Happy 2016! Looking back over 2015, I am struck by the centrality of our subject to the social and political world. The challenges we face and the choices we confront in education remind me of what brought me into this field 20 years ago. I still see tremendous opportunities through education to reduce disparities in children's and adult's lives traceable to their families of origin and substantial obstacles to achieving those ends. I am energized by work in the sociology of education but also feel privileged to work in a subfield that is so interdisciplinary, with colleagues in education, psychology, economics and other fields making substantial contributions to our understanding of how structure and biography intersect through education to shape intergenerational flows of privilege and disadvantage. I won't say that it’s a more exciting or interesting time than any other to be doing the work we do, but there is an awful lot going on. Among the developments that caught my attention this year were:

- The formal death of NCLB and the birth of ESSA. What exactly ESSA entails is unclear to me, but I am sure that anyone who reads the 1,061 page bill will be fully enlightened. What is clear is that the assessment machinery is headed for trouble.
- The rise and precipitous fall (or at least rebranding) of the Common Core.
- A remarkable swing of the pendulum in higher ed finance from state divestment over the past decade to a nascent free (community) college movement.

I continue to be impressed with the work present and future colleagues are doing in the subfield. This was a banner year for Sociology of Education, with a record 253 submissions. That’s almost double the number of submissions we had in 2003 (133). The substantive and methodological diversity of the field is reflected in the pages of the journal as well, with articles based on ethnographic, comparative and quasi-experimental methods appearing in 2015. Of course, Sociology of Education is not the only journal in which we publish; it is, however, a good proxy for activity in the field. Members also published a number of books in 2015 that have influenced how we understand the educational system and the ways it shapes us; some of those books are noted in this newsletter.

In addition to important information about section awards (deadline February 1), a call for applications to edit Sociology of Education (deadline February 5) and member news, this newsletter includes reflections on the importance of replication in both qualitative and quantitative work from some leading
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scholars in our field, including Stefanie DeLuca, Annette Lareau, Maia Cucchiara, Barbara Schneider and Rob Warren. Each of these scholars responded to a set of question we posed on the topic. We have also included a feature reminiscent of “It should have been a classic” (under section chair Rob Warren) titled “Things we forgot: Timely scholarship from before 1960.” While I won’t claim that these articles should have been classics, I think it’s important that we take stock of the rich history of our subfield from time to time and try to connect to the scholars and scholarship that has gone before us. My topic for this newsletter is an article by Kimball Young, Neal Drought and John Bergstresser titled “Social and Emotional Adjustments of Freshmen at the University of Wisconsin” published in the American Sociological Review in 1937.

I hope that you enjoy this newsletter and look forward to an exciting and productive 2016.

**Replication & Validation in Social Science: Multiple Perspectives**

Responses from Stefanie DeLuca, Annette Lareau, Maia Cucchiara, Barbara Schneider and Rob Warren

Recently we have seen some controversy in the discipline around issues of replication. Critics have raised concerns about ethnographic, experimental and quasi-experimental research. For this issue of the Sociology of Education Newsletter, I have asked five scholars to respond to the following four questions:

**What if anything can or should we do to maximize the likelihood that other researchers can replicate our results with the same data or at the same site?**

Stefanie DeLuca  
Johns Hopkins University

One distinguishing feature of qualitative research—perhaps especially ethnography—is that it is often done by a lone researcher who not only conducts all fieldwork but often the analyses as well. This approach makes a good deal of sense when developing intimate rapport with key respondents, especially over repeated visits. However, conducting solo fieldwork can also make it harder to think critically about your observations, and lead to interpretation in a vacuum. One approach to avoid the worst of these outcomes is to conduct collaborative fieldwork. For example, one can conduct interviews and observations in pairs, and as part of a larger team. In some field settings this has the added bonus of increasing safety, but the primary strength of team fieldwork is that it improves the quality of the data and the confidence of the inferences (thus aiding potential replication). Fieldworkers gain experience both watching others conduct interviews and receiving feedback on one’s own work, which allows for critical conversations about how it could have been done better, what was missed, what was found, or what might have been misinterpreted. An additional advantage to team research is that it’s much harder to make a mistake when others—who read and comment on your work—have all been in the same neighborhoods (or schools, etc.), interviewed others from the same family, and have read the same transcripts. Collaborative fieldwork can improve all aspects of study design and data collection, including: recruiting participants; interviewing and observing; writing field notes; logging, transcribing, coding and analyzing data; and writing and editing papers—including drafts of papers using data you helped collect, but might not be authoring.

Another way to improve replication in qualitative research is (when it makes practical sense) to both use systematic sampling techniques and be explicit about how exactly you found your research participants. This is a process that far too often gets short shrift in journals and even books, but should absolutely not be
shrouded in secrecy. Qualitative researchers seem reluctant to employ some of the same sampling design tools more traditionally used by quantitative researchers, and even less inclined to talk about who they could not recruit. While arguments about the extent to which qualitative research can achieve generalizability abound, it is still essential to make clear exactly how one obtained a sample of research participants. This can help the replication of results, in part because it helps clarify the range of conditions under which the data were produced. Without a clear and concise accounting of sampling, response rate and respondent characteristics, fellow researchers cannot possibly replicate or confirm findings, or even test them under other theoretically interesting conditions. Taking fieldnotes and keeping detailed memos of sampling frame decision rules, exclusion criteria and the handling of non-response are also essential steps.

Representativeness is usually not attempted by ethnographers because the depth of the observations they employ often restrict their focus to a few individuals, or a narrow range of activities, or a single venue. This is not a criticism; indeed, this is sometimes the only way to paint the rich and important pictures of some aspects of inner city life, for example. But do these approaches yield typical results? As a complement, a systematic, in-depth interview study that follows—to the degree possible—standard sampling procedures to, at the very least, ensure heterogeneity, or, at best, representativeness, can offer a wider lens on diverse individuals in the community (as could any additional supplemental data from studies of the same city or setting). Such an approach can be even more effective if the sample is prospective (rather than sampling on the dependent variable). It is also important to note that observations alone cannot offer a direct view into people’s inner lives, their perceptions, or the meaning-making that is going on beyond overheard conversations. Thus, without direct interviews, some researchers may also be in danger of inferring meaning (sometimes based on their own experience), or other aspects of their research participants’ inner worlds, through observation alone.

Do we have a scientific obligation to attempt to make data that are not widely distributed available to others? How if at all should we think about replication in such instances?

This is a difficult dilemma. On the one hand, Institutional Review Boards require researchers to maintain the confidentiality of research participants, but on the other, some federal funding sources and agencies require researchers to share such data with others in the scientific community. This is a particularly sensitive issue when conducting research on deeply personal topics, or spending several years in the lives of one’s respondents. Through our consent process, in exchange for honesty and openness, we promise that no one but the research team will ever have access to the full recordings or transcripts of in-depth life histories. This pact is key to ensuring trust and higher quality data. While both survey and in-depth interview or ethnographic data can reveal personal details that would make a respondent vulnerable, narrative data are much more difficult to aggregate and de-identify. Under circumstances where such data must be shared with other scholars, I think there are a few reasonable ways to do it. First, each interested scholar can ask to join the existing research team, and meet the requirements for the originating researcher’s IRB, and possibly undergo any additional training that the original PI required of team members. Second, data can be provided to an outside investigator as a collection of aggregated codes (research topics parsed across respondents), rather than intact narratives for any individual respondent.

If the original results have been published and replication in the same site or with the same data set fails to yield the same results, what if anything should happen? How if at all should we adjudicate among the competing claims, who should do so, and what form should this adjudication assume?

Again, I’ll speak specifically to the collection of qualitative data. I think this depends heavily on exactly how the original data were collected. There tends to be a great deal of variation in how qualitative researchers gather data. If the study was primarily interview based, with supplemental ethnographic observations and a
known sampling frame, some kind of adjudication might be possible. It would be much more difficult if an author relied on the firsthand observation and testimony of a handful of respondents who were selected precisely because they occupy marginal or atypical positions in society. However, in both cases, authors can be asked to clarify their original research design, sampling techniques, respondent characteristics, non-response patterns, and fieldwork starting and ending dates. Second, sharing interview protocols and observation templates can help establish the kinds of data that were collected more generally, and those collected in a systematic manner. A third possibility is to ask another field expert to review all materials and reflect on discrepancies and likely reasons. Ideally, such an explication could be included as an exchange in a journal, with supplemental materials included as an online appendix.

Despite the pressure to publish sole-authored papers, I would encourage young scholars to learn to collaborate first. We are never as clear-thinking and critical on our own as we are when required to work together. In addition to collaborative design, data collection, and writing, I would also encourage early-career scholars to think critically about their findings, especially when they seem to conform to initial hypotheses. Always look for the negative cases, and the cases that do not fit your conclusions.

**What advice about replication would you give to scholars working on their doctorates or relatively early in their careers? What actions can they take (or avoid) to help insure that their results are replicable?**

**Proceed with Caution: Replication and Ethnographic Research**

In our view, if another qualitative researcher had the same research questions and data set as that of a completed study, his or her results should be very comparable to the first work. After all, qualitative research is about listening to the data, focusing closely on participants’ meaning-making, and allowing patterns to emerge from the data. If the researchers have the same research questions, they should have comparable results from a strictly designed study at the same site (unless there were significant changes over time in the site) or through a re-analysis of the same data set. However, the uniqueness of each ethnographic case would make a full replication impossible. Ethnographic data are collected in a particular site, with a particular set of people, and at a particular moment of time—all of which are difficult to hold constant. Of course, if they ask a different research question then the results would be different. Hence, while replication has important challenges in the social sciences, when it comes to ethnographic research the process involved in doing replications is even more complicated.

Indeed, we are dubious about the value of researchers seeking to complete a replication by carrying out a secondary re-analysis of qualitative data collected by another researcher. Ethnographers bring to their analysis a deep knowledge of the setting and complex patterns of social interaction. Data analysis in ethnographic research is part and parcel of data collection as researchers focus, look for disconfirming evidence, and seek to make a contribution to the literature. After-the-fact analysis misses out on this richness. In addition, there are ethical concerns. Ethnographers build trust with respondents. They often (but not always) promise them confidentiality. Sharing raw data could be a betrayal not only of the participants’ confidentiality but of the relationship the ethnographer worked so hard to build with his or her respondents. Although it is certainly possible to do a reanalysis of a disembodied qualitative data set, it would cost thousands of dollars to redact all of the field notes, documents, and interview transcripts to

---

Annette Lareau  
University of Pennsylvania

Maia Cucchiara  
Temple University
protect the confidentiality of the people, sites, and settings, and we doubt that the results would be high quality.

This does not mean that replication is irrelevant to ethnographic research—just that the most useful approach will look different from those appropriate to other methodologies. For example, we do believe that it can be valuable to ask if the patterns ethnographers describe surface in similar ways in similar (and different) contexts. Ethnographers use deep, localized understandings of their sites and participants to make larger conceptual arguments about social processes. While ethnographers are certainly not trying to uncover universal laws of behavior, their findings should provide insights into other settings. For instance, Cucchiara’s (2013) study found that the increased participation of middle-class families in an urban school came at a price: working-class families at the school were marginalized and the growth of middle-class enrollment left fewer spots for other lower-income children hoping to avoid schools that were widely seen as lower quality. While the findings from other ethnographic studies of middle-class involvement in urban public education have not been identical to Cucchiara’s research on Philadelphia’s downtown, such studies (e.g., Posey-Maddox 2014) did document similar patterns of empowerment and exclusion—while also showing that middle-class parents’ actions played out differently due to contextual variations. These studies have helped to move our understanding of this phenomenon forward. For this reason we recommend that researchers interested in replication collect their own data in a new, but comparable site, with similar research questions that can develop, complicate, or challenge existing conclusions. Collecting ethnographic data is very time consuming. Yet, producing fewer high quality studies—that are widely read and have an impact on our understanding of social processes—is important. Rather than using replication as a way to check the findings of a particular ethnographic study, scholars should capitalize upon the strengths of ethnographic research to design comparable studies that further unpack the critical mechanisms in social life.

Replication? An Ethical and Professional Responsibility

Several years ago, I had the opportunity to sit on an AERA committee to develop standards for the reporting of empirical studies—studies that collected all types of data from intensive interviews to large scale international surveys. The committee was composed of a variety of scholars from multiple disciplines and the culminating set of guidelines we developed is now used in all the AERA journals, (see, Standards for Reporting on Empirical Social Science Research in AERA Publications, 2006). These guidelines were specifically designed for studies that employed qualitative or quantitative methods, or some combination of both. The driving focus of the committee was to assist researchers in reporting on the warrants for their evidence that follows a logic of inquiry, problem formulation, design, data analysis, and interpretation, and is transparent in its reporting. Some of the recommendations of the panel were to ensure that investigators were willing to release their data—including supplemental tables and access to de-identified materials to those willing to abide by conventional restricted data use agreements. IES and NSF also subsequently used these same guidelines when they developed their standards for proposal submissions (Common Guidelines for Education Research and Development, August 2013).

Barbara Schneider
Michigan State University

What does all of this have to do with replication? The AERA committee was composed of a diverse group of scholars, many of them leaders in anthropology, sociology, political science, and statistics. There was unanimous agreement among members of this group that no matter what data we collect, as social scientists we have an ethical and professional responsibility to make our data and results available for others to reanalyze and replicate (Begley & Ioannidis, 2015). If one believes in replication, as I do, the only way to evaluate the veracity of someone’s results is to know the exact process by which the data were generated and produced (King, 1995). The issue for me has always been full disclosure of sample selection, approach, measures, analysis, and interpretative strategies to facilitate replication. Not that replication is an end in itself but rather an opportunity to learn what findings are sustained regardless of potential confounders due to time and population and contextual variations.

Mark Lipsey and his team at Vanderbilt prepared one of the most thoroughly comprehensive lists of possible confounds to a randomized trial including the predisposition of the investigator. I have often looked back at this list as it reminds me of the hundreds of decisions we make that potentially introduce bias into our data collection efforts, analyses, and interpretations. I hope we would realize the value and importance of these considerations when beginning our work and reporting on it, as these are the decisions that have thwarted efforts of replication among investigators (Nosek, 2015). Lack of documentation of these decisions may be a source of inconsistent results when researchers attempt to replicate the work of others. Inconsistent results especially in social science research, in contrast to medical trials where the conditions are more easily replicable, are inherently messy. Nevertheless we need to call for more replication.

One method that helps with replication, especially for those who use quantitative methods, is sensitivity analysis (Frank et al., 2013). Sensitivity analysis allows us to raise the question of how many cases we would need to invalidate our findings. Sensitivity analysis provides us with a solid indicator of what in the replication of our work would have to persist if our results could be verified across populations and/or settings.

Philosophically and pragmatically we will never be able to replicate the test of a specific outcome with the same students, parents, and schools with the same set of demographic and social and emotional characteristics. However, determining if our results remain robust even with these circumstances or slight modifications is critical, especially when considering potential scale-up of promising interventions.

Why replication? The “why” is so painfully obvious to me, even in qualitative work, that I have a hard time figuring out why as a profession we are not more dedicated to ensuring that replications are conducted more consistently. We live in a fluid society where change is inevitable—but some human relationships and behaviors even in this unstable environment persist. We have an obligation to explain in deep detail all aspects of our work so that others can replicate the conduct of our research to learn not just what changes, but the magnitude of the change and its consequences. Fundamentally, science only advances with the building of replicable knowledge that moves our understanding of phenomenon forward.

What if anything can or should we do to maximize the likelihood that other researchers can replicate our results with the same data or at the same site?

First, people who publish articles describing quantitative research should insist that authors provide enough details. For whatever reason, many authors do not report basic facts about their analyses: exactly how the analytic sample was selected, what the sample size is, how variables were constructed, how scales were created, how the data were weighted, how missing data was handled, etc. Editors should not allow articles to be published unless all such details are plainly reported. Second, researchers should expect as a matter of course that their code or syntax will be made available to everyone. That means they need to document and annotate it better than most do; it also means they should be organized enough to be able to easily provide their code to anyone who asks – whatever their reason for asking for it – in short order.

Rob Warren
University of Minnesota

In some instances, the data we use may not be widely distributed. For example, data that are distributed only under very restrictive conditions (ranging from NCES licenses to analyses inside a census Research Data Center or ‘RDC’).

Do we have a scientific obligation to attempt to make such data available to others? How if at all should we think about replication in such instances?

Again from the quantitative side of things, data available in RDC’s or via restricted use licenses are available to everyone in those settings. For good reason, those data require extra steps to access. However, code and syntax usually faces no such restrictions. As quantitative researchers, we absolutely have an obligation to make it easy for others to replicate (and then extend, if they want) our analyses. The fact that the data require extra steps to access does not change that obligation.

If the original results have been published and replication in the same site or with the same data set fails to yield the same results, what if anything should happen? How if at all should we adjudicate among the competing claims, who should do so, and what form should this adjudication assume?

First, there should be communication between the original authors and the replicating authors – professional, civil discussions in which both parties have full access to the others’ data and code. Most of the time, coding errors or different assumptions or slightly different methods lie behind such discrepancies. If the authors of the already-published work turn out to be in error, and if the main findings or conclusions change, then those authors should cooperate in retracting the article or publishing an addendum; editors should be willing to cooperate in such efforts. If the authors of the already-published work are unwilling to retract their article or publish an addendum, then the replicating authors should be permitted to publish a response or critique in the same journal or venue.
First, do good research. Be careful, be thorough, and question all of your own assumptions. Try things different ways, double check everything, and carefully document all of your steps and procedures. If you do good and careful work, you have little to worry about. Second, do not be defensive. Be open to challenges and replication. More than anything else, you should want your findings and conclusions to be valid and reproducible. Take it as a sign of respect that somebody else thinks so much of your research that they want to double-check or extend it. In my experience, unpleasantness or hard feelings around replication efforts usually originate from the original author’s defensiveness or insecurities. Third, be organized. Can you easily find the data and code for your analysis – five years after the article was published? Young scholars should develop and stick to a comprehensive organizational system for keeping track of their various research projects.

**Things We Forgot: Timely Scholarship from before 1960**

By Eric Grodsky  
University of Wisconsin-Madison


For our initial column on “things we forgot,” I discuss an article published in the *American Sociological Review* in 1937 by Kimball Young, Neal Drought and John Bergstresser titled “Social and Emotional Adjustments of Freshmen at the University of Wisconsin.” Young studied sociology at the University of Chicago for five quarters and earned a doctorate in psychology at Stanford University. He was a pioneer in the study of personality and was the 35th President of the American Sociological Association in 1945. This article has been cited five times according to Web of Science and nine according to Google.

In this article, Young and his colleagues at the University of Wisconsin- Madison combine quantitative analyses of predicted and observed GPAs of first-year college men with semi-structured interviews to understand the degree to which “so-called personality traits” are implicated in academic trajectories during the first year of undergraduate study. In reviewing this article, I was struck by the degree to which the authors work touches on ‘cutting edge’ themes in contemporary research in sociology of education, including challenges of balancing home and college life, personal and academic challenges in the transition to college, and the relative contributions of cognitive and non-cognitive skills in accounting for disparities in academic achievement.

Young et al. base their analyses on assessment data and surveys from 750 men who entered the College of Letters and Sciences in September of 1935 (80 years ago). A random sample of 250 of these men also participated in ‘informal meetings’ “[u]nder the guise of a friendly but ‘official’ invitation from the Junior Dean’s office,” the Junior Dean being the second author of this paper. Yes, this was before the time of IRBs. The authors estimate Pearson correlations between measures of personality and the difference between observed first-year GPA and first-year GPA predicted based on high school class rank and American Council Psychological Test score. They go on to use their qualitative data, transcribed and
reviewed independently by Drought and Bergstresser, to try to account for the patterns they observe in the quantitative data.

The authors focus on personality traits identified in the Wisconsin Scale of Personality Traits (due to Ross Stagner, an early personality psychologist who earned his masters and doctorates at Wisconsin) including nervousness, introversion, self-esteem, and aversion to social contact. They also consider how Bell’s adjustment inventory (i.e., home adjustment, health adjustment, social adjustment, and emotional adjustment) are related to under- or over-prediction of first-year GPA.

The quantitative results show no statistically significant relationship between personality traits and the prediction error in first-year GPA conditional on high school class rank and the psychological test (though the correlations of prediction error and aversion to social contact is 0.20; other correlations are appreciably smaller). The same non-relationship seems to hold if one looks only at those who earned substantially higher or lower GPAs than predicted (i.e., 0.8 points from the predicted score).

The qualitative results suggest several factors that distinguish those students who over-performed (grade >0.8 point above the expected grade, n=11) from those who under-performed (grade >0.8 below the expected grade, n=27). Over performers (who the authors term the ‘Plus Group’) typically had good study habits, in contrast to a single underperformer (the ‘Minus Group’). Further, members of the Plus Group “indulge in much less excessive ‘society’ life, such as dating, horseplay, holding ‘bull sessions,’ and extravagant spending of time and money in leisure-time pursuits” and are appreciably more likely to have concrete occupational goals than members of the Minus Group and less likely to change their minds about what degree to pursue (pg. 171). The share of men who were partially or fully supporting themselves was about the same across groups, but no Plus Group member and three Minus Groups members worked “excessively” outside of school. The authors go on to offer more detailed discussion of eight respondents and the individual circumstances that the authors’ believe contribute to their divergent outcomes (including challenging relationships with family members, poor time management, a life of privilege that contributed to more partying than studying and economic constraints that contributed to feelings of inferiority, concerns about fitting in and a failure to adapt to the greater academic demands of college life).

Substantively, this article contributes to our understanding of the degree to which non-cognitive skills (operationalized here as personality traits) help account for changes in students’ academic trajectories during the transition to college. The article does not claim that personality traits are irrelevant to an understanding of academic achievement, as those traits may well predict high school class rank or be reflected in the psychological test the authors include in their models as a regressor. However, the article demonstrates the relative independence of changes in academic performance in the first year of college from the measured personality traits. The focus on non-cognitive skills came at a time when the systematic measurement of personality was evolving, as was the field of sociology. I do not know how closely the scales Young and his colleagues employ conform to the Big Five of today but imagine that neuroticism, conscientiousness and extraversion would line up with some of the subscales on the Stagner inventory.

Young et al. also address a question of continued concern to sociologists of education and policy makers today: what sort of barriers hinder student success in higher education? Their answers to this question are familiar. Part of the story is about variation in things like study habits and the rigor of different secondary schools; part of the story is about how students spend their time in college. Some students focus on their academic work and have a clear sense of intellectual and/or vocational pathways. Others spend more time socializing, partying and courting (or just hooking up; for more on this see Waller 1937).

Although the article is quite brief and the methods relatively rudimentary, I think this article is in some ways a very good example of multi-methods research. The authors draw on extant administrative data and couple those data with semi-structured interviews. They estimate correlations, identify subsets of interesting cases based on the deviations of those cases from expectations, and engage in inductive research using...
interview data to try to develop accounts for those deviations. They are candid about the limitations of their methods and about the uncertainty in their findings.

Sociology has come a long way in some respects from the work Kimball et al. published in 1937. In other respects, however, we would do well to link back to projects like theirs. Some of the causes of inequality in educational success we observe in higher education today are not necessarily products of our time; they are patterns that have played out in colleges and universities for 80 years or more. The fact that some patterns are rooted in an earlier time does not, in my mind, diminish the importance of documenting and understanding them today or undermine the novelty of the insights scholars in the field have brought to our attention. Instead, the history of empirical patterns and our field’s efforts to understand them serves to enrich those accounts.


Call to edit Sociology of Education

The Committee on Publications has extended the deadline for applications for the next editor of Sociology of Education until February 5, 2016.

Sociology of Education, published quarterly, provides a forum for studies in the sociology of education and human social development. SOE publishes research that examines how social institutions and individuals’ experiences within these institutions affect educational processes and social development. Such research may span various levels of analysis, ranging from the individual to the structure of relations among social and educational institutions. In an increasingly complex society, important educational issues arise throughout the life cycle.

The official term for the new editor (or co-editors) will commence in January 2017 (the editorial transition is anticipated for summer 2016) and is for a minimum of three years (until December 2019), with a possible reappointment of up to an additional two years.

Candidates must be members of the ASA and hold a tenured position or equivalent in an academic or non-academic setting. Applications from members of underrepresented groups as well as from institutions where resources and support for research are not prioritized are encouraged. ASA encourages applications for both sole editorships and co-editorships, including those located in different institutions.

In accordance with ASA’s mission to publish high-quality scholarship, the following criteria are considered in selecting editors: an established record of scholarship; evidence of understanding the mission of the journal and its operation; assessment of the present state of the journal and a vision for the future; openness to the different methods, theories, and approaches to sociology; and a record of responsible service to scholarly publishing, and evidence of organizational skill and intellectual leadership.

Application packets should be sent to Jamie Panzarella, Publishing and Employment Services Manager, ASA, 1430 K Street NW, Suite 600, Washington, DC 20005; publications@asanet.org.
The Sociology of Education David Lee Stevenson Award for Outstanding Graduate Student Paper
This award is for the outstanding graduate student paper in the field of sociology of education in 2014 or 2015. The author (or first author) must be a graduate student at the time of submission for the award, and all authors must have been graduate students when the paper was written. The paper may be unpublished, under review, accepted, forthcoming, or published (in 2014 or 2015). Please send a letter of nomination and an electronic copy of the nominated paper to the Award Committee Chair Brian Powell, powell@indiana.edu. The deadline for nominations is February 1, 2016.

The Sociology of Education James Coleman Award for Outstanding Article
This award is for the outstanding article in the field of sociology of education published in 2014 or 2015. Please send a letter of nomination and an electronic copy of the nominated article to Award Committee Chair Jessica Calarco, jcalarco@indiana.edu. The deadline for nominations is February 1, 2016.

The Willard Waller Award for lifetime achievement in the field of sociology of education
The Waller award recognizes lifetime achievement in the sociology of education and alternates every other year with the Doris Entwistle early Career Award. Please send an electronic version of the nominee’s CV and a letter of nomination to Award Committee Chair Adam Gamoran, agamoran@Wtgrantfdn.org. The deadline for nominations is February 1, 2016.

The Sociology of Education Pierre Bourdieu Award for Outstanding Book
This award is for the best book in the Sociology of Education published in 2014 or 2015. Please send a letter of nomination and copies of the book (either print version or PDF) to all committee members at the addresses listed below. Any questions regarding the award should be directed to the Award Committee Chair, Chandra Muller (cmuller@austin.utexas.edu). The deadline for nominations is February 1, 2016.

The Pierre Bourdieu Award Committee is comprised of five members:

Chandra Muller  
Department of Sociology  
The University of Texas at Austin  
College of Liberal Arts Building  
305 E. 23rd Street, Stop G1800  
Austin, Texas 78712-1699  
cmuller@austin.utexas.edu

Simone Ispa-Landa  
School of Education and Social Policy  
Walter Annenberg Hall  
2120 Campus Drive  
Northwestern University  
Evanston, Illinois 60208  
landa@northwestern.edu

Michael Gaddis  
Pennsylvania State University  
503 Oswald Tower  
University Park, PA 16802  
mgaddis@psu.edu

Michelle Jackson  
450 Serra Mall  
Building 120, Room 160  
Stanford, CA 94305-2047  
mvjsoc@stanford.edu

Laura Hamilton  
School of Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts  
University of California, Merced  
5200 North Lake Road  
Merced, CA 95343  
lhamilton2@ucmerced.edu

Please note that all nominees must be registered members of the ASA to be considered for section awards.
Member News

- Karl Alexander, Doris Entwisle, and Linda Olson receive prestigious $100,000 Grawemeyer Award in Education for *The Long Shadow*. The news was even posted in Time Square!

- Professor Prudence Carter has accepted appointment to the position of dean of the Graduate School of Education at the University of California, Berkeley. Dr. Carter will assume her new role on June 30, 2016.

- Research-Practice Partnerships between research institutions and school districts are working to improve the connection between education research and policy/practice. The newly formed National Education Research-Practice Partnerships (NERPP), a national network that aims to support and develop these partnerships, has hired Dr. Paula Arce-Trigatti to serve as director. See the Kinder Institute for Urban Research for more details.


In Memoriam

Ivar Berg, Emeritus Professor of Sociology at the University of Pennsylvania, passed away on January 1, 2016. Berg made seminal contributions to the fields of sociology of education and social stratification (particularly with respect to labor markets). His 1970 book *The Great Training Robbery* called into question the claim that productive efficiency led to the earnings advantages enjoyed by those with higher levels of education, a claim too few seem to question today.

For more information, see the obituary authored by one of his students, Arne Kalleberg, in *The New York Times* (here).
Book Announcements

**Race, Class, and Affirmative Action**  
Sigal Alon (Russell Sage Foundation)

In *Race, Class, and Affirmative Action*, Alon studies the race-based affirmative action policies in the United States and the class-based affirmative action policies in Israel. Alon finds that affirmative action at elite institutions in both countries is a key vehicle of mobility for disenfranchised students, whether they are racial and ethnic minorities or socioeconomically disadvantaged. The beneficiaries of affirmative action in both countries thrive at elite colleges and in selective fields of study. As Alon demonstrates, they would not be better off attending less selective colleges instead. The findings from both countries suggest, however, that neither race-based nor class-based models by themselves can generate broad diversity. According to Alon, the best route for promoting both racial and socioeconomic diversity is to embed the consideration of race within class-based affirmative action. Such a hybrid model would maximize the mobility benefits for both socioeconomically disadvantaged and minority students.

**Across Three Continents: Reflections on Immigration, Education, and Personal Survival**  
Katerina Bodovski (Peter Lang Publishing)

This combination of autobiographical narrative and sociological analysis discusses the author’s firsthand experiences in Soviet Russia, Israel, and the United States. This text is ideal for courses focused on comparative education, women’s studies, Jewish studies, sociology of education, childhood, and immigration. Beyond academia, it will resonate with immigrants who have experienced transitions between lands and languages and will be of specific interest to women, especially young women, who are trying to figure out the interplay between their family and professional life and what is possible for them to aspire for and to achieve.

**Lives in Limbo: Undocumented and Coming of Age in America**  
Roberto G. Gonzales (University of California Press)

Over two million of the nation’s eleven million undocumented immigrants have lived in the United States since childhood. Due to a broken immigration system, they grow up to uncertain futures. In *Lives in Limbo*, Gonzales introduces us to two groups: the college-goers, like Ricardo, who had good grades and a strong network of community support that propelled him to college and DREAM Act organizing but still landed in a factory job a few short years after graduation, and the early-exiters, like Gabriel, who failed to make meaningful connections in high school and started navigating dead-end jobs, immigration checkpoints, and a world narrowly circumscribed by legal limitations. This vivid ethnography explores why highly educated undocumented youth share similar work and life outcomes with their less-educated peers, despite the fact that higher education is touted as the path to integration and success in America. Mining the results of an extraordinary twelve-year study that followed 150 undocumented young adults in Los Angeles, *Lives in Limbo* exposes the failures of a system that integrates children into K-12 schools but ultimately denies them the rewards of their labor.
Improving Teacher Evaluation Systems: Making the Most of Multiple Measures  
Jason Grissom and Peter Youngs, co-editors (Teachers College Press)

The goal of this volume (2016) is to take stock of what we have learned about the impacts and challenges of data-intensive teacher evaluation systems from their initial years of development and implementation, and identify challenges for practitioners and researchers in the years ahead. Grissom and Youngs argue that rigorous teacher evaluation systems have the potential to promote school improvement but only if the systems are carefully designed and implemented and the data they generate are interpreted and used appropriately. The chapters in the volume, penned by scholars and policymakers working at the cutting edge of research and policy in this area, speak to what we know and what remains to be known about evaluation measures themselves, the implementation of evaluation systems, and the use of evaluation data. They also make recommendations for state policymakers and district administrators moving forward with such systems.

Handbook of the Life Course, Vol. 2  
Michael J. Shanahan, Jeylan T. Mortimer, and Monica Kirkpatrick Johnson, editors (Springer)

Building on the success of the 2003 Handbook of the Life Course, this second volume (2016) identifies future directions for life course research and policy. The introductory essay and the chapters that make up the five sections of this book, show consensus on strategic “next steps” in life course studies. Section I, on life course theory, provides fresh perspectives on well-established topics, including cohorts, life stages, and legal and regulatory contexts. It challenges life course scholars to move beyond common individualistic paradigms. Section II highlights changes in major institutional and organizational contexts of the life course. It draws on conceptual advances and recent empirical findings to identify promising avenues for research that illuminate the interplay between structure and agency. It examines trends in family, school, and workplace, as well as contexts that deserve heightened attention, including the military, the criminal justice system, and natural and man-made disaster. The remaining three sections consider advances and suggest strategic opportunities in the study of health and development throughout the life course. They explore methodological innovations, including qualitative and three-generational longitudinal research designs, causal analysis, growth curves, and the study of place. Finally, they show ways to build bridges between life course research and public policy.

Against Race- and Class-Based Pedagogy in Early Childhood Education  
Stephanie C. Smith (Palgrave Macmillan)

Against Race- and Class-Based Pedagogy in Early Childhood Education is a case study of two Chicago early childhood programs, both serving high-need populations. One program is Reggio Emilia-inspired, using a fully emergent curriculum, natural environmental elements, and investigative learning. It is a program philosophy much more common in affluent private preschools in the United States than in programs serving poor children. The comparison school uses a more traditional didactic pedagogy typical of schools serving high-need populations. Smith's study draws from several months of classroom observation, teacher and parent interviews, and child assessments. Smith uses Basil Bernstein's theories of pedagogy and social control, particularly with regard to visible and invisible pedagogies, to understand the differing classroom practices in the two schools and to consider the effectiveness for their vulnerable populations.
The Global Testing Culture: Shaping Education Policy, Perceptions, and Practice
William Smith, editor (Symposium Books)

The past thirty years have seen a rapid expansion of testing, exposing students worldwide to tests that are now, more than ever, standardized and linked to high-stakes outcomes. The use of testing as a policy tool has been legitimized within international educational development to measure education quality. The embedded nature and normative power of high-stakes standardized testing across national contexts can be understood as a global testing culture. This book problematizes the global testing culture by providing critical perspectives that challenge the assumptions of the culture and describe how the culture manifests in national contexts. The volume makes it clear that testing, per se, is not the problem. Instead it is how tests are administered, used or misused, and linked to accountability that provide the global testing culture with its powerful ability to shape schools and society and lead to its unintended, undesirable consequences.

Reports from the National Academies of Science

The Integration of Immigrants into American Society

This report from the Committee on Population provides an evidence-based overview of the U.S. immigrant experience. The report summarizes what we know about how immigrants and their descendants are integrating into American society in a range of areas, such as education, employment, and language.

Sponsors: Carnegie Corporation of New York; the Russell Sage Foundation; the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services of the Department of Homeland Security, and the National Science Foundation with additional support from the National Academy of Sciences Kellogg Fund.

Strengthening Research Experiences for Undergraduate Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Students

The Board on Science Education, in collaboration with the Board on Life Sciences, is overseeing a consensus study to examine the benefits and costs of a wide range of models for engaging undergraduate STEM students in research. The committee will identify best practices for designing and evaluating undergraduate research experiences and identify areas where further research is needed. The first meeting of the committee will be held June 4-5 in Washington, DC. Sponsored by the National Science Foundation.
¡En Sus Marcas, Listos, Ciencia!: De la investigación a la práctica en las clases de ciencias en la educación

This is the Spanish language version of Ready, Set, Science! from the Board on Science Education. It was edited by the Chilean Academy of Sciences under the direction of academy member Patricio Felmer.

Identifying and Supporting Productive STEM Programs in Out-of-School Settings

This report from the Board on Science Education provides guidance on how to evaluate and sustain STEM programs, and is a resource for local, state, and federal policy makers seeking to broaden access to multiple, high-quality STEM learning opportunities in their community. Sponsored by the National Science Foundation.

An Evaluation of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia: Reform in a Changing Landscape

This report from the Board on Testing and Assessment identifies what is working well seven years after legislation was enacted to give control of public schools to the mayor of the District of Columbia and which areas need additional attention. It examines business practices, human resources operations and human capital strategies, academic plans, and student achievement. Sponsored by the Government of the District of Columbia, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor.

Enhancing the Effectiveness of Team Science

This report from the Board on Behavioral, Cognitive, and Sensory Sciences synthesizes available research to provide guidance on effective ways to assemble a science team and to support leadership, education, and professional development for science teams and groups. The report also offers recommendations for science research agencies and policymakers.

Sponsors: National Science Foundation and Elsevier
Transforming the Workforce for Children Birth Through Age 8: A Unifying Foundation

This report from the Board on Children, Youth, and Families considers the science of children’s health, learning, and development from birth through age 8 and its implications for how the care and education workforce can support development and early learning. It includes information on the knowledge and competencies needed in this workforce; standards, expectations, and qualification requirements; professional learning; and leadership.


Innovations in Design and Utilization of Measurement Systems to Promote Children's Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral Health: Workshop Summary

This report from the Forum on Promoting Children's Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral Health summarizes a November 2014 workshop which focused on linking and integrating data to inform research and practice related to children’s cognitive, affective, and behavioral health.


Sharing the Adventure with the Student: Exploring the Intersection of NASA Space Science and Education: A Workshop Summary

This report from the Space Studies Board, in collaboration with the Board on Science Education, summarizes a December 2014 workshop that brought together representatives of the space science and science education communities to discuss ways to maximize the effectiveness of the knowledge transfer from scientists to the education community, including students, teachers, and informal educators.

Sponsor: National Aeronautics and Space Administration