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A Note from Rob Warren, Chair

We are excited to send you this newsletter because we think it reflects the vibrancy and productivity of the members of our section. The more junior members of the SOE section—also known as the future of SOE!—are taking on compelling questions in innovative new ways; see the profiles of more than a dozen of these “Early Career Scholars” beginning on page 13. The more senior members of our section continue to make significant new contributions to SOE and to sociology and social science more broadly; see the descriptions of section members’ new books (beginning on page 22) and recent accolades and awards (beginning on page 32).

In this edition of the SOE newsletter, we continue two “feature” sections. The first is called “It Should Have Been a Classic” (ISHBAC; page 3) in which a section member makes the case that some book or article has not received due acknowledgement of its importance to SOE (and beyond). We are grateful that Sam Lucas has contributed the ISHBAC essay for this edition. The second is called “Five Questions” (page 8) in which questions are put to a senior SOE scholar. We thank Jessica McCrory Calarco for posing questions of Annette Lareau for this edition. We are also adding a new feature in which representatives from various funding agencies describe opportunities for SOE scholars. We thank Hiromi Ono for contributing to this newsletter an essay on funding opportunities at the Institute for Education Sciences.

In my short tenure as the Chair of the section I have been overwhelmed by section members’ generosity with their time and energy. First and most notably, April Sutton has done a stellar job editing this newsletter. Megan Andrew and Mark Berends have agreed to organize the SOE section sessions at the 2012 ASA meetings (in Denver); I barely had to twist their arms. Susan Dumais, Jennifer Lee, Yingyi Ma, Debbie Warnock, and Audrey Devine-Eller put together a fantastic slate of candidates for next year’s section elections (stay tuned for more details). Numerous people have agreed to serve on committees to make our section’s various awards at next year’s meetings. And, of course, many people have pitched in by contributing to this newsletter, by serving on the section council, and so on and so on. Nobody has asked me to give a “State of the Section” speech, but my assessment is that our section is very healthy.

Rob
It Should Have Been a Classic ... Lacy and Middleton’s “Are Educators Racially Prejudiced?”

By Samuel Lucas

Samuel R. Lucas, Professor of Sociology at the University of California-Berkeley, has research interests in social stratification, sociology of education, research methods, and research statistics. Current projects include a 3-volume series on race and sex discrimination in the United States (volume 1, published 2008, titled Theorizing Discrimination in an Era of Contested Prejudice), a 16-nation multi-investigator study assessing whether effectively maintained inequality theory applies to both Western and non-Western nations (co-coordinated with Delma Byrne), and an emerging line of research on methods and epistemology, the first paper of which concerns risks posed by the rising use of statistics in human rights adjudication (titled “The Road to Hell . . . : The Statistics Proposal as Final Solution to the Sovereign’s Human Rights Question,” forthcoming in the Wisconsin International Law Journal. He can be reached at Lucas@demog.berkeley.edu


Wilson's original thesis was a structural one, highlighting how shifts in economic structure were changing the structure of opportunity for low-skill workers, removing the lower rungs many need to establish stable economic sustenance. Yet, Wilson's claim that race had declined in importance also resonated owing to long-run declines in the level of anti-black prejudice recorded by survey researchers.

In 1981, the unheralded paper by William B. Lacy and Ernest Middleton, titled "Are Educators Racially Prejudiced? A Cross-Occupational Comparison of Attitudes," entered this cauldron and promptly vanished. A check of Google Scholar on November 18, 2011 shows that only 10 works have cited this intriguing paper, and I account for 3 of the citations. The more restrictive Web of Science Citation count equals 2 as of the same date, and one of the citations is by an author of the 1981 paper (the Web of Science does not count citations that appear in books, in unpublished working papers or, apparently, in some sociology journals). We often lament the compartmentalization of sociological expertise in the new millennium, yet it appears that even in the early 1980s there is little evidence that sociologists of education, intimately interested in the personnel, processes, and production of education, had any awareness of this important paper. The limited interest the paper has garnered has come from scholars of survey research and prejudice attitudes, but there is only a smattering of evidence of even this attention. Thus, it appears that “Are Educators Racially Prejudiced?” is not only not recognized as a classic, it is, in fact, barely recognized at all.

This is incredibly unfortunate. The invisibility of this paper has shaped the development–or lack of development–of the understanding sociologists in general, and sociologists of education in particular, have of the insidiousness of race in education and society.
The research agenda Lacy and Middleton could have inspired now stands as a series of missed opportunities, many impossible to ever recover. How could one paper, especially one paper as ignored as this one, have had such a profound impact? To consider this question we must first consider what the paper accomplished, and then we must identify at least some of the absences in sociological literature and research design, absences that might have been filled had this paper been more widely recognized.

Turning first to what Lacy and Middleton (1981) accomplished, in 1981 the General Social Survey (GSS) was only 9 years old, and only 8 cross-sections of the now long-run series were available. GSS data, however, offered the first systematic chance for sociologists to explore the public's changing attitudes on a variety of issues of import. And, notably, GSS contained data on persons' attitudes around racial issues. Analysts had studied the changing nature of racial attitudes before. For example, several different survey firms repeatedly asked questions on such issues. However, because the samples were not collected in consistent ways across firms, nor were questions on attitudes, occupation, education, or many other potential factors standardized, piecing together a time series on attitudes was possible but exceedingly difficult (e.g., Schuman, Steeh, and Bobo 1985).

What makes Lacy and Middleton (1981) especially interesting, however, is that, using the 6 waves of GSS data from 1972 through 1977, they pulled persons from key occupations, including teachers, from the dataset for closer scrutiny. To the extent the GSS provides a national probability sample, the teachers in the GSS constitute a national probability sample of teachers. Thus, the Lacy and Middleton strategy allowed them to investigate the incidence of prejudiced teachers in U.S. schools, and to compare that level with the incidence of prejudiced persons in other occupations and professions.

Using this approach, Lacy and Middleton found that amongst non-black respondents, 20 percent of kindergarten and elementary (henceforth K-6) school teachers, 12 percent of secondary school (henceforth 7-12) teachers, and 20 percent of school administrators (henceforth administrators) supported laws against racial intermarriage—this, at least five years after the Supreme Court unanimously struck down bars against racial intermarriage in 1967 in Loving v. Virginia. Further, 16 percent of K-6 teachers, 13 percent of 7-12 teachers, and 17 percent of administrators strongly agreed that whites have rights to segregated neighborhoods. Notably, 79, 74, and 96 percent of K-6 teachers, 7-12 teachers, and administrators, respectively, opposed busing. Lacy and Middleton report additional complexity. They find some instances where teachers are much less likely to embrace prejudicial positions. They took hope from evidence suggesting teachers may be less prejudiced than the wider society. And, they sketched a research agenda highlighting exploration of the impact of such attitudes on behavior and outcomes, an agenda they contend would be best pursued with multiple methods of research.

As far as I know, to whatever extent that agenda has been pursued, it has not been pursued with the insights of Lacy and Middleton (1981) as a touchstone. Their findings have several important implications. First, the findings raise doubt about the veracity of the thesis of the declining significance of race, if by declining one means that race is (or was) becoming an unimportant
factor in determining the socioeconomic outcomes of African Americans. If schools are the primary site of human capital investment or, put another way, if schools are the primary site of public involvement in persons’ acquisition and certification of skill, what are the implications of such sites employing a non-negligible number of persons in pivotal positions of skill development and evaluation who profess to see some of those for whom they are responsible as second-class students? How can race be of limited import if the very allocation of opportunity and the very assessment of achievement in school occurs at the hands of at least some who are prejudiced? It is hard to see a structural argument as cogent if it fails to resonate with the arguably non-structural reality occurring just beneath and through the structure.

The impact of their substantive findings is also important for what we have not done, as researchers and as a society. The idea that to obtain key indicators of the functioning of society one might require probability samples of pivotal occupations, such as school teacher, has yet to become sufficiently visible to affect practice. Thus, even though we have waves of data on several high school cohorts, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) insists on using a data collection strategy that cumbersomely prevents one from obtaining a probability sample of teachers. For example, for High School and Beyond, the National Education Longitudinal Study, and subsequent similar data collection efforts, ETS has collected the responses of teachers teaching a few subjects in school to a few questions about specific students they teach and a few additional general questions. This design necessitates connecting each teacher to one or more sampled students. If a teacher does not have any sampled students in their classes that term, that teacher is not eligible for the sample. This feature of ETS sample design requires a great deal of administrative effort prior to the day of survey administration to assure that teachers without sampled students are not given questionnaires. Alas, this cost expenditure greatly limits the utility of the data obtained and undermines the logic of asking other intriguing questions such as teachers’ attitudes toward general groups in society (or, even, their experiences with respect to teacher pay).

It is easy to see how the Lacy and Middleton research suggests slight but powerful changes in the ETS design. One could do everything to link specific teachers to students they are teaching, but still survey every teacher who lacks a student in the sample. Not only would this make the design a probability sample of teachers, but it would also lower administration costs and reduce missing data (e.g., teachers erroneously thought to not have any students in the sample would still be able to answer questions on students they now realize are in the sample).

If the ETS approach were re-designed along such lines, it would become possible not only to discover the composition of the teaching force on key factors (e.g., levels of prejudice) at specific sites, but also to link specific students to their exposure to prejudiced versus non-prejudiced teachers. The former would allow investigation of structural factors that may increase the likelihood of prejudiced teachers as well as how structural outcomes (e.g., tracking policies) may be partly determined by the composition of teachers. The latter might substantially alter research and policy concerning racial gaps in track location, measured achievement, and discipline. Although certainly more sophisticated designs may eventually be needed to disentangle the processes linking teacher attitudes to student opportunity and outcomes, using designs and collecting data that allow such linkages to be
made are important precursors to any serious assessment of the impact of teachers on student opportunity and outcomes. Yet, this linkage, and the data and questionnaire designs necessary for nationally representative investigation of the issue, are not even on the radar screen. Here we can recognize a consequential absence produced, perhaps in part, by inattention to the Lacy and Middleton paper.

Not only policy, but also basic research should have advanced had the paper been more prominent. Had analysts been inspired to augment data collection efforts by the Lacy and Middleton example, we might be further along in discovering the impact of the timing of exposure and intensity of exposure (e.g., which grade(s) matter most, and how many such exposures may occur without lowering achievement trajectories) on outcomes, a key basic research question for the behavioral sciences.

No work is perfect, so of course the work had limitations. Most notably, the GSS used block quota sampling in the first three waves of data collection, used both block quota and probability sampling in 1975 and 1976, and switched to a full probability sample design only in 1977. Thus, 5 of the 6 waves of data Lacy and Middleton used were not actually probability samples. However, this limitation was inherent in the data collection, not to their general approach.

This limitation does not reduce, and in fact may increase, our wonder at why the paper did not inspire followers. Clearly, an intriguing line of research assessing changing prejudice levels in key occupations could have been motivated at first by an interest in replicating their findings using data from a full probability sample design, and then by increasing sophistication concerning the complexity of issues surrounding prejudice and its measurement.

The Lacy and Middleton example, focused on race, is generalizable. For example, what is the incidence of prejudice against women amongst teachers? What is the incidence of prejudicial attitudes toward gays and lesbians amongst teachers? One could offer many other examples of questions Lacy and Middleton inspire, examples followed only rarely and in a limited way (Lucas 2008).

Lacy and Middleton illustrate a creative way to proceed to disaggregate national data in illuminating ways. Had their insights been more widely-disseminated, and had they influenced our data collection and conception of phenomena, both our inside sociology and wider national dialogue on inequality and discrimination would have been much improved. Teachers, almost always harried, very often disparaged, and very likely underpaid, stand at the center of multiple policy interventions to improve education and, ultimately, adult social and economic outcomes. While we need to provide teachers with the tools to work these miracles, we need also assess their commitment to working those miracles for every child they encounter. Lacy and Middleton reveal an important way that assessment can be accomplished, and suggest its import for many other efforts to collect data on the workings of schools.

We have delayed our response to the research agenda–and illustrative creativity–Lacy and Middleton suggest. But, there is little stopping us from taking up that agenda today. The social issues of their period have stubbornly remained, and the centrality of teachers is undiminished. It is with that recognition that I contend that Lacy and Middleton (1981) should have been a classic. But, fortunately for us, it can still become one.
References and Cases Cited


Five Questions to ... Annette Lareau

by Jessica McCrory Calarco

Jessica McCrory Calarco is a doctoral candidate in the Sociology Department at the University of Pennsylvania. Her research explores how culture and social interaction matter for stratification. Current projects include an ethnographic study of children’s role in creating and maintaining educational inequalities. The first paper from this project examines social class differences in student-teacher interactions, with a focus on children’s classroom help-seeking (titled ‘“I Need Help!’ Social Class and Children’s Help-Seeking in Elementary School,” forthcoming in the American Sociological Review). Jessica can be reached at jcalarco@sas.upenn.edu.

Your book, Unequal Childhoods shows how different logics of childrearing dramatically influence the lives and life chances of children from poor/working-class and middle-class families. In 2011, University of California Press released a new edition with 100 additional pages based on the follow-up interviews with the original participants. What were the most surprising findings from this new research?

The young adults in the different social classes were exactly the same age. Still, the working-class and poor youth seemed to be much older than the middle-class youth. The middle-class youth were generally in college. They were excited about traveling in the future. They were often very dependent on their parents. They seemed young. By contrast, the working-class and poor youth were working-full time in hourly-wage jobs (or were unemployed). Some had been working since they were 14. Some had children. The working-class and poor young adults seemed worn, although they were still hopeful. Since this was the reverse of the pattern when they were younger—when the working-class and poor youth seemed younger than the more sophisticated and blasé middle-class children—it was a surprise.

I was also somewhat surprised to learn that the class patterns that I found in childhood not only were sustained over time, but the power of social class grew. For example, the transition to college is a long and complicated process. (Parents’ roles are much more complicated than parent involvement when children are in fourth-grade.) The middle-class parents had taken countless steps to ensure a smooth transition to college including helping their children select high school courses, assisting with college applications, settling on a list of suitable colleges, driving them to visit colleges, and giving them advice on the choice of a college major. Even in college, the middle-class youth spoke with their parents frequently. Not only had the working-class and poor kids not gone to a four-year college, their flirtations with community college were extremely brief. If the working-class and poor youth had applied to go to college, they had done it virtually all on their own with the assistance from high school counselors. Also, the parents and young adults presumed that it was up to the young people to manage the process; parents had a limited role. The working-class and poor young adults saw their parents frequently. They loved their parents very much. But they did not depend on them in the same way that the middle-class youth did. Instead, the working-class and poor youth were “grown.”

While it wasn’t a surprise, there were also important ways that race mattered. As a young African-American man, Alexander Williams was nonetheless followed around in stores—shopkeepers and security guards worried that
he was going to steal things. His high SAT scores and his enrollment in a pre-med program in “Columbia” did not buffer him from this racialized treatment in public life. But the white (and black) working-class and poor men also complained vociferously about the police, in very similar ways to what the middle-class Black men experienced. Still, overall, the power of social class, in some ways, grew over time.

What do you see as the strengths of ethnographic research on families and schools?

I respect quantitative work, but I always wonder about the meaning of the patterns in people’s lives. Ethnography can illuminate the rituals of daily life. It can show, as C. Wright Mills suggested, the interweaving of structure and biography. I am currently writing a book about doing ethnography in the real world. I worry that some qualitative studies are becoming too big. I particularly value participant-observational studies that show how social life unfolds. Indeed, I believe that there should be a bright line between studies that only rely on in-depth interviewing, and studies that include both participant observations and in-depth interviewing. My favorite dissertations are those that involve about nine months of participant observations, and around 20 or 30 in-depth interviews with people that the researcher has met in the field site. By situating these interviews in a particular social context, I believe that the results are much richer. Unequal Childhoods was too ambitious; it is not a role model. “Small is good” when it comes to ethnographic work.

Following up on the previous question, what advice do you have for graduate students and other young scholars who are hoping to conduct their own ethnographic research in schools or in other social settings?

I think that the study should be ambitious, and, at the same time that it should not be too ambitious. I think that doctoral students should go to a field site over and over and over again. The researcher should get to know people in the setting. This kind of work is best done by young people, actually. Young people may not be famous, but they have the gift of time. They usually have much more time than faculty members have. And, indeed, some of the very best ethnographic books have been revised dissertations. But students have to make hard choices. One study cannot do everything. Thus it’s important to not do too much. It’s also important to focus the study. It’s important to have one and only one thesis. Students should also show the contribution to the literature. It should answer the “so what” question by showing how the research is a “friendly amendment” to the previous research.

I often hear from faculty members that rejection is a regular part of life in academia. How do you cope with these stumbling blocks on the road to publication?

The path to success is filled with rejection. My first book, Home Advantage, was summarily rejected from the first press that I sent it to for review. It was not even sent out for review. I think it’s important to expect to be rejected. Even the most stinging rebuke provides food for thought. It is appropriate to take a few weeks for the sting to subside, but then it’s appropriate to try to learn from the reviews. I recently had a paper rejected from a top journal in the field. It stung a little bit, but the reviews were very helpful. I plan to thoroughly
revise it and resubmit the dramatically altered paper to a different journal. Graduate students sometimes have an unrealistic idea about how long it takes to get a paper (or book) published. It is very helpful to get others to provide a critical review of it during the development of a piece. There are many, many revisions in the process of producing one article.

Your current work looks not only at families and schools, but also at how neighborhoods matter in stratification. Could you tell us a little more about this project and what you are finding in the field?

With Elliot Weininger, I have been conducting a study called Choosing Homes, Choosing Schools. We know that children largely grow up in stratified neighborhoods, but we don’t have a sufficiently detailed understanding of the actual processes of how parents choose where to live, as well as the role that schools play in those residential decisions. The emerging results suggest that many—but not all—parents rapidly decide the general area in which they will live. The interviews, for example, reveal that white, upper-middle-class parents say “everybody know the schools are good here.” While they can provide rich detail about other life decisions, such as which summer camp to choose, the residential decision is difficult for most parents to discuss in great detail. With Michael Bader (American University), I am organizing a mini conference on Choosing Homes, Choosing Schools, to take place at the Eastern Sociological Society annual meeting in New York City on February 24\textsuperscript{th} and 25\textsuperscript{th}. It seeks to bring together sociologists of education with scholars studying residential segregation. Details are at: https://sites.google.com/site/upennchoosinghomes/. All are welcome!
Funding Opportunities at the Institute for Education Sciences

By Hiromi Ono

Hiromi Ono is a program officer for the postsecondary/adult education program at the National Center for Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences (IES), U.S. Department of Education. Prior to joining IES, she was an associate professor of sociology at Washington State University, Pullman, and a research professor at the Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan.

As the research arm of the United States Department of Education, the Institute of Education Sciences (IES) provides competitive grants to support both theoretically and methodologically rigorous research on education. Our goal is to advance scientific knowledge that contributes to the improvement of students’ academic outcomes. The Institute supports interdisciplinary research projects, including those on which sociologists are the Principal Investigators or are team members of the project. A range of different types of research projects are funded, including those in which primary data collection projects are supplemented by secondary data analyses, as well as projects consisting solely of secondary data analyses. Many IES projects also collect qualitative data. Ethnographers play critical roles as team members on those projects. These projects seek to answer both exploratory and confirmatory research questions about interventions that have the potential to improve student outcomes. In addition, IES provides support for researchers to develop and validate new, or validate existing, measures pertaining to education as well as for the development or evaluation of education interventions.

Several IES topic areas and research programs may be of particular interest to researchers in sociology of education who study the correlates and causes of students’ educational attainment. Topic areas within our Education Research Grants Program include: post-secondary education; reading and writing; social and behavioral context for academic learning; mathematics and science education; early learning programs and policies; improving education systems: policies, organization, management, and leadership; and English language learners, education technology, and effective teachers and teaching. In addition, our program on Statistical and Research Methodology in Education may be of interest to sociologists. Research projects can be situated, developed, and analyzed in a variety of settings. Eligible applicants include public and private, non-profit and for profit entities.

IES has sought since 2004 to support a range of projects, including those focused on the development of interventions and measures, as well as those intended to test whether an intervention works to improve student outcomes. Some sociologists of education have the misperception that IES only funds efficacy trials. We would like to clarify that this is not the case as rigorous evaluations make up only about one-quarter of our research grant portfolio. A quick review of currently funded projects reveals the wide diversity of topics and methods used in IES supported research (see http://ies.ed.gov/funding/grantsearch/index.asp). It is, however, the case that IES funds research that is closely tied to aspects of the school environment that are under the control of the education system. IES is particularly interested in identifying education practices that help disadvantaged students in ways that
could have immediate and broad impacts on the students’ academic outcomes and overall well-being. As a result, applicants are encouraged to develop research questions that arise from the education settings in which students participate.

A Request for Applications describing application requirements is posted annually by early spring and is available at [http://ies.ed.gov/funding](http://ies.ed.gov/funding). Registering for the IES Newsflash at [http://ies.ed.gov/newsflash/](http://ies.ed.gov/newsflash/) (check all after NCER) enables researchers to obtain automatic notification and timely information on the Request for Applications. Applications may be submitted at two deadlines each year and are evaluated through an external peer review process. Proposal text is limited to 25 pages, with emphases on strong significance and research methods sections. Funding available to a project could range from $100,000 to $900,000 per year, with years of funding ranging from 1 to 5 years, depending on the type of project. Please visit our website for additional information: [http://ies.ed.gov/funding/ncer_progs.asp](http://ies.ed.gov/funding/ncer_progs.asp).

IES provides technical assistance to applicants. Program staff gives quality feedback at various stages of the development of applications, including providing comments on draft applications. New applicants should contact a program officer at the earliest stage of the conception of an application to receive feedback and develop strategies to improve the quality of their applications. Early contact by junior investigators is strongly encouraged. IES program officers are happy to answer your questions regarding a possible grant submission at any time. Information about which program officers oversee which topic areas are available on the NCER website.
Profiles of Early Career Scholars

Dameon V. Alexander

Dameon V. Alexander is a professorial lecturer of sociology at The George Washington University (GW) in Washington, D.C. where he teaches Economic Sociology and Social Research Methods. He also holds an administrative position as Director of Strategic Initiatives in the department of Academic Technology. Aside from being a sociologist, he has a colorful professional background ranging from strategic management, education consulting, and electronic media. He earned his PhD from the University of Cambridge, in England in 2010. His dissertation was a theory building case study of two senior high schools: one, a private, Jesuit school with a strictly college prep mission and the other, a public charter school designed to prepare students for both college and careers. His first book, entitled, *The Imprint of Business Norms on American Education*, is an expanded version of his doctoral research and will be published in December 2011. One of the unique analyses highlighted in the book is the difference between a religious paradigm and a careerist pedagogical approach, both functioning in a democratic market economy. Also, three contextual themes emerge from his data: entrepreneur ethics, social skills, and technology - all areas where he looks forward to exploring in greater depth in the future.

While his core research agenda aligns within the sociology of education and economic sociology, his other research interests are in the sociology of organized crime and religion. He is currently exploring a research project that examines ways to bridge K-12, university, and the world-of-work together in a way that allows all institutional stakeholders to benefit. In the future, he looks forward to exploring how certain images and concepts of organized criminality affect conceptions of knowledge and career for certain youth. He has been featured as a guest speaker on a couple occasions ranging on topics from closing the wealth gap in America, the globalization of education, and most notably as a Congressional panelist for a forum debating the educational mandate No Child Left Behind.

While skeptical of some ways businesses engage educational processes of both k-12 and universities, he finds that a business-education partnership is not *taboo*. In 2005, he launched an independent consulting practice dedicated to what he refers to as "educentric" solutions where his goal is to help both for-profit and non-profit organizations achieve their intended goals in education—keeping student needs the center of attention. While in his full-time role at GW, from time-to-time he engages in independent consulting and volunteering activities primarily working on education based projects on a domestic and international scale.
Steven E. Alvarado received his Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Wisconsin, Madison in 2011 where he was an Institute of Education Sciences pre-doctoral fellow. He is currently in his first of two years as a postdoctoral fellow at the Center for Research on Educational Opportunity at the University of Notre Dame. Alvarado’s interests include stratification, education, social demography and immigration. In his dissertation, he used restricted tract-level data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth between 1986 and 2008 and fixed-effects models to investigate the causal link between neighborhood dis/advantage and obesity and educational achievement for urban youth. These data allowed him to conceptualize neighborhoods as dynamic and evolving entities that change over time. By analyzing movers and stayers separately, he found that the odds of being obese were attenuated as a result of moving to more affluent neighborhoods among poor and urban Black youth. He also found that math and reading test scores were improved for both urban Black and Latino youth as a result of a) moving to more affluent neighborhoods and b) experiencing an increase in neighborhood affluence around them over time (e.g., gentrification). These findings have implications for ongoing federal policies such as Section 8 and HOPE VI that aim to reduce inequality through housing interventions. As a postdoctoral fellow, Alvarado will extend this work to understand how these early inequalities in neighborhood context, health, and education accumulate over time to affect post-secondary schooling and labor market outcomes. He also plans to investigate how Catholic schools, and the notion of the “common good,” affect science and math course-taking using data from the High School Longitudinal Study of 2009.

Soo-yong Byun is a Research Associate and Assistant Director of Research Support for the Social Dynamics and Special Populations Research Program within the College of Education and is affiliated with the Population Research Institute at the Pennsylvania State University (PSU). Before joining PSU, he worked as a postdoctoral scholar at the National Research Center on Rural Education Support at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (2008-2011) and at the International Study Center at the Michigan State University (2007-2008). Byun completed his Ph.D. in Educational Policy and Administration at the University of Minnesota with a specialization in Comparative and International Development Education.

His main fields of interest are cross-national research on education, sociology of education, social stratification, race/ethnicity, and educational policy analysis. His work seeks to identify cross-national variation in the mechanisms and processes of social stratification as well as to assess the role of educational interventions and policies in bridging the achievement gap among students of diverse backgrounds. Byun is also interested in investigating issues related to serving students from rural communities and/or with disabilities.

In his collaborative article (with Hyunjoon Park) forthcoming in Sociology of Education (January 2012), Byun uses data from the Educational Longitudinal Study to assess the relevance of shadow education in the high academic
performance of East Asian American students by examining how East Asian American youth differ from other racial/ethnic students in the prevalence, purpose, and effects of SAT coaching defined as the American style of shadow education. In another collaborative article (with Evan Schofer and Kyung-keun Kim) forthcoming in Sociology of Education, Byun revisits the relevance of cultural capital in East Asian Educational systems by investigating variation in the relationships among family socioeconomic status, cultural capital, and children’s academic achievement across South Korea, Japan, France, and the United States using data from the 2000 Programme for International Student Assessment. More information and research can be found at: https://sites.google.com/site/sooyongbyunshompage/.

Roberto G. Gonzales

Roberto G. Gonzales is an Assistant Professor at the University of Chicago’s School of Social Service Administration. He received his Ph.D. in sociology from the University of California at Irvine. His scholarly interests include international migration, immigrant incorporation, the transition to adulthood of vulnerable populations, urban poverty, and youth civic involvement. Professor Gonzales’ research focuses on the ways in which legal and educational institutions shape the everyday experiences and the transitions to adulthood of poor, minority, and immigrant youth. His work has been published in the American Sociological Review, Current Anthropology, and the Peabody Journal of Education, among other journals. He is currently working on a book manuscript based on his research on Los Angeles.

His West Coast Undocumented Young Adults Research Project has collected in-depth qualitative data on over 200 undocumented immigrant young adults who have lived in the U.S. since childhood. Broadly, this research is aimed at generating a better understanding of their educational trajectories, how they come of age, and how a segment of these young people engages in civic and political activity. Gonzales finds that conflicting and contradictory laws—most importantly, those regarding immigration and education—move undocumented adolescents and young adults from experiences of belonging and inclusion to those of rejection and exclusion. The process of “learning to be illegal” tremendously impacts these young people’s coming of age, identity formation, friendship patterns, aspirations and expectations. And, while these transitions differently impact undocumented college goers and those who exit the school system early, by their mid-twenties, the overwhelming majority has very few legal options.

Gonzales’ research indicates that while most American youngsters today face some difficulty managing adolescent and adult transitions, undocumented youth face added challenges. Their exclusion from important rites of passage in late adolescence and movement from protected to unprotected status leave them in a state of developmental limbo, preventing subsequent and important adult transitions. Moreover, unlike their legal peers who linger in adolescence due to safety nets at home, many of these youngsters are required to start contributing to their families and taking care of themselves at early ages. These unique incorporation patterns shape adolescent and adult transitions that diverge significantly from those of their documented peers, and place them in jeopardy of becoming a disenfranchised underclass. However, Gonzales has found that the presence of parental support, nurturing school environments, and
school-based mentors can enable undocumented students to overcome financial and legal barriers, succeed in school, and develop capacity for leadership.

Anthony D. Greene

Anthony D. Greene is a visiting assistant professor of sociology at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. He earned his Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Miami in 2008. He specializes in research about race-ethnic relations and sociology of education, especially the effects of race and social class on academic track placement. He has taught and conducted research on topics that include social stratification, race relations, sociology of sport, academic tracking, school desegregation, and student achievement. He is trained in both quantitative and qualitative methodologies and has experience in survey development, advanced statistical techniques such as hierarchical linear modeling, regression modeling and ethnographic research.

Greene’s current areas of research include social class, cultural, and ethnic identity among Black student populations. His most recent publication is “Get Up, Get Out, and Git Sumthin’: How Race and Class Influence African Americans’ Attitudes about Inequality,” (American Behavioral Scientist Special Edition, 2012), which examines how social class differences among African Americans influence their ideas about whether racism and/or personal merit most strongly influences prospects for upward mobility.

In another recent manuscript, he highlights the independent effects of race on the tracking process within high school vocational programs and how these processes shape both academic achievement outcomes and career opportunities. He also is investigating how the perception of discrimination impacts social psychological factors (i.e. social anxiety, depressive symptoms, self-esteem) among Black subgroups in the U.S.

Simone Ispa-Landa

Simone Ispa-Landa, who earned her doctorate in sociology from Harvard University, will join the faculty of Northwestern University’s School of Education and Social Policy this fall as an assistant professor in the Human Development and Social Policy program. Her research interests focus on inequality in education. Ispa-Landa was the first researcher to look at racial integration from a gender perspective. Her dissertation was titled “Race, Reputation, and Community Resources: Gender Differences in the Experiences and Effects of an Urban-to-Suburban School Integration Program.” She found that the lived experience of racial integration was very gendered. Comparing the experiences of teen boys and girls who were bused to school, she found that girls felt more social isolation while boys benefited more, because they were taken out of environments that were dangerous for them. Drawing on a comparison between students who were enrolled versus waited for the integration program, she also explored the mechanisms through which exposure to affluent schooling contexts can affect urban minority students’ goals and understanding of the adult professional world. Overall, her work adopts an inductive-theory building approach, identifies micro-level social processes that contribute to uneven outcomes across race and gender categories, and deepens our appreciation for the processes through which
educational contexts affect the cultural repertoires of individuals and groups. Ispa-Landa has earned a number of awards, grants and fellowships. These include the Spencer Foundation Dissertation Fellowship, a National Science Foundation Dissertation Improvement Grant, the Rose Laub Coser Dissertation Proposal Award and the Harvard Weatherhead Project on Justice, Welfare, and Economics Dissertation Fellowship.

Yingyi Ma

Yingyi Ma is currently an Assistant Professor of Sociology at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University. She is also an affiliated faculty member in the Women’s Study Department and the program of Asia/Asian American Studies. She obtained her PhD in Sociology at Johns Hopkins University in 2007. Her work deals with a variety of themes of social inequality related to education, gender and migration. Her article, “Family SES, Parental Involvement and College Major Choices,” published in Sociological Perspectives in 2009, finds that low-SES students tend to choose lucrative college majors and thus raises the possibility that college major choice is potentially weakening the intergenerational transmission of inequality. This article also finds that SES trumps gender effects in that lower SES women are particularly likely to choose lucrative fields. Her recent research projects focus on the gender and racial/ethnic differential concentrations in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) fields. This line of work has been funded by National Science Foundation and Alfred Sloan Foundation. Her article “Model Minority, Model for Whom?--An Investigation of Asian American Students in Science/Engineering,” published in AAPI Nexus Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders Policy, Practice & Community in 2010, finds that Asian American students are disadvantaged in cultural capital compared with other racial groups from similar socioeconomic backgrounds, and they tend to formulate certain negative self-perceptions associated with their inclination towards STEM fields. Her most recent publication is a sole-authored paper forthcoming in Social Science Quarterly, titled “Gender Differences in the Paths Leading to a STEM Baccalaureate.” She finds that women are more likely to switch into the STEM fields later in college to attain their STEM bachelor’s degrees, and attitudes and course taking behaviors during high school years contribute to the different pathways that men and women travel.

Anne McDaniel

Anne McDaniel is a postdoctoral fellow at the Institute for Social and Economic Research and Policy at Columbia University. She received her Ph.D. from The Ohio State University under the direction of Claudia Buchmann in 2011. Dr. McDaniel’s dissertation, titled “Three Essays on Cross-National Gender Gaps in Education,” used cross-national data assembled from diverse sources to examine two key features of contemporary gender inequalities in education—the fact that women now earn more college degrees than men in much of the world and the fact that gender segregation in fields of study persists and women remain underrepresented in most science, engineering and math fields. As a postdoctoral scholar, she is continuing research on gender inequalities in education by investigating why so few academically talented women enter science fields in the United States. Dr. McDaniel’s

**Sarah Ovink**

Sarah Ovink is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech) in Blacksburg, Virginia. She received her Ph.D. in Sociology at the University of California, Davis in June 2011. She earned her Bachelor’s degree in Sociology at Kalamazoo College in Kalamazoo, Michigan. She teaches a newly designed course, Human Diversity and Community Engagement, which focuses on inequality by race/ethnicity, gender, social class, sexualities, and ability/disability. Students in her course participate in community engagement projects linking course concepts to community action aimed at ameliorating social inequality in the New River Valley region.

Dr. Ovink has published research (*Qualitative Sociology*, January 2011) that explores themes of punishment and social control in a new truancy center established in an underresourced school district. Her most recent publication (*Research in Higher Education*, Ovink and Veazey 2011) examines cultural capital and identity among undergraduates who participated in a program designed to increase participation in research-related careers for underrepresented minority students in STEM fields.

Dr. Ovink’s current research focuses on the postsecondary pathways of underrepresented minority students. Her dissertation was a mixed-methods study that included longitudinal, in-depth interviews with a cohort of 50 San Francisco Bay Area Latino/a students, examining their transition from high school to college. She also examined the role of family/cultural factors in college enrollment patterns using ELS:2002. Her dissertation research was supported by an NSF Dissertation Improvement Grant.
Improvement Grant as well as an AERA Dissertation Grant.

**Patricia Bromley**

Patricia Bromley is an Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Utah. She primarily teaches courses related to nonprofit organizations and research design in the Masters of Public Administration program. Bromley graduated from the School of Education at Stanford University in 2011, after completing a dissertation that analyzed the content of more than 500 high school social science textbooks from 74 countries. This work used multilevel modeling to provide evidence of a repurposing of mass schooling away from its traditional goal of constructing a cohesive national citizenry towards post-national emphases on universal rights and diversity. Related publications, developed collaboratively with John W. Meyer and Francisco O. Ramirez, have appeared in *Sociology of Education, Comparative Education Review, and Social Forces*. She recently received funding from the Spencer Foundation for a project that extends this research entitled, “Varieties of the New Civics: Institutional Influences on the Evolution of Civic Education Curricula in the US and Canada, 1850-2010.” More details can be found on her website at [www.patriciabromley.com](http://www.patriciabromley.com). In addition to research on worldwide changes in civic education, Bromley studies the effects of rationalization on non-profit and non-governmental organizations and the rise of formal organization of social and cultural issue collaborations. A set of her studies focus on the structural, social, and social psychological factors that prevent disadvantaged youth from enrolling in college. One study finds that adolescents whose parents did not attend college are distinct in that parental support is seemingly unrelated to whether or not they plan to attend college. Another has focused on the lower sense of control among students who attend high-poverty schools. This work is particularly inspired by Dara’s four years as a math teacher at both low- and high-poverty middle schools. A book chapter co-authored by Dara was recently published in *Linguistic Minority Students Go to College*. She is also first author for a paper under review which finds that diverse high school athletes have consistently experienced a college going advantage over the last three decades. Dara’s dissertation research, supported by a NSF grant awarded to Chandra Muller, explores the markers of social disadvantage that leave youth most vulnerable to being labeled as learning disabled in high school, and whether the label is subsequently related to stigma and stratification. She has published findings from this work in *Research in Social Science and Disability Series, Journal of Learning Disabilities, and Journal of Special Education Technology*; several other related articles are in progress or under revision for a journal. Quantitative research is a personal strength, as a result of Dara’s BA in mathematics and her training at UT’s Population Research Center. Nonetheless,

**Dara Shifrer**

Dara Shifrer will complete her Ph.D. in Sociology at the University of Texas at Austin in 2012. She has pursued her core interests in socioeconomic and racial disparities in educational attainment through several research collaborations. A set of her studies focus on the structural, social, and social psychological factors that prevent disadvantaged youth from enrolling in college. One study finds that adolescents whose parents did not attend college are distinct in that parental support is seemingly unrelated to whether or not they plan to attend college. Another has focused on the lower sense of control among students who attend high-poverty schools. This work is particularly inspired by Dara’s four years as a math teacher at both low- and high-poverty middle schools. A book chapter co-authored by Dara was recently published in *Linguistic Minority Students Go to College*. She is also first author for a paper under review which finds that diverse high school athletes have consistently experienced a college going advantage over the last three decades. Dara’s dissertation research, supported by a NSF grant awarded to Chandra Muller, explores the markers of social disadvantage that leave youth most vulnerable to being labeled as learning disabled in high school, and whether the label is subsequently related to stigma and stratification. She has published findings from this work in *Research in Social Science and Disability Series, Journal of Learning Disabilities, and Journal of Special Education Technology*; several other related articles are in progress or under revision for a journal. Quantitative research is a personal strength, as a result of Dara’s BA in mathematics and her training at UT’s Population Research Center. Nonetheless,
holding mixed methods as an ideal, Dara will continue to incorporate qualitative methods into future research.

Stephanie Southworth

Stephanie Southworth is a visiting assistant professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Clemson University. She received her Ph.D. in Public Policy from the University of North Carolina at Charlotte in 2008. Her research focuses on educational stratification. Specifically, she examines the effects of school racial and socioeconomic composition on students’ opportunities to learn. In her coauthored 2007 Social Forces article she found that the racial composition of a school affected the track placement of students differently depending on their race and gender. In a 2010 article published in Educational Policy Analysis Archives, she examined school racial and poverty composition and teacher quality effects on elementary and middle school students’ math and reading achievement. She found that all students performed higher in low poverty, racially balanced schools. She also found that the effects of teacher characteristics on achievement differed by grade. Middle school student test scores benefitted from having licensed teachers in the classroom, whereas in elementary school, teacher experience was more important.

The Center for Research on Educational Opportunity (CREO)

at the University of Notre Dame announces the following new faculty members and early career scholars:

Megan Andrew

Dr. Megan Andrew received her PhD from the University of Wisconsin 2009 after completing her dissertation on the socioeconomic and social psychological determinants of post-secondary schooling. After completing her dissertation, Dr. Andrew was awarded a Scholar in Health Policy Research Fellowship from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation at the University of Michigan. During that fellowship, she studied education-health gradients among Latino young adults. Dr. Andrew brings expertise to CREO in the sociology of higher education and is currently working on projects dealing with the intergenerational transmission of post-secondary schooling. Dr. Andrew is most excited about being part of a research center with an eye to the future and continuing its growth. “As a new faculty member, it’s exciting to be part of a research center where there is a lot of energy and excitement about the sociology of education. It’s easy to explore new territory here because of the amazing resources at the center and the strong support of the university.”
Amy Langenkamp

Dr. Amy Langenkamp is the O’Shaughnessy Assistant Professor Chair of Educational Studies. She received her PhD in Sociology from the University of Texas at Austin in 2007. After receiving her PhD, Dr. Langenkamp was a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Population Research Center of the University of Texas at Austin. Prior to her arrival at CREO and the University of Notre Dame, she was an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology at Georgia State University. Her research currently focuses on analyzing how social networks and community organizations influence the transition to postsecondary schooling among immigrant students. Dr. Langenkamp is thrilled to join the Center for Research on Educational Opportunity, “CREO and the University of Notre Dame provides a vibrant community of scholars studying sociology of education.”
News from Section Members: Books

Lost in Transition: Youth, Work, and Instability in Postindustrial Japan
by Mary C. Brinton (Cambridge University Press)

Lost in Transition: Youth, Work, and Instability in Postindustrial Japan tells the story of how Japan's highly institutionalized school-work system changed during the 1990s and beyond as Japanese economic growth slowed and as the economy became increasingly service-oriented. Using a mixture of research methods from interviews with teachers and principals at vocational and general high schools, an original young adult survey coupled with in-depth interviews of high school graduates, and network analysis to analyze recruiting relationships between high schools and firms, Brinton charts the effects of a disintegrating system on the lives of young Japanese men. Brinton argues that the institutional and economic changes that Japan has undergone have fundamentally weakened the relationship of less-achieving young people to school and have also weakened their attachment to the workplace as a source of personal identity and security. In a concluding chapter, Brinton explores the implications for school-work transition systems in other postindustrial economies including the U.S. Given the policy implications of her analysis, Brinton originally published a popular version of the book in Japanese; the English version is targeted to the social science audience in the U.S., especially scholars of education, youth, and the labor market.

Mary C. Brinton is the Reischauer Institute Professor of Sociology at Harvard University.
Schools and Society: A Sociological Approach to Education
by Jeanne H. Ballantine and Joan Z. Spade (eds.) (Pine Forge Press)

A comprehensive, theoretically balanced overview of the sociology of education that features a wealth of original readings by noted scholars.

Offering a wide array of theoretical perspectives and methods, a broad range of resources, and both classic and contemporary studies, this fully updated Fourth Edition uses the open systems approach to provide readers with a framework for understanding and analyzing the book’s disparate topics. Edited by Jeanne H. Ballantine and Joan Z. Spade, both of whom actively teach Sociology of Education courses, this text includes dozens of readable articles that illustrate major concepts and theoretical perspectives in the field.

Jeanne H. Ballantine is professor of sociology at Wright State University in Dayton, Ohio.

Joan Z. Spade is professor of sociology at The College at Brockport, State University of New York, in Brockport, New York.
Scholarly analysis in the sociology of education has burgeoned in recent decades. *Frontiers in Sociology of Education* (2011), Maureen Hallinan, editor, provides a roadmap for sociologists and other social scientists as they set bold new directions for future research on schools. In Part 1 of this forward-looking volume, the authors present cutting-edge research to set new guidelines for the sociological analysis of schools. In Part 2, notable social scientists, historians, administrators and educators provide a wide-ranging array of perspectives on contemporary education to insure that scholars make creative and broadly informed contributions to the sociological analysis of schools.

The contributors to this volume examine events currently influencing education including: globalization, expansion of educational access, the changing significance of religion, new family structures, and curriculum reform. *Frontiers in Sociology of Education* offers an innovative collection of research and ideas aimed at inspiring new analyses of schools better linked to changing societal conditions.

**Maureen Hallinan** is the William P. and Hazel B. White Professor of Sociology at the University of Notre Dame.
The Sociology of Education, 7/E
by Jeanne H. Ballantine and Floyd M. Hammack (Pearson)

A comprehensive and cross-cultural look at the sociology of education.
The Sociology of Education: A Systematic Analysis integrates important and diverse topics in the field by showing how they are related and provides a sociological analysis of education using several theoretical approaches. The authors include practical applications and current educational issues to discuss the structure and processes that make education systems work.

Learning Goals
Upon completing this book, readers should be able to:

• Learn diverse theoretical approaches in the sociology of education
• Assess important current or emerging topics, including higher education, informal education ("climate" and the "hidden curriculum"), the school environment, education around the world, and educational movements and alternatives
• Understand how change takes place and what role sociologists play
• Become involved with educational systems where they can put to use the knowledge available in textbooks

The website for the book is at: http://www.pearsonhighered.com/educator/product/Sociology-of-Education-The-7E/9780205800919.page. Exam copies can be ordered there along with instructor materials.

Jeanne H. Ballantine is professor of sociology at Wright State University.
Floyd M. Hammack is professor of educational sociology and higher education at New York University.
Inside the College Gates: How Class and Culture Matter in Higher Education
by Jenny Stuber (Lexington Books)

"In this important and illuminating book, Stuber takes the reader into the social and extra-curricular worlds of students at two college campuses. Through compelling interviews, Stuber shows how social class matters during college, in terms of the types of resources students bring with them and how these translate into opportunities for integration and social involvement. By addressing these long neglected topics, this research broadens our understanding of the stratifying processes taking place on college campuses."
—Ann L. Mullen, University of Toronto

"Stuber deepens our understanding of the ways higher education serves as a site for social reproduction, and offers practical advice for colleges and universities to enhance the personal development of working-class students."
—Elizabeth Aries, Amherst University

"This well-written book should attract attention from like-minded sociologists of education, specialists in higher education, qualitative methodologists, and stratification/elite researchers. And, it forces all of us to ponder a vexing question: can higher education deliver more equal experiences for all?"
—Scott Davies, McMaster University

About the Book
To date, scholars in higher education have examined the ways in which students' experiences in the classroom and the human capital they attain impact social class inequalities. In this book, Jenny Stuber argues that the experiential core of college life—the social and extra-curricular worlds of higher education—operate as a setting in which social class inequalities manifest and get reproduced. As college students form friendships and get involved in activities like Greek life, study abroad, and student government, they acquire the social and cultural resources that give them access to valuable social and occupational opportunities beyond the college gates. Yet students' social class backgrounds also impact how they experience the experiential core of college life, structuring their abilities to navigate their campus's social and extra-curricular worlds. Stuber demonstrates that students' social interactions, friendships, and extra-curricular involvements also shape—and are shaped by—their social class worldviews—the ideas they have about their own and others' class identities and their beliefs about where they and others fit within the class system. By focusing on student's social class worldviews, this book provides insight into how identities and consciousness are shaped within educational settings. Ultimately, this examination of what happens inside the college gates shows how which higher education serves as an avenue for social reproduction, while also providing opportunities for the contestation of class inequalities.

**Jenny M. Stuber** is assistant professor of sociology at the University of North Florida.
Understanding the causes of the racial achievement gap in American education—and then addressing it with effective programs—is one of the most urgent problems communities and educators face.

For many years, the most popular explanation for the achievement gap has been the “oppositional culture theory”: the idea that black students underperform in secondary schools because of a group culture that devalues learning and sees academic effort as “acting white.” Despite lack of evidence for this belief, classroom teachers accept it, with predictable self-fulfilling results. In a careful quantitative assessment of the oppositional culture hypothesis, Angel L. Harris tested its empirical implications systematically and broadened his analysis to include data from British schools. From every conceivable angle of examination, the oppositional culture theory fell flat.

Despite achieving less in school, black students value schooling more than their white counterparts do. Black kids perform badly in high school not because they don’t want to succeed but because they enter without the necessary skills. Harris finds that the achievement gap starts to open up in preadolescence—when cumulating socioeconomic and health disadvantages inhibit skills development and when students start to feel the impact of lowered teacher expectations.

Kids Don’t Want to Fail is must reading for teachers, academics, policy makers, and anyone interested in understanding the intersection of race and education.

Angel Harris is assistant professor of Sociology and African American Studies at Princeton University.
The African American Struggle for Schooling, 1940-1980: Closing the Graduation Gap  
by John L. Rury and Shirley A. Hill (Teachers College Press)

“Based on prodigious research, *The African American Struggle for Secondary Schooling* sets a new standard of excellence in social history and policy studies. The authors evocatively recreate the passions of the civil rights movement and centrality of public schools in the ongoing quest for justice, opportunity, and freedom.”  
—William J. Reese, Carl F. Kaestle WARF Professor of Educational Policy Studies and History, University of Wisconsin–Madison

“This book is a rich and compelling addition to the literature on secondary education generally and on secondary education for African Americans specifically. It will set the standard for historical studies on American high schools for a long time to come.”  
—Jeffrey Mirel, David L. Angus Collegiate Chair of Education, Professor of History, University of Michigan

“The African American Struggle for Secondary Schooling fills a major gap in the history of African American educational history. This book will be on my shelf and will no doubt be on the shelves of scholars and students who study African American educational history.”  
—Thomas V. O’Brien, Professor and Chair, Department of Educational Studies and Research, University of Southern Mississippi

“This is the only book-length account of the growth and impact of secondary education for African Americans post-1930. With a unique and original analysis, the authors frame key themes not only within the common historiographical tradition of an unfolding of ‘growth and development’ over time, but correctly understand that high school entailed opportunities for ‘attainment’ in a broader social sense as well.”  
—Michael Fultz, Professor, Department of Educational Policy Studies, University of Wisconsin–Madison

This is the first comprehensive account of African American secondary education in the postwar era. Drawing on quantitative datasets, as well as oral history, this compelling narrative examines how African Americans narrowed the racial gap in high school completion. The authors explore regional variations in high school attendance across the United States and how intraracial factors affected attendance within racial groups. They also examine the larger social historical context, such as the national high school revolution, the civil rights movement, campaigns to expand schooling and urging youth to stay in school, and Black migration northward. Closing chapters focus on desegregation and the "urban crisis" of the 1960s and 1970s that accelerated "White flight" and funding problems for urban school systems. The conclusion summarizes these developments and briefly looks at the period since 1980, when secondary attainment levels stopped advancing for Blacks and Whites alike.

John L. Rury is professor of education and history at the University of Kansas.

Shirley A. Hill is professor of sociology at the University of Kansas.
Assessing Teacher Quality: Understanding Teacher Effects on Instruction and Achievement
by Sean Kelly (ed.) (Teachers College Press)

Recent educational reforms have promoted accountability systems which attempt to identify teacher effects on student outcomes and hold teachers accountable for producing learning gains. But in the complex world of classrooms, it may be difficult to attribute “success” or “failure” to teachers. In this timely collection, leading education scholars challenge market-based models of school improvement and argue that merely holding teachers accountable for scores on end-of-the-year exams will not lead to educational improvement. The authors show why, in addition to test performance, a close examination of instructional processes and school context are needed in order to truly understand teacher effects and improve learning in our nation’s classrooms.

“This book is a valuable corrective to the current frenzied enthusiasm among policymakers for untested methods of teacher accountability. It offers a balanced and thoughtful critique of some of our most popular fads in educational policy.”

-Diane Ravitch, New York University, author of The Death and Life of the Great American School System

Book Features:
• A conceptual framework, grounded in studies of real schools and teaching, for an alternative vision of educational reform.
• An interdisciplinary perspective with interpretive chapters covering the most important research dealing with teacher effects on learning and achievement.
• A balanced assessment of the promises and pitfalls of teacher accountability.

Contributors: Colette Cann, Sean P. Corcoran, Judson G. Everitt, Kenneth A. Frank, Adam Gamoran, Laura S. Hamilton, Richard M. Ingersoll, Jennifer L. Jennings, Chong Min Kim, Spyros Konstantopoulos, William R. Penuel, Ben Pogodzinski, Min Sun, and Peter Youngs

Sean Kelly is a visiting assistant professor in the department of Educational Administration at Michigan State University.
A Match on Dry Grass: Community Organizing as a Catalyst for School Reform
by Mark R. Warren, Karen L. Mapp and the Community Organizing and School Reform Project
(New York: Oxford University Press)

The persistent failure of public schooling in low-income communities constitutes one of our nation's most pressing civil rights and social justice issues. Many school reformers recognize that poverty, racism, and a lack of power held by these communities undermine children's education and development, but few know what to do about it. A Match on Dry Grass argues that community organizing represents a fresh and promising approach to school reform as part of a broader agenda to build power for low-income communities and address the profound social inequalities that affect the education of children. Based on a comprehensive national study, the book presents rich and compelling case studies of prominent organizing efforts in Chicago, New York City, Los Angeles, Denver, San Jose, and the Mississippi Delta. The authors show how organizing groups build the participation and leadership of parents and students so they can become powerful actors in school improvement efforts. They also identify promising ways to overcome divisions and create the collaborations between educators and community residents required for deep and sustainable school reform. Identifying the key processes that create strong connections between schools and communities, Warren, Mapp, and their collaborators show how community organizing builds powerful relationships that lead to the transformational change necessary to advance educational equity and a robust democracy.

Mark R. Warren is associate professor of education at Harvard University.

Karen L. Mapp is lecturer on education at Harvard University.

Website: www.matchondrygrass.com
Beyond the Comparative: Advancing Theory and Its Application to Practice
by John C. Weidman and W. James Jacob (eds.) (Rotterdam: Sense Publishers)

Beyond the Comparative: Advancing Theory and Its Application to Practice is the inaugural volume in the Pittsburgh Series in Comparative and International Education. The book expands on the life work of University of Pittsburgh Professor Rolland G. Paulston (1930-2006). Recognized as a stalwart in the field of comparative and international education, Paulston’s most widely recognized contribution is in social cartography. He demonstrated that mapping comparative, international, and development education (CIDE) is no easy task and, depending on the perspective of the mapper, there may be multiple cartographies to chart. The 35 contributors to this volume, representing a range of senior and junior scholars from various CIDE backgrounds and perspectives, celebrate the life and work of Paulston by addressing issues, perspectives and approaches related to charting the future course of the field. The volume reports on new research in several genres as well as conceptual analysis. As the title suggests, authors were encouraged to go “beyond” established canons of CIDE.

John C. Weidman is professor of education at the University of Pittsburgh.

W. James Jacob is assistant professor and Director of the Institute for International Studies in Education (IISE) in the School of Education at the University of Pittsburgh.
News from Section Members: Awards

- **Dameon Alexander**'s book, *The Imprint of Business Norms on American Education* (Cambria Press), is scheduled for publication in December of 2011. He is the Director of Strategic Initiatives in the department of Academic Technology and Professorial Lecturer in Sociology at George Washington University.

- **Robert Bozick**, Research Scientist at the RAND Corporation, was awarded a National Science Foundation grant ($299,216) to study how computer science and engineering courses taken in high school influence math learning and the pursuit of STEM careers in college, as well as a Spencer Foundation grant ($174,405) to study preparation for and enrollment in college among children of undocumented immigrants.

- **Jennie Brand**, now the Associate Director at the California Center for Population Research (CCPR), received two awards for her 2010 *American Sociological Review* article (with Yu Xie), entitled “Who Benefits Most from College? Evidence for Negative Selection in Heterogeneous Economic Returns to Higher Education.” The article was the Sage Most Downloaded Article of all articles published in ASR in 2009 and 2010 and received the 2011 ASA Inequality, Poverty, and Mobility Section Distinguished Article Award.

- **Stefanie DeLuca** was appointed to the MacArthur Foundation’s Network on Housing and Families with Children to embark on a research program looking at the effects of housing on children and intended to inform housing policy. DeLuca also recently completed a white paper (with Peter Rosenblatt) entitled “Increasing Access to High Performing Schools in an Assisted Voucher Program,” for a joint initiative between the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Department of Education. The final report is called "Finding Common Ground: Coordinating Housing and Education Policy To Promote Integration" and can be found at [http://www.prrac.org/pdf/HousingEducationReport-October2011.pdf](http://www.prrac.org/pdf/HousingEducationReport-October2011.pdf)

- **Angel Harris** was recently promoted to Associate Professor of sociology and African American Studies at Princeton University. His new book, *Kids Don’t Want to Fail: Oppositional Culture and the Black-White Achievement Gap* (Harvard University Press), was published in June.

- **The Association of Teacher Educators (ATE)** selected **Richard Ingersoll** as their 2011 "Outstanding Researcher" and invited him to present the keynote address at their annual meeting in February of 2012 in San Antonio.

- **David H. Kamens’** new book, entitled *Beyond the Nation-State: The Reconstruction of Nationhood and Citizenship* (Emerald Press: London), is scheduled for publication in April of 2012. It examines the impact of the world educational revolution on the political culture of 43 countries over time, using neo-institutional arguments. Kamens employs multi-level models to examine the impact of national characteristics, like expanded secondary and tertiary education, on individuals'
trust; support for multi-culturalism; racial vs. cultural and legal definitions of citizenship; willingness to fight for one's country; and a variety of other individual outcomes.

- **Beverly Lindsay**, Invited Visiting Professor at the Institution of Education at the University of London, was recently the Featured Speaker at the annual conference of the International Engagement for Domestic Citizenship in London. Her presentation was entitled "University Academic and Civic Engagement in the Post-Katrina Era: Models for Universities in New Orleans."

- **Christy Lleras** was recently promoted to Associate Professor in the Department of Human and Community Development at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.


- **Timothy Madigan** received an Overseas Young Chinese Foundation teaching scholarship in the spring for teaching the sociology of education at Central China Normal University in Wuhan, China. While there he also conducted research on the achievement of 1st and 3rd grade students and had a documentary on Lester Ward, the founder of the ASA, translated into Chinese.

- **Ruth N. López Turley** spent the last year developing the Houston Education Research Consortium (HERC), a new education researcher-practitioner partnership between Rice University and the Houston Independent School District, for the purpose of closing the socioeconomic gaps in educational achievement and attainment in Houston. More details may be found at: http://www.media.rice.edu/media/NewsBot.asp?MODE=VIEW&ID=16067.
News from Section Members: Announcements

Call for Conference Papers
Income, Inequality, and Educational Success: New Evidence about Socioeconomic Status and Educational Outcomes

May 15-16, 2012
Stanford University

We are soliciting papers for a research conference devoted to investigating the causes and consequences of the rapid increase in socioeconomic educational achievement gaps over the last 30 years. We are interested in papers using quantitative or qualitative methods from a variety of disciplines (including Education, Child Development, Sociology, Economics, and Demography, for example) to address topics related to the widening income achievement gap. Possible topics include analyses exploring whether widening socioeconomic gaps are also evident in other countries and/or in outcomes other than test scores, explanations for the widening income achievement gap, analyses of the consequences of socioeconomic achievement gaps, and analysis of any other factors that will shed light on the relationships between socioeconomic status and educational outcomes.

Please submit a 3-5 page extended abstract by Thursday, Dec. 1, 2011. The abstract should include a description of the questions addressed in the paper, the data used, the analytic strategy, and preliminary/expected findings. Abstracts should be submitted through the conference website, at http://cepa.stanford.edu/conference2012. For the 12-20 authors whose papers are selected, the conference will pay all travel and lodging expenses and a modest honorarium. The conference will be held May 15-16, 2012, at Stanford University. Afterwards, authors will have time to revise and edit papers, and a selection of them will be published in an edited volume. For logistical questions, please contact Anna Chmielewski (chmielewski@stanford.edu); for substantive questions, please contact Sean Reardon (sean.reardon@stanford.edu).

The conference planning and advisory committee includes Sean F. Reardon (chair), Harry Brighouse, Greg Duncan, David Grusky, Sandy Jencks, and Susanna Loeb. The conference is sponsored by the Institute of Education Sciences and the American Education Research Association, with additional support from the Stanford Center for Education Policy Analysis and the Stanford Poverty Center.
"Choosing Homes, Choosing Schools" Mini Conference
February 24th and 25th
2012 Eastern Sociological Society Annual Meeting

Co-organizers: Annette Lareau, University of Pennsylvania and Michael Bader, American University

Parents' decisions about where to buy or rent a home is one of the most consequential decisions that they make. Despite the links between residential choice and school choice, little research integrates these two perspectives. The mini conference, “Choosing Homes, Choosing Schools” provides an opportunity to spark discussion across researchers who study each process to expose residential choice scholars to those studying school choice and vice versa, including innovative efforts underway to integrate the two. Speakers include Amy S. Wells, Roslyn Mickelson, Stefanie Deluca, Kimberly Goyette, and others in sociology of education. John Logan, Maria Krysan, Camille Charles, Ingrid Ellen Brown, and other scholars in residential segregation will be there. A number of talented junior scholars will also share their work.

All are welcome! To attend the conference, simply register for the Eastern Sociological Society meeting.

Millennium Broadway Hotel
New York, NY
February 24-25, 2012
Program information: https://sites.google.com/site/upennchoosinghomes/
See also: www.essnet.org
2011 Section Award Winners

James S. Coleman Award for best article:

Dennis Condron (Emory University), for his paper entitled “Social Class, School and Non-School Environments, and Black/White Inequalities in Children’s Learning,” published in the American Sociological Review (October 2009).

David Lee Stevenson Award for best graduate student article:

Jessica McCrory Calarco (University of Pennsylvania), for her paper entitled “Can You Help Me Get Ahead?: Social Class Differences in Elementary Students’ Efforts to Negotiate Opportunities for Learning.” This article is forthcoming in the American Sociological Review (December 2011).

Pierre Bourdieu Award for best book:

In the next issue.....

- Five questions to another senior sociology of education scholar
- It should have been a classic
- 2012 ASA Preliminary Information

Submit contributions for the next newsletter to
April Sutton
april.sutton@mail.utexas.edu