Additional nominees may be placed on the ballot through open nominations. The deadline for filing petitions supporting other candidates for the positions covered in this announcement is January 31, 1983. Petitions for nominees for the Presidency and Vice Presidency require the signatures of one hundred voting members of the Association. Petitions for nominees for Council and Committees require fifty signatures.

Candidates nominated so far are listed below:

- **PRESEIDENT-ELECT:** Kai Erikson, Yale University; Alex Inkeles, Stanford University
- **VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT:** John Clagett, University of California, Berkeley; Morris Rosenberg, University of Maryland
- **COUNCIL MEMBER AT-LARGE:** Glen H. Elder, Jr., Cornell University; Lucie Cheng Hirta, University of California-Los Angeles; Alan C. Kerckhoff, Duke University; Jack Ladinsky, University of Wisconsin-Madison;
- **Cora Marrett, University of Wisconsin-Madison;**
- **Roberta G. Simmons, University of Minnesota;**
- **Gay Tuchman, CUNY Graduate Center;**
- **Michael Useem, Boston University
- **COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS:**
  - **BRUCE RIBNICK, MEMBER AT-LARGE:**
    - **GLEN H. ELDER, JR., CORNELL UNIVERSITY;**
    - **LUCIE CHENG HIRTA, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-LOS ANGELES;**
    - **ALAN C. KERCKHOFF, DUKE UNIVERSITY;**
    - **JACK LADINSKY, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON;**

Detroit: A Good Setting for an Annual Meeting

Dear ASA Members,

This is the first of a series of letters I will be writing through FOOTNOTES to tell you about plans underway for the 1983 Annual Meeting in Detroit, August 31 through September 4th.

But this is perhaps the most important letter in my series. I have just returned from a first visit to Detroit in many years. I went to Detroit with a good deal of skepticism, or worse, I would find, but I returned in a state of enthusiasm and euphoria. The trip was largely informed by a worry that ASA members might share my earlier skepticism and tend to "skip the Detroit meeting," as one of my students put it. Did it not take long to dispel that skepticism, once on the Detroit scene? For one thing, our major hotel was the Motor Inn, the most impressive hotel ASA will meet in for many years, with 70 floors of well-appointed rooms (at a good discount for ASA registrants), and the most commodious facilities for our sessions that I have ever seen. It is a round, corner-shaped building, every bedroom and suite with a breathtaking view. Each room has its own thermostat to control temperatures and there are escalators connecting the meeting room floors so no one will stand waiting for elevators. And no one will have to scurry through August heat to another hotel to make a meeting, because the Westin Hotel is large enough to hold all our professional and social activities.

There is an 8-floor Atrium core to the round hotel, with all the meeting rooms, exhibit halls, pool, sauna and exercise rooms, ballrooms, easily accessible on the first several floors surrounding the core. There are vast parking facilities close to the hotel and the bus trip from the airport to the hotel costs only $5.00.

The Westin Hotel itself has 4 restaurants, several cocktail lounges and a nightclub. The Atrium levels are honeymooned with comfortable, quiet nooks for casual visitation and private conversation. (Notice office workers from nearby buildings enjoying brown-bag lunches in these facility, "pods" with a view of views, hugging vines, guitar, music and take on the ground floor below them.)

The Westin Hotel is part of the complex known as the Renaissance Center. Just a few steps from the hotel Registration Desk, you will find a great variety of restaurants (ranging from a McDo- nald's and fast food shops to elegance of French, Greek and Japanese). A wide variety of shops, six movie theaters, ethnic coffee and pastry shops. (There are even expensive breakfast shops that open at 6 a.m. for Early Bird ASA members like myself.) Buses to Windsor, Canada, leave just across the street from the Westin Hotel, for a quick 10-minute trip through the tunnel under the Detroit River, where your American dollar can buy $1.20 worth of Canadian food, drinks and gifts. Close to the Westin Hotel, there is a sports arena, an outdoor concert facility, a weekend ethnic festival throughout the summer, and easy access to Belle Isle in the middle of the Detroit River, where there is a zoo, conservatory and marina.

(See Renaissance Page 5)

Task Group on Homosexuality Report Published

In response to a resolution presented by the Sociologists' Gay Caucus and passed by the membership at the annual business meeting at the 1978 convention in San Francisco, the ASA Council established a Task Group on Homosexuality. This group was given the specific charge of (1) reviewing existing knowledge in the sociology of homosexuality, and (2) identifying topics in this field which demand research. The original resolution had also called for a thorough and impartial investigation of discrimination against homosexuals within the discipline and of restraint upon research on the topic of homosexuality. Further, it required that the findings of the investigation be widely disseminated.

The Task Group, chaired by Joan Huber and consisting of John Gagnon, Suzanne Keller, Ronald Watson, Patricia Miller and William Simon, completed its work in December, 1981, and its report was published in the August 1982 issue of The American Sociologist. The highlights and recommendations from the report are reprinted below:

HIGHLIGHTS

A discussion of the research literature on homosexuality convinced the Task Group that a primary need was an investigation of the extent to which gay and lesbian sociologists encounter problems in being hired and promoted, and the extent to which any sociologists encounter problems in teaching courses and conducting research on homosexuality. Our findings are based, primarily on three surveys. The first survey was mailed to the approximately 2,000 heads and chairs of graduate and undergraduate sociology departments in the United States; 64 usable questionnaires were clipped and returned. The second was surveyed at the 1982 Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association; 54 usable questionnaires were clipped and returned. The third was mailed to the Sociologists' Gay Caucus and was published in Networks (May 1980), the newsletter of Sociologists for Women in Society; 51 were returned. The main findings were as follows:

First, sociology department heads and chairs frequently perceive real barriers to the hiring and promotion of known homosexuals. Sixty-three percent of the heads and chairs reported that hiring a known homosexual would produce serious problems. They explained that it could not just be done. Difficulty in hiring gay rights' activists is seen as being more widespread; 84 percent of the heads and chairs said that it would produce serious problems or could not be done. The proportion of heads and chairs who perceive barriers in promoting homosexuals is high, 49 percent for promoting known homosexuals, 65 percent for promoting activists.

Among these most widely viewed as disapproving homosexuals are the campus gatekeepers.

Departmental Visits Program Continues to be Successful

During the twelve-month period between September 1, 1981 and August 31, 1982, nineteen institutions requested and received the services of the Teaching Resources Group. This program of institutional visits—a component of the ASA Teaching and Service Program—combines general and specific skills that consultants bring to departments' agendas on teaching with evaluative and support functions as well. The reports from these institutions testify to the success of this program, and document its effectiveness at the institutions visited. Ten visits were made to universities, eight to four-year colleges, and one was arranged through a professional association. It is most regrettable that no visits were either requested or arranged with a two-year institution. The informal information networks and formal announcements which keep colleges and universities informed only simply do not operate for the two-year institutions, Dr. Hans Mauksch, coordinator of the Teaching Resources Group. He also stressed the difficulty in channeling information to sociologists in multidisciplinary divisons within two-year institutions.

While most visits involved a service to sociology departments or to individual disciplinary departments including sociology, seven visits were essentially interdisciplinary in structure. The services provided by the American Sociological Association have no comparable counterparts in other disciplines, thus an increasing number of requests come from interdisciplinary groups or divisions, or, at times, from other disciplines. Teaching clinics, especially, have been requested by teachers from a wide range of backgrounds. These clinics in

Season's Greetings
An Alternative Approach to Discipline's Funding Problems

Cynthia B. Flynn
President, Social Impact Research, Inc.
Professional, Recession Association Managers

The August 1982 FOOTNOTES contained an article by Edna Benach that articulated an ethical approach to solving budget problems, starting at the departmental level. This article is a response to that article which addresses one of its limitations. Many of you who have been appointed to exactly the same academic community, some of you outside of academia who are already addressing some of the same problems, and are doing it with limited financial resources, feel that the debate has not been resolved. The August 1982 FOOTNOTES contained an article by Edna Benach that articulated an ethical approach to solving budget problems, starting at the departmental level. This article is a response to that article which addresses one of its limitations. Many of you who have been appointed to exactly the same academic community, some of you outside of academia who are already addressing some of the same problems, and are doing it with limited financial resources, feel that the debate has not been resolved.

Firstly, the composition of the ASA panel chosen for San Francisco was apparently chosen from members of the academic community. Those of us outside of academia who are already addressing some of the same problems, and are doing it with limited financial resources, feel that the debate has not been resolved.

Second, the article asserts that “virtually no one believes that young sociologists is being annihilated by lack of employment opportunities.” The remainder of the article makes it clear that the only employment opportunities considered are academic and quasi-academic positions. Those who are “charmed into private industry” are, as the article defines them, in reality “unemployed.” Such a statement is not only incorrect, it is offensive.

The facts are, in fact, the most exciting opportunities for young sociologists are located outside academia. The term “lines” is one of limited utility in solving the budgetary problems of academia.

But from a “business” viewpoint, there are several “lines” which are available as alternatives to those defined by existing sources supporting academic activity. Just one example is private consulting. This is a viable source due primarily to the differences in the value placed on academics’ time inside versus outside academia. For instance, currently, the salary of a full-time Professor with a good University is about $13 per hour. However, in an applied setting, that academic’s knowledge is in high demand at times when academic hourly rate, and with a bit of applied experience, is worth considerably more.

The problems inherent in utilizing this price differential are considerable. One serious problem is the fact that graduate schools teach us not to place a value on our time or what we know. If we don’t know what they earn per hour, don’t know what their time is worth outside of academia, and would be unlikely to know who would expect them to know. Like fine artists, we are taught to fear the academic “system” which pays for our work. It is not uncommon for the professional ethics of applied sociologists to be questioned by academics. Most academics are (justifiably) afraid that if anything is paid to them or written about their area of expertise, their colleagues will question their integrity.

Another serious problem is that academia as a group are poor time managers; they don’t seem to realize that all they have to “sell” is time. They lose out to or any other institution—is their time. Those who have more experience and expertise can sell their hours, for example, can charge off each week with the same 168 hours to allocate. We don’t have any “vectors” in our inventory; we just have hours. The question is how to invest these hours most profitably among the many “lines” available to us. For instance, if you can sell an hour for $20 or $30 or $50 or $100, you can invest it in your academic research, does not the whole academic community benefit? If we are to begin rethinking our approach to our professional work, I would agree with the conclusion that the academic system is being seriously threatened. A major university has already disturbed its geography and possibly its basic research. Further, I believe that it is clear that academia can no longer de-emphasize (if they can) its academic viewpoint, but to develop other “lines” to insure the survival of that viewpoint.

One thing that has not been taken immediandy, the implication of this problem can be illustrated from the example above. We can choose to stop placing the blame for budgetary problems on the internal, including, the university administration. We can cut the responsibility for the financial support of our work by creatively examining alternative “lines” of sponsoring our academic work. We can begin by rethinking our traditional attitudes toward the monetary value of our work. We can then turn our attention to the marketing of our research and teaching efforts. We can begin by rethinking our traditional attitudes toward the monetary value of our work. We can then turn our attention to the marketing of our research and teaching efforts.

The Future of Sociology and the University: A Reply
Edna Benach
University of California-Riverside

It is clear that Cynthia Flynn and I start from very different premises, making it easy for us to talk past one another, not having different goals and define the central problem differently. Thus Flynn assumes that the discipline is in such bad health and the chief dilemma we face is one of fund-raising. She puts it this way: “...How can departments and faculty member have little control over any of those sources. But many young sociologists are under such pressure from the larger systems in which they operate that each is now less able to support academic departments.”

In contrast, I am concerned with a much larger question, namely: What will be the future of higher education, in general, and the social sciences in particular? A society where both are under severe attack as independent institutions? My concern is not merely with the survival of academic sociology, but with the form that survival can and should take. The key questions are: What is the kind of research and education that we are providing and how appropriate are they to current conditions? What shifts in our research and education do we need to make in light of the withdrawal of state support? And what implications do these shifts have for the substance and independence of our discipline?

Flynn appears to believe that accommodating to current pressures, which includes attempts to tie the university more closely to the private sector, is non-problematic. Following good marketing guidelines, she seems sell our skills to the highest bidder. If sociologists seem a bit reluctant to do this, she attributes it more plausibly to a tendency to fatalistic sociology: “We are taught to be wary of being coerced...Most academics are afraid that they will de-emphasize their academic viewpoint, but to develop other ‘lines’ to insulate the survival of that viewpoint.”

Some Further Steps
There are many positive steps that can be taken immediately; the implication of this problem can be illustrated from the example above. We can choose to stop placing the blame for budgetary problems on the internal, including, the university administration. We can cut the responsibility for the financial support of our work by creatively examining alternative “lines” of sponsoring our academic work. We can begin by rethinking our traditional attitudes toward the monetary value of our work. We can then turn our attention to the marketing of our research and teaching efforts.

On one point I fully agree with Flynn. The university is not the only place for sociologists to work. There are exciting opportunities outside of academia, and there is vital work to be done. Indeed, I am very much in favor of breaking down the barriers between the university and society at large, encouraging access by all populations to the university, and involving the university actively in the social concerns of the nation. But I would hope that sociologists would work more closely with the university with more than the almsbox in mind.

We find ourselves in a crisis; not only by economic stagnation, monstrous unemployment, cutbacks in social programs, but by the fear that our own country is not a discipline, which encompasses some of the most profound and thorough research on social issues, we have some responsibility to confront these issues. Following the path advocated by Flynn, of serving as paid consultants to the business community (See Struggle Page 3)
Struggle for Survival Can Threaten Social Responsibility

(continued from page 3)

morality (or, for that matter, to the government or bureaucratic organizations) will quell any critical role that might otherwise be helpful in improving the quality of life for all members of this society. At the heart of the disagreement betweenFlight and other groups is the differential weighting of the values of survival (at the individual, departmental, or disciplinary levels) versus the communal necessity. Obviously concern for survival must occupy some of our time and attention. But in this society, pervaded by threatening insecurity, negotiating one's survival becomes a primary obsession. We seem to lose sight of the question: Survival for what? What larger social purposes should sociology serve?

It is easy to let the struggle for survival lead to a kind of social decay, in which everyone scrambles and competes with one another for a piece of the cake. Too few of us will make it through the contractions. Those who do will leave a sigh of relief and comfort their conscience by the knowledge they have earned the right to win in this rat-race. But, as sociologists, we need to have a larger picture of the future of the race itself and what it does to people, of the social values it represents, and of the necessity to develop some collective responses to prevent the war of all against all.

And what of those people who do not survive? Have we no responsibility to them? Instead of blaming these victims (for incompetence, inadequacy, lack of initiative, or the nature of themselves, etc.) we should not consider the social implications of a society which does not provide adequate guarantees for its members to put their hard-earned education to social use?

Instead of letting declining resources drive us into a destructive battle for survival, in which our discipline's independence is undermined, we can use the crisis in higher education to raise our awareness of current social forces, to develop collective responses, and to consider alternative directions. I would like to see sociologists become an important force in this society, speaking out against the move to higher education to private corporations, as servants of the current social order. Sociologists who will speak in a unified voice in favor of an independent university, and independent social sciences, which are not part of the core institutions, and provide leadership in the search for social justice and human liberation.

OBSERVING

On Consciousness Raising, and Other Matters

There are more than enough reasons to complain about the questionnaire that was mailed with the dues billing, requesting information about the Annual Meeting. The most profuse complaints came from persons in business or government. And well they should. So without further ado, I offer my most sincere apology for the fact that the questionnaire seemed to ignore their interests and needs. Such an interpretation was not justified. In fact, by answering a questionnaire in no way reflects our evaluation of their place in the ASA. If that questionnaire has any merit, it may be that it has raised the level of our consciousness about the interests and needs of those who think of themselves as business, governmental, or corporate-oriented sociologists, or more generally as sociologists in applied settings.

Acknowledging fault is only the beginning of the matter rather than the end. In the months ahead we will turn our attention to developing additional ASA programs that speak to the interests and needs of that growing body of people who work in applied settings. At this point, I would like to encourage people with ideas about developing our common interests to write or otherwise communicate. I promise not to respond with an "Ask not what ASA can do for you, but..."

I will return to this issue at a later time, but for now I will merely draw your attention to the Open Forum column, in which aspects of the "Applied Campus" Debate are aired in some detail.

A memo just in from the National Humanities Alliance (of which we are members) urges me to inform you that NEH funding is still available. Because of all the publicity about proposed cuts, applications to the NEH in 1982 were down. But since the middle of 1982 it turned out, the Conservative Caucus postcard campaign asking Congress to abolish the NEH failed. As a result, the funding level for NEH in 1982 was the same as for 1981. We should not sit back and let a decrease in applications mar the program in the future. Good applications in increasing numbers are the best way to develop momentum needed to insure adequate funding for NEH.

In the same vein, it now appears that the override of the President's veto in early 1983 was a good thing. Good事情 those interested in exploring the possibility of arranging a student internship with their firm or agency. And the third list includes respondents open to discussing their work with individual students. One purpose of all these lists is to assist faculty and students interested in building an applied emphasis into their graduate or undergraduate programs. Another is to foster greater contact and cooperation between practicing and academic sociologists. Each list includes between 400 and 550 entries arranged by state and alphabetically within each state. For each person listed, the following information is provided: name, title, address, telephone number, if available; and conditions. The last item specifies any constraints respondents have imposed on their participation in colloquia, internships, or other programs. In an effort not to burden those ASA members who have generously agreed to help students and departments inform themselves about applied work, circulation of the lists will be limited. "ASA Members Willing to Discuss Their Work with Others" will be sent to Department Chairs, Directors of Graduate or Undergraduate Studies and individual ASA members. There is a minimal charge of $2.00 for each list to cover the cost of reproduction and first class postage. The entire set of three can be purchased for $5.00. Orders should be directed to the ATTENTION OF BETTINA HUBER at the Executive Office (722 N Street N.W., Washington, DC 20006). The letter of request should specify which lists are desired and include a check made out to the ASA.

New Applied Lists Available

About a year ago the Executive Office sent out a brief questionnaire to those Association members employed by business, government, and industry. Respondents were asked for the following information: name, title, address, telephone number, if available; and conditions. The last item specifies any constraints respondents have imposed on their participation in colloquia, internships, or other programs. In an effort not to burden those ASA members who have generously agreed to help students and departments inform themselves about applied work, circulation of the lists will be limited. "ASA Members Willing to Discuss Their Work with Others" will be sent to Department Chairs, Directors of Graduate or Undergraduate Studies and individual ASA members. There is a minimal charge of $2.00 for each list to cover the cost of reproduction and first class postage. The entire set of three can be purchased for $5.00. Orders should be directed to the ATTENTION OF BETTINA HUBER at the Executive Office (722 N Street N.W., Washington, DC 20006). The letter of request should specify which lists are desired and include a check made out to the ASA.

New Applied Lists Available

Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Nominations Invited

Nominations are invited for the 1983 ASA Award for a Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship. The Award is given for a single work, such as a book, monograph, or article, published in the preceding three calendar years (1980-1982).

The winner of this award will be offered a lecture known as the Sorokin Lecture. Regional and state sociological associations/societies may apply to ASA to receive this lecture at ASA expense after the award recipient is announced at the 1983 ASA Annual Meeting.

Members of the Association or other interested or knowledgeable parties may submit nominations for the Award. Nominations should include name of author, title of work, date of work, and publisher, and should be sent by February 15, 1983, to Gerald Suttles, Chair, Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Award Committee, Department of Sociology, University of Chicago, 1126 E. 59th Street, Chicago, IL 60637.
The quadrennial Congress of the International Sociological Association, held in Mexico City from August 16-20, 1962, was, as always, a remarkable event for everyone, provided you knew how to choose. Since many members of ASA do not know that Mexico and other important countries of the world have an ISA Congress, it is like, I shall in this report give something of an overview of both.

The Program of an ISA Congress is even more complex than that of an ASA Convention. It is an ASA Convention that an ISA Congress comes in two parts—one planned by the Program Committee, the other by the host country, from what an ASA Program Committee puts together. Instead of appointing a multitude of Chairs for the sessions that are intended to cover the main fields of sociological specialization, an ISA Program Committee limits itself to a few sessions of general character, leaving it to the program committees of the host country to fill in the gaps with specialized sessions. The Program Committee also passes on requests for ad hoc groups and a few minor changes, but leaves the details to the local organizers. The Research Committees’ portion of the Program is more like that of a convention of the ASA, except that there are many more ISA Research Committees, which tend to be rather more narrowly focused than the sections in ASA, and each of the Research Committees had as many as ten sessions of two or three hours each. Not planned by either the Program Committee or the Research Committees, but certainly fascinating and important, was a student demonstration demanding that the proceedings of the Congress be translated into Spanish. It was a protest against the fact that, because of the language barrier, many discussions were conducted in English, and this had a profound effect on the meetings.

Since the Congress is an opportunity for sociologists from all over the world to come together, it is important to consider the logistics and the implications of the event. The Congress was held in Mexico City, which is a major hub for international travel and a rich cultural center. The city is known for its vibrant streets, bustling marketplaces, and world-renowned museums. The Congress itself was held at the National Autonomous University of Mexico, which is one of the most prestigious universities in Latin America.

The Congress was a significant event for the field of sociology, bringing together scholars from all over the world to discuss the latest findings and ideas in the field. The program was packed with presentations, workshops, and networking opportunities, providing a valuable opportunity for participants to connect with other professionals and share their research.

In conclusion, the ISA Congress was a memorable event for all those who attended. It provided a platform for the exchange of ideas and the advancement of the field of sociology. The richness of the discussions and the diversity of the participants made for a truly enriching experience. The Congress is an event that should not be missed by anyone interested in the future of sociology.
New Association Formed

The Sociological Practice Section has recognized the tremendous diversity of work settings of its members. These settings range from clinical work in private practice to managers in corporations and analysts in governmental offices. In response to this variety, the Section on Sociological Practice has sponsored a subgrouping for those Section members located in the for-profit sector. To this end, the Association of Sociologists in Business and Industry was formed with Philip Monchar as chairperson.

The general purpose of ASBI is threefold: (1) to foster communications among sociologists in the for-profit sector for the development of a social network; (2) to promote contact between sociologists in the business world and colleagues in other sectors; (3) to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas, problems, and solutions to issues common to business people.

Currently, no fee is involved in membership in ASBI, although membership in the Practice Section is required. Persons interested in participating in ASBI should contact the Correspondent Secretary: A. Emerson Smith, Metromark Market Research, 2230 Devine Drive, Suite 103, Columbia, SC 29205. Phone: (803) 256-8694.

The ASB Executive Office continues to try to address the needs of its members working in applied settings, and to assist academic sociologists gain knowledge and experience about sociological applications. Two booklets on careers are now available, one targeting non-academic careers (Embracing a Career with a Sociological Major) and the other for graduate students (Mastering the Job Market). Each booklet is $3.00 (with a 15% discount for bulk purchases) and can be ordered from the ASB Executive Office. See November FOOTNOTES for details.

Three other projects are in the developmental stages: (1) Teaching Applied Sociology, a Reader, which will be available from the Teaching Resources Center in January; send your name and address to be notified for availability or for announcements in FOOTNOTES and the ASB Teaching Newsletter; (2) a series of skill-oriented workshops designed to provide continuing education for sociologists will be held in Washington D.C. in the spring of 1983; (3) preliminary plans are underway for an internships program at the postdoctoral levels. At this time, the Executive Office would appreciate communications from potential internship site supervisors as to their willingness to have advanced interns, the nature of the work to be performed, salary and other compensation available, and the needs of the sponsoring organization.

Search, 2230 Devine Drive, Suite 103, Columbia, SC 29205. Phone: (803) 256-8694.

ASBI Vice-chairperson is L. Carroll DeWeese III, who has responsibilities for a social evening at the 1983 ASA Annual Meeting in Detroit. Carroll would welcome your ideas and can be contacted at: Societal Analysis Department, General Motors Research Laboratories, CAM Technical Center, Warren, MI 48090. Phone: (313) 575-3245.

At this time, ASBI is considering a plan to host a session of roundtables for sociologists interested in the process of research rather than its outcomes. This approach would be more in keeping with the organization's interest in the data collected in business settings. The Chair of ASBI would welcome your ideas or suggestions for organizing, ways it can serve sociologists in for-profit settings, and contributions you can make to its projects. Please communicate your comments to: Philip Monchar, A&T&T, Room 4A20, Route 206, Bedminster, NJ 07921. Phone: (201) 234-6922.

The ASB Executive Office continues to try to address the needs of its members working in applied settings, and to assist academic sociologists gain knowledge and experience about sociological applications. Two booklets on careers are now available, one targeting non-academic careers (Embracing a Career with a Sociological Major) and the other for graduate students (Mastering the Job Market). Each booklet is $3.00 (with a 15% discount for bulk purchases) and can be ordered from the ASB Executive Office. See November FOOTNOTES for details.
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Minorities and Women in Sociology: An Update

by Paul R. Williams

During the early 1970s there were severe shortcomings in the status of minorities and women in sociology which focused mainly on their representation and progress as faculty and students in graduate programs. These reports, initially requested by Council and prepared by the Executive Committee, were based primarily on "audits" of graduate departments. In addition, reports on coverage of such issues as the admission and treatment of minority students and women who were members of graduate faculties and their proportions among new and continuing graduate students and other graduate faculty and staff were also included in the "audits." The term "audits" was published as a special supplement to FOOTNOTES in 1977. Between 1977 and 1981, reports on admission, enrollment, and other aspects of the situation of minorities and women continued. However, emphasis shifted away from the use of internally generated material as the basis for reports to use of data that were provided by other sources. In particular, National Research Council's panels of learned doctores and various other NRC surveys served as the basis for several reports by Wilkenson during this period. The shift away from the use of audit data was prompted by several considerations, perhaps the most important being the general perception that departments were no longer responding adequately to these requests for information about their faculty and students. However, soon after audits were discontinued, a limited number of questionnaires was administered to departments and the same information was added to the questionnaires that are routinely completed by departments in order to be included in the annual graduate guides.

Information from the graduate guide questionnaire for 1981 is now available for the first time, and data provided by individual members regarding their racial and ethnic status. This information was collected with the cooperation of the most recent biographical membership directory. The report that follows draws on information provided by departments in an effort to determine whether minorities and women have experienced notable changes in their status since the earlier reports.

GENERAL MEMBERSHIP DATA

Earlier reports have suffered in various ways from a lack of information about the extent to which minorities and women are represented among the members of the association. Reports on the participation of women in the annual meetings have relied on estimates of the number of women in the discipline as the basis for reporting comparisons. However, as noted above, information collected for the 1982 membership directory indicates that it is extremely difficult to estimate more carefully the proportion of members who are females and the proportions who are members of various minority groups. These estimates are presented in Table 1. The data are not reported in the usual form because it is known that the percentages presented in Table 1 are estimates. First, as indicated in the table, a substantial proportion (39%) of the membership did not provide information about their race/ethnicity. There are also classification errors which make interpretation of some of these percentages hazardous. For example, some proportion of the sixty members who listed themselves as "Native American" are undoubtedly Native White Americans of European descent. Also, the rather substantial proportion of Americans who are classified as international members raises questions about how minority status is interpreted and for this purpose it is important to note that at this time, Americans who are enrolled in the Department of Sociology, the section of the Association's membership.

Not surprisingly, the membership is substantially more likely to be predominantly male with the only real deviation being among students. Over half of all student members are women, and less than 40% of the facilities are members who are predominantly male. The women of the student membership are and for minorities. We have noted previously that disproportionately large segments of the student membership are female and female membership and, and a part of the differences may be explained by this.

Income categories shown in Table 2 are those used by members to determine their dues payments. Income is not uniformly defined, and the distribution is not necessarily a good reflection of the "true" income distribution of the membership. Also, members whose dues payments are not based on income, i.e., associate members, students, etc., are excluded. Nonetheless, notable differences can be seen. Women are more likely to be members of the lowest income category and minorities report lower income than their majority counterparts. Overall, to the extent that other factors are equal, sex has a stronger influence on income than does race/ethnicity, as demonstrated by the fact that minority males generally earn more than majority females. The data for 1974/75 taken from Lewis L. Harris, "Women and Minorities in Sociology: Findings From Annual ASA Audit," FOOTNOTES, Volume 4, Number 1, January 1975.

MINORITIES AND WOMEN IN GRADUATE PROGRAMS

As noted earlier, many of the earlier reports have examined the relative position of minorities and women in graduate departments. The data in Table 3 for the years up to and including 1974 are taken from these reports, and they indicate moderate progress for women and for most minorities. It should be noted that one of the earlier reports was guarded in its interpretation of the status of this progress. The data for 1981, taken from departmental responses to the graduate guide questionnaire, indicate a now obvious shift in perspective about just how much progress there has been. On the positive side, the relative...
Minority Faculty Gains Minimal Since Early Seventies

The growth in the overall proportion of minority students and faculty at U.S. college and university campuses has been minimal since the early 1970s. Table 1 shows that the proportion of minority faculty members (defined as those who are not White) in U.S. colleges and universities has increased only slightly since 1972. For example, the proportion of minority faculty members in the total faculty population was 12.7 percent in 1972, compared to 13.0 percent in 2000. This represents an increase of only 0.3 percentage points over the 28-year period.

Table 2 provides additional details about the distribution of minority faculty members across different racial and ethnic groups. As of 2000, the largest group of minority faculty members were Asian Americans, representing 12.2 percent of the total. Black faculty members made up 11.2 percent of the total, followed by Hispanic faculty members at 10.0 percent. Other minority groups, such as American Indians and Native Hawaiians, represented smaller proportions of the total faculty population.

The proportion of minority faculty members in the total faculty population has remained relatively stable over the past several decades. However, significant challenges persist for minority faculty members, including limited advancement opportunities, lower salaries, and a lack of tenure and promotions. These challenges are reflected in the lower representation of minority faculty members in tenured, tenure-track, and associate professor positions, as shown in Table 1.

Minority faculty members are also more likely to be found in lower ranks, such as assistant professors, than in higher ranks, such as full professors. This pattern is consistent across all racial and ethnic groups. As of 2000, the proportion of minority faculty members in assistant professor positions was 8.5 percent, compared to 7.7 percent in full professor positions.

The lack of representation of minority faculty members at higher ranks has significant implications for the diversity and inclusivity of the faculty at U.S. colleges and universities. It also limits the diversity of perspectives and experiences that are brought to the classroom and the research enterprise. As such, efforts to increase the representation of minority faculty members are critical for promoting equity and excellence in higher education.

Table 3 provides a breakdown of the distribution of minority faculty members by race and ethnicity. As of 2000, the largest group of minority faculty members were Asian Americans, representing 12.2 percent of the total. Black faculty members made up 11.2 percent of the total, followed by Hispanic faculty members at 10.0 percent. Other minority groups, such as American Indians and Native Hawaiians, represented smaller proportions of the total faculty population.

In conclusion, while there has been some increase in the representation of minority faculty members in U.S. colleges and universities since the early 1970s, the progress has been limited. Significant challenges remain, including limited advancement opportunities, lower salaries, and a lack of tenure and promotions. As such, ongoing efforts to increase the representation of minority faculty members are critical for promoting equity and excellence in higher education.
Few Minorities Are Elected to Offices and Committees

The early “audits” of sociology programs were initiated in 1970 and continued through 1974. The 1970 survey included responses to the GraduateCole questionnaire for 1970-71 and a supplementary instrument completed by heads of graduate departments. The 1972 audit also included two questionnaires mailed to graduate departments at two different times during the year. These gathered information on employment and other conditions relating to minorities and women. The 1973 and 1974 versions of the audit were slight revisions of the 1972 questionnaires. In addition to the items included and updated in this report, the early questionnaires also included several items relating to the departmental attempts to hire minorities and women.

The 1971 data used to inspect the audit reports come entirely from questions asked of department chairs regarding (1) the racial/ethnic distribution of full-time, part-time, and newly admitted graduate students, (2) the sex and race/ethnicity of individual faculty, and (3) the sex and race/ethnicity of individuals who had received the PhD degree during the previous year.

The response rate for the different “surveys” is indicated in the table below.

The meaning of “response” varies. In 1981 nonrespondents include the 53 departments that provided some information, but not enough to calculate the percentages of women, or minorities, etc. For the earlier years, nonresponse can be defined more traditionally as the chains who did not return forms.

Other data analyzed for the 1981 report indicate the responses of members to questions about their sex and race/ethnicity as asked in connection with the preparation of the 1982 Biographical Directory. Of the 11,759 members completing the directory questionnaires, 114 or about one percent did not provide information regarding their sex, and 1,916 (16.3 percent) did not provide information regarding race/ethnicity.

APPENDIX
Notes on the Data

Further details are found in the surveys and may be obtained from the Research Council.
Teaching Services Program Will Sponsor Annual Meeting Workshops

Teaching workshops and literature available from the Teaching Resources Center. During the spring and summer of 1983, there will be several sets of workshops on teaching sociology. In April, three workshops will form the annual National Series of Workshops on Teaching Methodology. The topics and locations are Teaching Clinic, Denver, CO; Developing a Teaching Unit, Atlanta, GA; A Workshop for Chaparron and Deans, St. Louis, MO. During the summer, a series of four workshops will focus on the topic of computer-assisted instruction. Each workshop will feature hands-on experience in using microcomputers for instructional purposes. The four locations are tentatively set as follows: Cincinnati, OH; Provo, UT; Washington, DC, and Boston, MA.

At the 1983 ASA Annual Meeting, the Teaching Services Program will sponsor four workshops on teaching specific courses in the curriculum: Teaching Introductory Sociology (offered twice), Teaching Sex and Gender with a developmental focus, Internationalizing the Curriculum, and Teaching Sociology of Aging. All of these workshops will be publicized in detail in future issues of FOOTNOTES or more information may be obtained from Carla B. Houwey at the Executive Office.

The Teaching Resources Center holds over fifty titles relevant to the teaching of sociology, most of which have been written by sociologists for the TIC. A catalogue listing the resources is available free of charge from the Executive Office. The 1983 catalogue shows several new products: Sylphar and Instructional Materials for Sociology of Aging, E. B. Palmore (ed.) ($0.00/$10.00) Sociology of Minor Groups: Sylphar and Related Materials, Wilhelmina Perry, ed. ($0.00/$7.50) Directory of Teaching Innovations in Sociology, L. R. Meeth and D.S. Gregory, eds. ($0.00/$8.00) Using Films in Sociology Courses: Guidelines and Rereadis (new edition), Robert Wolensky and Sally Rogers, eds. ($4.00/$5.00) Teaching Sociology Through Humor, David S. Adams, ed. ($3.00/$5.00) Methods of Evaluating Student Performance, Theresa G. Turk, ed. ($4.00/$5.00) Sex and Gender in the Social Sciences: Reassessing the Introductory Course, Judith F. Davis and Janice Pearse ($6.00/$10.00) Peace and World Order Studies: A Curriculum Guide, from the Institute for International Peace ($6.00) Sylphar and Instructional Materials for Research Methods, Russell K. Schur, M. Greinein, and Theodore C. Winans, eds. ($7.50/$10.00)

The first price listed is for ASA members, the second for non-members; all orders must be prepaid.

Data Notes (continued)


Section News

The following election results have been reported:

Collective Behavior and Social Movements: Richard Wil- liam Gunson and Roberta Acehe Gar- ner, Council Members; David Snow, Roberta Acehe Gar- ner, Workshop, Publications.

Comparative Historical Sociology: Ronald Glassman, Chair-Elect; Judith MacDowell, Secretary-Treasurer; Jeanne Ballen- tone, Dean Don and Ann Sundgaard, Council Members.

Undergraduate Education: Michael Delaney, Chair-Elect; Peter Bishop, Secretary-Treasurer; Jeanne Ballen- tone, Dean Don and Ann Sundgaard, Council Members.

Four Sociologists Get Russell Sage Awards

Sociologists received all three of the visiting scholar appointments earlier this fall by the Russell Sage Foundation, and one sociologist was selected for the ten-month period during which he received Russell Sage Fellowships. Russell Sage scholars are selected from among the emerging group of sociologists, including young postdoctoral researchers, by senior members of the profession and the selection committee.

Sociologists who received appointments and their research topics follow:

Visiting Scholars

James S. Coleman, University of Chicago: Analyzing the structure of social action, actors and re- sources in the social system, and the emerging organization of modern societies.

Steen L. Del Sarto, Brown University: The relations between technology and social changes; social, professional and public control of technology, and technology and risk.

 drifting, and I want to use this opportunity to discuss some of our conclusions and implications for future research.

In summary, the study of symbolic interaction and the sociological perspective have provided valuable insights into the construction of social reality. However, these insights are limited to the social world and do not capture the complexities of the natural world. Therefore, a more comprehensive approach that combines elements of both perspectives is needed to fully understand the process of social change. This includes the role of social norms and institutions, the impact of technology, and the influence of cultural values and beliefs. By considering these factors, we can gain a better understanding of the dynamics of social change and the factors that drive it.
The Sociology of Names: Having Fun with the ASA Directory

by David O. Friedrichs, University of Scranton

The 1982 Biographical Directory of ASA Members is a useful, in- structive and amusing exploration of a large and growing volume. Of its many possible functions just one will be discussed here: it enables us to correct our image of important sociologists with identical, or very similar, names. One well-known case of such confusion involves the late sociologists Egon B. Becker and Howard S. Becker (Northwestern University), who have been confused by their junior colleagues, the deviance, the sociology of art, and occupations, and methodology. Inevitable errors arise when a namesake works in the same (or a closely related) discipline as his father: N.J. Demerath III is probably often confused with his father, D.T. Demerath; Harold E. Pipkinsky, the criminologist, and his father, Harold B. Pipkinsky, the psychologist (both are currently deceased).

A few cases of confusion or potential confusion which the directory can clarify and correct are detailed in this article. The author is W. Coleman (California Polytechnic State, who has co-authored a social problems textbook, with U. S. Coleman, currently at Syracuse University), a mathematical sociologist and author of "the Coleman Report," Edward W. Hackett (University of Chicago), an expert on political sociology while Edward C. Lehn (SUNY-Brockport) writes on the sociology of religion; dissolve, or mediate, or make peace (which isn’t listed in the directory), Paul E. Starr (Harvard University), economy and society, and Paul D. Schuit (University of Wisconsin, applied sociology, are different people. So are Steven Spitzer (Suffolk University, who specializes in sociological biography), and the law, and the sociologist Stephen P. Spitzer (University of Minnesota, who has written on criminal justice (NY’S Division of Substance Abuse) and Bruce H. Johnson (University of Maryland) have both published in the area of deviance; and then there is Bruce C. Johnson (UC-San Diego), who specializes in political sociology. James A. Davis (Harvard University), writing in the areas of quantitative methodology and social change isn’t F. James Davis (Illinois State), who is known for his work on minorities and on law and society, and neither should be confused with two other James Davis (NY’s Political Science).

The above is a small sampling of the possible confusions on names. The ASA Directory of members, by Mark Bill Mills, David Smith, and four Richard Petersens, to note three examples of same-named sociologists. These cases may not be entirely surprising, insofar as the surnames are quite common in the given name’s popular. It is not often so disconcerting, however, to discover that the Directory lists two Kentorkis (or "cos") Markaredes! In fact, with the addition of the "less common" additional name one can claim two or more members with the following names: Jef-frey; Richard Ball; Robert Bell; John Clark; Alfred Clarke; Bernard Cohen; Richard Davis; John Dono-van; Richard Harris; Richard and Robert Hill; James Huber; John Hudson; Lea; Leanae; Richard; Louis; Lewis; Kenneth; Paul and Robert Jones; Howard Kaplan; James Kelly; Donald Levine; David and Gordon Lewis; Judith prebendary listing of all the cases. As to which is which, readers are referred to the Directory itself.

Then there are sociologists with very similar names (but different surnames), names who might easily be taken for each other. For example: Albert Cohen (University of Com-}

Competitions

Poetry Contest

A $1,000 grand prize will be awarded in the Eighth Annual Poetry Competition sponsored by World of Poetry, a quarterly newsletter for poets. Poets of all styles and on any subject are eligible. The deadline is March 1, 1982. Check for submission address. World of Poetry, 2521 N. Dakota Avenue, Chicago, IL 60618.

DOROTHY S. THOMAS AWARD

Pre- or postdoctoral students are in-

cluded in the Dorothy S. Thomas Award competi-
tion. The award is presented annually by the Population Association of America to the best paper on any topic in both fields of internal migration or the interrelationships among social, eco-
omic, and demographic processes. The award consists of a $1,500 prize and an appropriate certificate. Five copies of the paper and nominating letters must be submitted by January 15, 1983. Contact John Goodman, J.P.A. Secretary-General, 611 Urban Institute, 2100 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

Design Research Award

The Design Arts Program of the National Endowment for the Arts wishes to honor, through a nationwide public recognition program, completed research projects which promise to have a major impact on design excellence and to the quality of life, and which can serve as models of such projects. The program will cover a wide range of research types, methods and contexts. Contexts for research will include, but not be limited to, communities, buildings and interiors, open spaces and landscapes, etc. A publication of all projects selected as models will be distributed to professional and academic associations, journals, public and private organizations for public education. The award is $1,500, as announced by the American Institute of Architects. Contact the NEA, 201 Constitution Ave., Washington, D.C. 20565, telephone 202-633-0598.

Dorothy S. Thomas Award

DOROTHY S. THOMAS AWARD competition. The award is presented annually by the Population Association of America to the best paper on any topic in both fields of internal migration or the interrelationships among social, economic, and demographic processes. The award consists of a $1,500 prize and an appropriate certificate. Five copies of the paper and nominating letters must be submitted by January 15, 1983. Contact John Goodman, J.P.A. Secretary-General, 611 Urban Institute, 2100 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.
Fear of Stigma Deters Research on Homosexuality

(continued from page 1) recruitment/promotion committees (55%), higher administration personnel (56%), and trustees (74%).

This fear extends to both faculty and chairs saw tenured faculty and ten percent saw nontenured faculty as discouraging. Perceived disagreements on the part of service departments offering no sociology major, followed by undergraduate departments and MA programs. Perceived disagreement was least frequent in PhD-granting departments.

Defendant by a survey conducted by the Sociologists’ Gay Caucus a few years earlier tended to substantiate the departmental attitudes and findings. Of 52 respondents reported having experienced overt discrimination. One-third of these persons were full professors. Others reported homosexuality-related problems in gaining tenure.

Second, the 640 department heads and chairs report 39 gay and lesbian colleagues who are activists or who, if not activists, are living openly gay. They report that the homosexual preference of another 45 colleagues is known only to a small circle. Department heads and chairs of state and city departments of health were typical of American women in their sexuality and open about it in the department. The majority of Black and Hispanic homosexual colleagues would have been recorded by the heads and chairs. Perhaps the proportion of homosexuals in these groups is lower among sociologists than among the general population. Even so, this discrepancy is substantial.

In view of other findings of the Task Group, it seems probable that a majority of gay and lesbian sociologists feel compelled to re-talce or to hide their sexuality in departments. Such decisions undoubtedly affect profoundly the availability of course content dealing with gay and lesbian issues. Sociologists who choose not to do research on this topic. For homosexual faculty members, the decision affects advising of students, planning of research, and work-related goals.

Third, the fear of stigma diverts sociologists, heterosexual and homosexual alike, from doing research on homosexuality. The department heads and chairs expect their campus gatekeepers would be more less discouraging of research on homosexual topics than gay and lesbian faculty members. Of 72 percent of the 640 department heads and chairs report 16 percent expected recruitment/promotion committees to discourage 29 percent expected that higher administration would discourage 34 percent expected that trustees would discourage such research. Fear of such discouragement may dissuade potential sociology researchers. An even greater danger in discouraging such research is that colleagues may assume that a person’s nonheterosexual or homosexual identity is not a reason why they are not doing research on homosexuality they are gay or lesbian — a risk that only the bravest or most foolhardy are likely to take. Indeed, heterosexual sociologists also report stigmatization from their association with work. It is not surprising that 11 of 22 members of the Sociologists’ Gay Caucus who had wanted to do dissertation research on such topics, only 16 of 35 engaged in or planning later research on homosexuality, reported obstacles such as advice that the research would harm their careers. More, they agreed unanimously with the advice. Apparently many of these sociologists who conduct such research feel they must omit it from their CVs or attempt to offset its damaging effects by also publishing in totally different fields.

Fourth, the stigma among members inhibits the number of professionals appropriate courses that otherwise would be offered on the topic. Only 2 percent of the 624 departments reported listing a full course on homosexuality. Further 16 percent stated that the topic was covered in a course, such as deviance. However, of the six respondents to the Sociologists’ Gay Caucus questionnaire only 8 were not warned against teaching such a course, even though they themselves were doing research on the topic. Other professors, feeling insignificantly small, significant others were likely to assume that person’s wanting to teach such a course must be gay or lesbian. It may be that many avoided such topics or delayed teaching them until after being tenured.

Fifth, department heads and chairs expected fewer problems with admitting or awarding degrees to gay or lesbian graduate students than with hiring or promoting faculty members with such characteristics. For example, “only” seven percent of those departments and chairs expected that awarding degrees to students known to be gay would harm their careers. For example, “only” seven percent of those departments and chairs expected that awarding degrees to students known to be gay would harm their careers. The comparable figure for faculty hiring, noted above, was 64 percent. The difference in beliefs of chairs and thus felt free to train people they did not feel quite free to hire, once trained.

Thus these data imply that sociologists and students who are viewed as homosexuals or even gay or lesbian are in a vulnerable position. The reason is apparent, according to the perceptions of department heads and chairs, of experiencing discrimination in being hired or promoted in a sociology department. Hence the vast majority remain closeted within their colleges. This, in turn, hampers the building of a strong-gay-interest, in and engaging in, research advising, or teaching courses on the topic of homosexuality.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Because the Task Group’s research indicates that discrimination and stigmatization of homosexuals and research on homosexuality are widespread among sociologists and among sociologists, we therefore make the following recommendations:

1. That the Council take steps to ensure the publication of the Task Group’s major findings in an ASA publication with broad readership.

2. That the Council appoint a new group to examine in detail the ASA specific measures which sociologists, collectively and individually, can implement to combat the discrimination and stigmatization against homosexuals.

Council accepted the Task Group’s report at its January 1982 meeting. The group was appointed to implement the second recommendation consists of Janet Chodzko, Chair, Elaine Burgess, Groups, Academic Programs, District Miller, Harvey Molotch, Martha Rosenthal, and Barry Adair.

DISCUSSION

The Urban Institute, a private, nonprofit policy research organization in Washington, D.C., has a minority fellowship program for Hispanic doctoral students who are interested in a career in public policy analysis. The program includes a summer work assignment at the Institute and a modest stipend the following academic year to support the student’s dissertation research. The deadline for the 1983-84 academic year is February 1, 1983. Contact Director, Minority Fellowship Program, Urban Institute, 2301 M Street, N.W., Washington DC 20037; (202) 322-1930.

American Foundation for the Blind announces its Minority Fellowship Program for partial funding of doctoral dissertation research in the area of its concern. The total amount to be awarded in the 1983 competition is $2,500, part of which will be awarded for each of two deadline dates, January 3 and April 4, 1983. Potential applicants should contact AFBl by mail or tele- phone in advance of submitting a proposal. Contact: Alfred F. Wroblewski, Director, or Jacki Packer, Research Associate, Social Research Department, American Foundation for the Blind, 15 West 16th Street, New York, NY 10011 (212) 632-2162.

POSTDOCTORAL

Rutgers-Princeton Mental Health Training Program, Princeton, New Jersey, run by Mechanic, Alan Horwitz, and Julian Wolfret, has a limited number of post-doctoral traineeships (1983-84 funded by NIMH). The five areas of training are: the epidemiology of psychiatric disorders and helping behaviors; the integration of medical and psychiatric care; psychosocial rehabilitation of the mentally ill; the evaluation of mental health programs; and mental health policy analysis. Trainees receive between $13,380 and $18,780 per year depending on previous work experience. Inquiries to: Alan Horwitz, Department of Sociology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J. 08854.

University of California, Los Angeles, Department of Sociology, offers applications for NIMH-funded post-doctoral fellowships in mental health evaluation research. The fellowship program integrates several topics of professional training advanced qualitative methods, evaluation training including "hands-on" training, mentor and mental health training. Stipends begin at $13,380. Applicants should submit vita, copy of published or unpublished work, letters of evaluation, and a brief description of mental health research interests. Contact: Otto D. Stern, Director, Mental Health Program, Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024. The deadline for applications is December 10, 1982.

The Population Studies and Training Center, Brown University, invites applications for National Science Foundation Postdoctoral Fellowships in Demography for a period of 9-12 months, beginning in either July or September. Postdoctoral fellowships are given free tuition and awarded a monthly stipend; they are also provided with office space and research equipment. Those submitting a formal application and supporting documents, interested individuals are requested by November 1 and their eligibility for an award by January 15, 1983. Contact: Dr. Alden Speare, Acting Director, Population Studies and Training Center, Brown University, Providence, R.I. 02912, (401) 863-1415 or 2668.

OTHER

The U.S. Japanese Cooperative Program, administered by the National Science Foundation, currently supports an internship in Japan for graduate students in the social sciences. Contact: Ms. Lisa Shigetomi, Research Development Assistant for the Internship Program, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550.

Funding Opportunities

Albany Conference on Urban Theory and National Urban Policy for the 1980’s, State University of New York at Albany. Structured around the presentation and critique of invited papers by social scientific urbanists, this conference will provide a national forum for debate on urban policy under the New Federalism. The conference format will encourage participation in the discussion in both formal and informal settings. For information and research materials, write: Ms. Gail Gates, Administrative Assistant, Department of Sociology, State University of New York, Albany, N.Y. 12222.