

Footnotes



DECEMBER 1985

VOLUME 13
NUMBER 9

Nominations for 1986 Elections

The candidates for positions on ASA Council, the Committee on Publications, the Committee on Nominations, and the Committee on Committees in the 1986 election have been selected. They are:

COUNCIL

Judith R. Blau, SUNY-Albany
Celestino Fernandez, University of Arizona
Richard H. Hall, SUNY-Albany
Sally T. Hillsman, Vera Institute of Justice
Joseph S. Himes, University of North Carolina-Greensboro
William T. Liu, University of Illinois-Chicago
Joanne Miller, Russell Sage Foundation
Howard F. Taylor, Princeton University

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

Jeylan T. Mortimer, University of Minnesota
Caroline H. Persell, New York University
James P. Pitts, Northwestern University
Wilbur H. Watson, Atlanta University

COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

District 1
Ruth L. Love, Bonneville Power Administration
Judith Treas, University of Southern California
District 2
Kathleen S. Crittenden, University of Illinois-Chicago
Jae-On Kim, University of Iowa
District 3
Margaret M. Marini, Vanderbilt University
Barry Schwartz, University of Georgia
District 4
Koya Azumi, Rutgers University
David A. Goslin, National Research Council

District 5
Susan Eckstein, Boston University
Barry Wellman, University of Toronto
District 6
Myra Marx Ferree, University of Connecticut
Edward C. Lehman, State University College, Brockport (NY)

COMMITTEES ON COMMITTEES

District 1
Joan R. Acker, University of Oregon
Alfredo Miranda, University of California-Riverside
District 2
Marejjoyce Green, Cleveland State University
Russell Thornton, University of Minnesota
District 3
Rose Brewer, University of Texas-Austin
Robert Davis, North Carolina A & T State University
District 4
Esther Chao, American University
Vilma Ortiz, NAEP, Educational Testing Service
District 5
Gary D. Sandefur, University of Wisconsin-Madison
Austin T. Turk, University of Toronto
District 6
Christine E. Bose, SUNY-Albany
Martin P. Levine, Bloomfield College

Additional candidates may be nominated through the open nominations procedure. Petitions supporting candidates for the above positions must be signed by at least fifty (50) voting members of the Association and must be received at the ASA Executive Office, 1722 N Street NW, Washington, DC 20036, no later than January 31, 1986. □

American Sociological Foundation Off and Running

The newly created American Sociological Foundation was officially inaugurated at last August's ASA Annual Meeting in Washington with the first meeting of its Board of Directors and a "kick-off" fund raising.

The Foundation Board comprises the five most recent ex-presidents of the ASA, with the office President being filled by the most senior, the Vice-President by the next, etc. Officers for the current year include Peter H. Rossi, President; William F. Whyte, Vice-President; Alice S. Rossi, Secretary; James F. Short, Jr., Treasurer; and Kai T. Erikson as liaison to ASA Council. Meanwhile, the ASA's Endowment Committee has become advisory to the Foundation staff. The Committee is chaired by N.J. Demerath III and includes Beth B. Hess, John W. Riley, William H. Sewell, David L. Sills, and Charles V. Willie, Executive Officer William V. D'Antonio, and current ASA President Matilda W. Riley, ex officio.

The ASA meeting and the recent dues billing launched a kick-off drive for Foundation funds. Contributors to date are listed at the end of this article, and many ASA ex-Presidents, Council members, and current officers have been especially generous. But 1986 marks the beginning of a three-year campaign to raise funds towards three objectives which are especially urgent and consensual at the moment:

(1) *Minority Fellowships and Expansion of Opportunity in and Through Sociology*: Federal funding support for the Minority Fellowship Program has been cut by more than a half; meanwhile, the Cornerhouse Fund, which has provided \$10,000-\$15,000 annually since 1975 to help students with dissertations, has announced that its current grant will be its last for such support. Thus, the short-

term and long-term needs are great if ASA is to meet its commitment to having the minority representation in the discipline approximate that of the general population. The discipline must help itself in addressing this major and continuing social problem.

(2) *Enhancing Sociology's Public Image and Policy Pertinence*: This, too, is an urgent need at a critical juncture. As sociological scholarship becomes increasingly sophisticated and worth heeding, the discipline is under increasing attack because of an unsympathetic administration and political climate. Necessary expenditures include continued support of COSSA in its work with the federal government on behalf of increased research funding, work to inform political officials and policy makers of sociology's value as an intellectual resource, efforts with the media to increase coverage and understanding of sociological work of special significance, and an annual DC Fellowship. The ASA is the only major social science association that does not provide at least one DC fellowship each year. The success of the three modest summer fellowships offered in 1983 and 1984 has encouraged Council to approve a full-year fellowship in principle, but so far funds to implement the idea have not been available.

(3) *Enriching Developments in Sociology's Teaching Effort*: Here is another area where important projects begun with

See ASF, page 3

INSIDE Footnotes

- 2 President's Report, ISA Congress Travel, TSP Workshops, Capital Comment, Scholarship Award
- 3 Social Science Hearings
- 4 Sociological Practice Notes, ASA Contributors, Regional Meetings
- 5 Teaching Column
- 6 DuBois-Johnson-Frazier and Teaching Awards
- 7 NSF, NIMH Awards
- 8 Fulbright, Gerontological, ACLS Awards
- 9 Interview with Abrahamson, Presser of NSF
- 11 Open Forum
- 12 Good Ideas; Rossi, Gallego New NACA members
- 14 Department/Business Columns
- 15 Obituaries

They eventually demanded "any and all notes, records, log, diary pertaining to...any restaurant" by subpoena. Mario contacted the Sociology Department members who sent him to the University Attorney's Office where compliance was recommended. Since he disagreed with that advice, Mario sought other legal assistance and met with the Assistant District Attorney. He decided to offer oral testimony to the grand jury on matters directly relevant to the investigation that he knew as an employee rather than as a researcher, but steadfastly refused to deliver his fieldnotes.

This was unacceptable to the Assistant D.A., who threatened to have Mario jailed for contempt. On the date specified for surrender of the materials, Mario appeared before Judge Stuart Airt

See Brajuha, page 13

The Outcome of the Brajuha Case: Legal Implications for Sociologists

While not all aspects of the legal regarding confidentiality are involved in the Brajuha case, many of the main issues are represented by it. It also merits a closer look due to its timeliness and legal outcome. That outcome was a partial victory, yet one that offers valuable lessons to the professional community. This account begins with an account of the case as it developed, offers a discussion of its conclusion and suggests its implications for social science research.

Development of the Case

Mario Brajuha is a graduate student seeking the PhD in the Sociology Department at the State University of New

York at Stony Brook. In 1982 he began writing fieldnotes, making interviews and examining documents at a restaurant at which he was employed as a waiter. His intention was to study the organization of work in the restaurant as a dissertation project. He continued this work as an overt participant observer for about nine months, and had collected about 700 pages of notes for his study when a suspicious fire destroyed the building. A few days after that, representatives of the county fire marshal made contact and requested his assistance in the investigation of an alleged arson. Local detectives also became involved and asked him many questions about the restaurant and his research.



President's Report

Recollections and Gratitude

by Kai T. Erikson

I have been out of office for three months now, time enough, one would think, for the mind to have done the weighing and sorting necessary to compose an account of the events of the year just passed. That is what presidential reports are supposed to do. But I find that my memory is not working that way at all. The official life of a president is so short and depends so much on the charity of colleagues that other recollections seem to fuse into a general feeling of gratitude. I would like to use this space then to say two things:

First, presidents are blown into office by chance winds and move out again just as quickly. That does not give the Executive Office time enough to train them how to act sensibly or think

straight, so the office has no choice but to bend as best it can every year to a new set of vanities, a new set of urgencies, a new set of work rhythms. I did not appreciate, until it was my turn to receive that blessing, how much generosity and gallantry is involved in it. Looking back, I'm amazed.

Second, most of the work of a president takes the form of drawing designs on pieces of paper and then hoping somebody else will convert them into reality. I was again amazed throughout the two years I served as President-Elect and President at how often and how readily colleagues agreed to take on responsibilities that could offer them nothing but headaches and a chance to be of service. I am thinking of those who worked so hard on the Program Committee and Washington advi-

sory group, those who presented at the Plenary and Thematic Sessions, those who undertook the hundreds of tasks that Council passes out with such abandon and so on. A tiny scattering of people said no for reasons good and bad, but virtually everyone else agreed—which is a reflection on them as individuals, but also a reflection on the professional community of which we are all a part. It's a wonderful thing we have going here; to be near the center of it for a season was as warming an experience as anything I have known.

What I really want to say is: Thank you Jan, thank you Jay, thank you Bill, thank you Cynthia, thank you Marvin, thank you Jen, thank you Herb, thank you Matilda, thank you Jack, thank you Paul, thank you Bob, thank you Dave, thank you Bettina, thank you Ted, thank you Carla, thank you Jim, thank you Arlene, thank you... □

Teaching Services Program to Hold Spring Workshops

The ASA Teaching Services Program will sponsor spring workshops in both New York City and Seattle, Washington. Why not join us?

■ April 3-4, 1986, New York, NY Developing Sociology Programs and Courses: Clinical Sociology as a Model

This teaching workshop is a collaborative conference with the Eastern Sociological Society and the Clinical Sociology Association. The workshop is immediately prior to the annual meetings of the Eastern Sociological Society. In this workshop, participants will: identify trends affecting social science programs; examine program models—sociological practice, clinical sociology, applied sociology; determine appropriate content for a clinical sociology program—major, concentration, and/or course; learn how to integrate clinical sociology into an established curriculum; and develop an action plan for supporting a program—attracting students, developing financial resources, and establishing resources.

The staff of the workshop includes: Elizabeth J. Clark, Montclair State College and President of the Clinical Sociology Association; Jan Fritz, American University and Past-President of the Clinical Sociology Association; and William Ewens, Michigan State University and Field Coordinator of the ASA Teaching Services Program. The fee for the workshop is \$75 for ASA members and \$100 for non-members. Applications are due by March 1, 1986, along with a \$25 deposit.

Corrections

■ There is an error in the November 1985 article titled "Reference Format for ASA Journals to Change in 1986." An extra comma was mistakenly inserted into some of the examples in the second to the last paragraph. The correct examples read as follows:

This matter has been discussed by several commentators (e.g., Smith 1985, p. 55; Jones 1984b; Brown 1984, 1985).

■ In recent issues of *Footnotes*, the following names were misspelled: Bernard Barber, Herbert Blumer, Mary R. Laner, and Hans Zeisel.

Our apologies! □

■ April 4, 1986, New York, NY Teaching the Sociology of Law

This teaching workshop is a collaborative conference with the EAST-ERN Sociological Society and the American Bar Association Advisory Commission on College and University Non-professional Legal Studies. This workshop is to be held immediately prior to the annual meetings of the Eastern Sociological Society. In this workshop, participants will: discuss alternative law courses; formulate alternative methods of teaching courses in the sociology of law; and gain information on more effective evaluation of sociology of law courses.

The staff of the workshop are: Robert Kidder, Temple University; Ronald J. Berger, University of Wisconsin; Craig McEwen, Bowdoin College; and John Paul Ryan, ABA Advisory Commission on College and University Non-professional Legal Studies. The fee for the workshop is \$20 for ASA members and \$35 for non-members. Applications are due by March 1, 1986, along with a \$10 deposit.

■ April 24-25, 1986, Seattle, WA Two-Year/Four-Year Articulation and the Improvement of Undergraduate Education in Sociology

This workshop will be held on the campus of the University of Washington. In this workshop, participants will: review current information on teaching methods and research; review current information on selective substantive issues and research in sociology; survey undergraduate education missions and the role of sociology in local programs; and learn how to build and maintain teaching support among local and regional colleagues.

The staff of the workshop includes: Anne Martin, Edmonds Community College; Frederick Campbell, University of Washington; and Joseph DeMartini. The fee for the workshop is \$50 for the two day session. Applications are due March 15, 1986, along with a \$15 deposit.

For more detailed information about these workshops and application forms, contact: William Ewens, ASA Teaching Services Program, Department of Sociology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824; (517) 355-6639. □

Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Award

Nominations are invited for the 1986 Award for a Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship. The Award is given for a single work such as an article, monograph, or book published in the preceding three calendar years (1983-1985).

The winner of this award will also be offered a lectureship known as the Sorokin Lecture. Regional and state sociological associations/societies may apply to ASA to receive this lecture at ASA expense after the award recipient is announced at the 1986 ASA Annual Meeting.

Members of the Association or other interested and knowledgeable parties may submit nominations for the Award. Nominations should include the name of author, title of work, date of work, and publishers, and should be sent by January 31, 1986, to: Teresa A. Sullivan, Chair, Distinguished Contribution to Scholarship Award Committee, Department of Sociology, University of Texas-Austin, 436 Burdine Hall, Austin, TX 78712-1088. □

Capital Comment

■ The September 21, 1985, edition of the *New York Times* reported on President Reagan's remarks at a meeting on American education and the liberal arts. A college student at the White House meeting asked the President what he saw as the "value of a liberal arts education in today's fast-moving, high-tech industry."

The President replied, "I majored in economics and sociology, then found that my careers in the bulk of my adult life came from my extracurricular activities. I always was, you know, in all the class plays and belonged to the Drama Club and loved that sort of thing. And my other love was football, mainly, but athletics in general. So the first two careers I had were as a sports announcer and then as an actor, and final-

ISA World Congress Travel Arrangements

The Eleventh Congress of the International Sociological Association (ISA) will take place in New Delhi, India, August 18-22, 1986. Special travel arrangements have been worked out with two travel agencies. The ISA has designated *Flag Tours, Inc.* of New York City as its official agent for the conference. *Flag Tours* is working with *Air India* to develop a variety of tour packages that will include air fare, hotel, and pre/post-conference site visits at all-inclusive rates. Those wishing information about *Air India* and these tour packages should write directly to: *Flag Tours, Inc.*, ATTN: Hilary d'Costa, 38-West 38th Street, New York, NY 10018; (212) 921-3366.

The American Sociological Association has designated *Karson Travel* of New York to arrange flights via Pan American Airways. This is especially relevant for those expecting travel assistance from the U.S. government, which requires that its travel awards be used on U.S. carriers. For information about air fare rates via Pan Am and related tour/hotel rates, write directly to: *Karson Travel*, 3185 Long Beach Road, Ocean-side, NY 11572; (800) 645-2182.

The ASA has applied for travel funds from the National Science Foundation; as of this writing, final approval is pending. The number of awards is certain to be fewer than the number of applicants, so a special committee will be established to make these awards. Persons wishing to apply, should address letters to: ASA/ISA Travel Awards, American Sociological Association, 1722 N Street NW, Washington, DC 20036.

Please include evidence of your participation in the ISA Congress and other information that you believe relevant for consideration by the award selection committee. Applications for travel funds must be received in the ASA Executive Office by February 15, 1986. Awards will be announced by May 1, 1986.

Please remember that those receiving travel funds from the U.S. government must use U.S. carriers, in this case Pan Am. The ASA will notify all applicants as soon as official word has been received about the status of the NSF Travel Grant Proposal. □

ly I got around to a job, when I was talked into running for Governor, where I could use, maybe, the economics and sociology."

■ On November 19, the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee voted on the nomination of Edward Curran for Chair of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). The nomination was not sent forward from the Committee on a vote of 8-8. Senator Stafford (R-Vermont) voted with the Democrats on the Committee to defeat Curran's nomination. ASA, through COSSA, had lobbied against confirmation, expressing concern about Curran's qualifications to serve. The vote had been postponed several times since Curran's nomination eight months ago. □

House Task Force Holds Hearings on Social Science

This article is excerpted from COSSA *Washington Update*, October 4, 1985. For more details on these materials, contact the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), 1200 Seventeenth Street, NW, Suite 520, Washington, DC 20036.

Public hearings were held September 17-19 by the House Science and Technology Committee's Task Force on US Science Policy. The hearings centered on the role of the social and behavioral sciences in federal science policy. The first day was devoted to a general overview of the social and behavioral sciences and an identification of the fields of active research. The second day's hearing was on the utilization of the social and behavioral sciences in government and industry with particular attention on current controversies surrounding federal funding. The final day assessed the federal role in facilitating the use of the social and behavioral sciences in national policy. These hearings were chaired by Rep. Doug Walgren (D-PA), Chairperson of the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology.

The first day featured Herbert A. Simon, Nobel laureate in economics (Psychology, Carnegie-Mellon), R. Duncan Luce (Psychology, Harvard) and Neil J. Smelser (Sociology, UC-Berkeley). Each provided examples of recent accomplishments in research: Simon on economics, theories of decision-making, and cognitive science; Luce on perception, psycho-biology, linguistics, health and behavior, social psychology and methodology; and Smelser on the study of criminal careers, the processing of collective choice and the increasing internationalization of social, political and economic life.

There was consensus that the social and behavioral sciences would benefit most from four factors: (1) funding arrangements should enhance opportunities for interdisciplinary research, (2) there should be more support for longitudinal data collection, (3) more facilities that allow greater advanced experimentation and (4) greater opportunities for international research. There also was support for the creation of research centers akin to those recently established by engineering by the National Science Foundation (NSF).

Rep. Walgren noted that the political system often has been less than fully appreciative of the social and behavioral sciences; he asked for comments on difficulties these fields have encountered in the federal funding process. Simon indicated that since these disciplines often deal with controversial questions, research findings sometimes antagonize decision makers. Rep. Walgren asked how the witnesses would argue the legitimacy of the social and behavioral sciences vis-a-vis the physical and natural sciences. Luce's response was that the logic of both types of science is identical. He observed that the charge of not being cumulative often leveled against social and behavioral sciences simply is untrue. Continuing, he noted that what often is not appreciated is that topics in the social and behavioral sciences inherently are more complicated than in other scientific domains. This results, quite naturally, in a number of alternative perspectives within the social and behavioral sciences; it indicates that there is no one fully developed theoretical base. Simon noted that social and

behavioral science tends to capture public attention only when controversy is stimulated by research results.

The second day of hearings focused on the utilization of the social and behavioral sciences by the federal government and industry. James Coleman (Sociology, University of Chicago) noted that "social policy research has become, over the past twenty years, an important element in social policy." He argued that the crucial question is not whether research useful to the government shall be done, but rather how it will be carried out. He stated that key considerations are (1) maintaining the democratic pluralism of the policy process, (2) insuring that social policy research is done with sufficient independence to be objective, yet sufficiently responsive to provide relevant information when needed and (3) insuring that individual skills and organizational capabilities are available and continue to develop. Coleman argued that basic research would continue as the basis for timely applied research, citing the recent work by James Q. Wilson and Richard Herrnstein, *Crime and Human Nature*, which draws from a wide range of disciplinary research to clarify policy choices regarding crime.

Joseph Newhouse (Rand Corporation) described the Rand Health Insurance Study, a 14-year longitudinal experiment funded by the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation in the Department of Health and Human Services. He asserted that this study yielded clear-cut, reliable findings on a major and enduring problem which could not have been studied successfully using existing data sets; it was an example of research that cost millions of dollars but whose findings show the way to save billions for society. Despite this study, Newhouse argued, government simply underinvests in large-scale, long-term projects. This is the case both in randomized experiments and in observational studies.

Both Walter Albers (GM Research Labs) and Douglas Bray (formerly with AT&T) described the role social scientists play in industrial research and development. Albers noted that in the 1980s social and behavioral science research in industry has become a necessity. At General Motors, this has included the measurement of social change and scenario building; survey research; technology assessment and societal risk assessment; behavioral research related to such things as community noise, outdoor visibility, driver behavior and risk taking; demographics; and on human resources such as personnel benefits and health care. The key words for social and behavioral science in industry, according to Albers, are "interdisciplinary and quantitative". Bray focused on industrial organization research and its impact on management behavior and organizational culture. He noted that, "behavioral scientists employed by industry usually apply existing knowledge rather than develop new scientific principles... (and) it is evident that industry is a long way from devoting much effort to basic research." Business, however, will have to be involved with basic research because its "cultures can't be replicated by using college students as subjects".

The day's final witness, Clark Abt (Abt Associates) identified himself and his firm as fortunate commercial benefi-

ciaries of basic social science research, the production of which has been under-funded by both government and industry. In his view, while social and behavioral science research does not solve society's problems, it does provide information that is essential for determining policy. It does so at a relative low cost. Echoing Newhouse, Abt held that social and behavioral sciences have a "marketing problem" in communicating their cost-effectiveness. Abt predicted a modest growth in industry funding social and behavioral science, in order to respond competitively to regulation, deregulation and government imposed incentives and constraints. He held that the level of social science research and development was less important than its continuity, maintaining that "the most expensive thing government does is to change its mind" on continuing to fund particular research projects. Abt did call, however, for sharp increases in government support for evaluation research, asserting that

such action would prevent billions from being spent on unproductive programs. He pointed out that departments and agencies generally spending most on programs are those spending least on evaluation and related research.

Rep. Walgren asked panelists to comment on the economic productivity of social and behavioral research. Albers remarked that social and behavioral sciences in industry typically avert heavy costs or identify overlooked opportunities—benefits that are difficult to measure economically. Bray held that, in his area of worker motivation and industrial productivity, the benefits of research were essential to business, but similarly hard to quantify. Coleman reported his observation, based on eleven years on GM's science advisory board, that most of the problems identified by GM management as technical proved to turn on organizational features, incentive structures and other managerial factors, suggesting an in-

See *Hearings*, page 4

ASF, from page 1

federal funding are threatened with demise through funding cutbacks. At a time when sociology is seeking increased recognition as a pedagogically rigorous and creative field, it needs major support for existing programs as well as new ventures. Activities here include teaching workshops, teaching resource materials, special consultantships to help departments with limited resources, a visiting scholar program, and ASA's new journal on teaching.

The Foundation Campaign will run for three years from 1986 through 1988. In addition to ASA members, the discipline's friends and relatives, both individual and institutional, will be asked to contribute. Special letters and materials will be sent out after the first of the year. All contributions will be tax-

deductible—whether single gifts, three-year pledges, wills and bequests, or forms of property.

Final control of the Foundation's disbursements is in the hands of its Trustees. It is expected that most requests will come directly from ASA's Council and committees rather than individuals. While it is impossible to know how the Trustees will spend endowment interest in the years 2000, 2025, or indeed, 2085, the three needs listed above will likely dominate funding for the foreseeable future. This is a clear opportunity for the current members of the discipline to make a substantial difference in sociology's short-term as well as long-range future.

The following people have already made contributions or pledges to the American Sociological Foundation:

Mark Abrahamson	Michele A. Eayers	Wilfred A. Kraegel	Matilda White Riley
Ben Aguirre	Glen H. Elder	Gary Kreps	Robin Roberts
Michael T. Aiken	Abbott L. Ferriss	Jane C. Kromick	Pamela Roby
Ronald Akers	Claude S. Fischer	Robert Lammers	Hyman Rodman
Rodolfo Alvarez	Joseph P. Fitzpatrick	Henry A. Landsberger	Hermann A. Roether
Alan A. Amerson	Liliane Flöge	Bibb Latane	Morris Rosenberg
Andy B. Anderson	David A. Ford	Lloyd Leupont	Alice S. Rossi
Robert W. Avery	William Form	Ruth Lubenstein	Richard Schermerhorn
Koya Azumi	Greer Litton Fox	Eugene Litwak	Carmi Schooler
E. Digby Baltzell	Razelle Frankl	John Lofland	Russell K. Schutt
Gary F. Beanblossom	William R. Freudenburg	Lyn H. Lofland	Richard D. Schwartz
Marshall H. Becker	Eugene B. Gallagher	Ruth L. Low	T. P. Schwartz
Yam Bengtson	William A. Gansson	Elmore E. Lurie	Ruth Searies
Esther Benjamin	Arthur E. Gilmer	John Macisco, Jr.	Hanan Selvin
Albert Biderman	Joseph B. Gitler	William Martineau	William H. Sewell
Robert Bierstedt	Paul Glick	Floyd M. Martinson	Carole L. Seyfrid
F. Marian Bishop	Albert Gollin	John D. McCarthy	S. Frederick Seymour
Tad Blalock	Rodolfo S. Goncabeate	Donald A. McElvaney	Luis F. Steir-Younis
Charan Anjanjan	Leonard Gordon	Murray Melbin	Deborah Sherman
Karol H. Borowski	Mary E.W. Goss	Elizabeth G. Menaghan	John H. Shope
Robert T. Bower	Mareyjoyce Green	Mary H. Mentz	James F. Short, Jr.
Jeffrey Broadbent	Michael Hannan	Robert K. Merton	David Sills
William R. Brown	Marie Haug	Barbara Jean Mieras	Teresa Sullivan
Theodore Caplow	Philip Hauser	Mvura Mminis	William A. Sutton, Jr.
David Chaplin	Amos Hawley	S. Frank Miyamoto	Richard Suzman
Jay Chaskes	Both B. Hess	Suzanne Model	Ann Swidler
Kevin James Christiano	Wolf Heydebrand	Phyllis Moen	William Tash
John Clausen	Barbara S. Heyl	Wilbert Moore	Evert Tornfelt
William T. Clute	Barbara Heyns	Bernhardt L. Mortensen	Gaye Tuchman
David W. Coombs	Joseph S. Himes	Jeylan T. Mortimer	Herman Turk
Rose Coser	Burkhardt Holzner	Annabelle E. Motz	Michael Useem
Herbert Costner	Jennett S. House	Susan Ozak	Arthur J. Vidich
Susan Cozzens	Lan McDonald Howard	Leslie K. Oppenheimer	Walter Vogts
Stephen Crawford	Jessie Howard	Marcia G. Ory	Miriane Voshing
Kathleen Crittenden	Carla Howery	Carol A. Owen	Hannah R. Wartenberg
Frances Cullen	Joan Huber	Charles Page	Norman F. Washburne
William D'Antonio	Joseph E. Jacoby	Robert Parke	Sloan R. Wayland
Arlene Daniels	Hazel C. Johnson	Paul Peachey	D. Wheeler
Ross Danielson	Bennett Judkins	Leonard Pearlín	J. Allen Whitt
Martin E. Danzig	Rosabeth M. Kanter	Harold A. Pedersen	William F. Whyte
J. Kenneth Davidson, Sr.	Suzanne Keller	Lauri Perman	Katherine Williams
N.J. Demerath	Patricia L. Kendall	Thomas Pettigrew	Robin Williams
Richard Dewey	Edith W. King	Jerrí Lynn Phillips	Charles V. Willie
Augusto Diana	Jack F. Kinton	Clyde R. Pepe	James R. Wood
Nancy DiTomaso	Connie Kirchner	David Pratt	Jack Wright
Thomas H. Donnelly	Samuel F. Klausner	Daniel Price	C. Peter Yeager
Kevin J. Dougherty	Heather S. Kleiner	Sharon Randi Randolph	J. Milton Yinger
Paula Dubech	William E. Knox	John A. Riccio	Mayer N. Zald
Russell Dynes	Mel Kohn	James W. Riley, Jr.	Harriet Zuckerman
JoAnne L. Earp	Mirra Komarovsky		

Hearings, from page 3

direct effect of social and behavioral research on economic productivity, but that its indirect savings have yet to be fully calculated.

The third day led off with testimony by two foundation officers. Both Francis X. Sutton (Ford) and Albert Rees (Sloan) described the importance of this involvement for social and behavioral science research and training. They noted this was particularly true of a few major American foundations and had been taking place for better than fifty years. They also reported sporadic and inconsistent patterns of support for the core of the disciplines. Both reported that foundations generally are in an era of greatly reduced resources and that there is little likelihood of massive investments in the social and behavioral sciences by foundations in the foreseeable future, other than to provide what Rees labelled "venture capital" in a few areas of priority to particular foundations. Sutton ascribed the decline not only to foundations' diminished resources but also to an ambivalence in the general public (including foundation trustees) to "surrender to the authority of experts...in matters that touch our intimate lives or seem to lie within the realm of practical judgment and experience." He also noted a growing general skepticism toward social institutions, the possibility for rational amelioration of societal problems, and the automatic usefulness of disciplinary knowledge in practical affairs. He emphasized the increasing internationalization of social and behavioral science activity, in research, training and application and pointed out an impressive achievement in transnationally relevant knowledge and in the training of personnel, both American and foreign, by US social science. Now, however, with opportunities for cooperative international research never greater, there are few funds for actual projects, international linkages, etc., other than the generally inadequate and uncoordinated amounts that national government may provide.

Rees dwelt on the importance of large-scale continuous data collection, saying such an activity was beyond the resources of foundations. In his view, "adequate, continuous and assured support for basic data collection is the most important single way in which the federal government can support the social sciences". He pointed out that a unique longitudinal data base, the Panel Study of Income Dynamics, had been saved from disastrous interruption in 1981 by a consortium of foundations; he warned, however, that the "Congress cannot count on such rescues...to take place regularly."

Amitai Etzioni (George Washington University) drew a distinction between the analytic capacity of the social and behavioral sciences and their capacity for policy, between understanding the world and being able to change it. He maintained that "the social sciences' policy capacities and resources are relatively under-endowed." Etzioni held that because the importance of social science in the policy mode is not well understood, mission-oriented agencies tend to drift toward support of basic research of only a nominally relevant nature, and thus actually continue the cycle of nonrelevance.

The final witness of the hearings was psychologist Richard W. Pew (BBN Labs), a leader in the development of engineering psychology and human factors research. Pew stressed the feasibility of pragmatically aimed research. His example was the study of reactions of human users of new technology. Pew urged that ways be devised to support activity falling between investigator-initiated research and mission-oriented development.

Rep. Walgren asked for the kind of case that could be made for the utility of the social and behavioral sciences. Rees said there is utility in bringing attention to problem areas where their social importance is clear and the analytical tools are at hand. He cited teenage unemployment as a current area. He also cited a long-term impact that often is overlooked: the ways we think about human development, or corporate cultures and labor relations, or crime, depends on social science conceptions. Sutton agreed, pointing to the crucial contributing role social science played in the gradual elimination of famine in India, or in preparing for resumed diplomatic relations with China. Pew cited the degree to which human factors are already taken into account in industrial design.

Rep. Fuqua, Subcommittee member, inquired why government and the sciences had trouble bringing multidisciplinary research to realization, when virtually all speakers in the hearings had placed emphasis on the merging of knowledge and methods from different fields. Rees stated his belief that government science programs do adapt multidisciplinary developments, but slowly: it was not yet clear whether federal agencies would, in the future, support cognitive science at necessary levels. Etzioni tended to locate the problem also in government, citing that when the Department of Energy was created, prominent national science leaders spoke to the need for cooperation between the physical and social/behavioral sciences, but that Department of Energy managers failed to respond. □

1986 Regional Meeting Schedule

Eastern Sociological Society, April 4-6, 1986, Penta Hotel, New York City, NY
Midwest Sociological Society, March 26-29, 1986, Marriott Hotel, Des Moines, IA
North Central Sociological Association, April 17-19, 1986, Holiday Inn River-view, Toledo, OH

Pacific Sociological Association, April 9-12, 1986, Writers' Manor, Denver, CO

Southern Sociological Society, April 9-12, 1986, Monteleone Hotel, New Orleans, LA

Southwestern Sociological Association, March 19-22, 1986, Menger Hotel/Convention Center, San Antonio, TX □

Sociological Practice

■ The Society for Applied Sociology held its third annual meeting on the campus of Edinboro State College (PA) on October 4-6, 1985. About 120 people attended the conference on the theme, "Sociologists Serving the Community."

The opening night session featured a panel of community leaders from Erie, PA, and their comments about how sociology could be useful to their work in the public schools, in community development and in the state legislature.

Saturday's program centered around papers presented on a range of topics including: clinical sociology, ethics in sociological practice, religion and intervention, sociology and business, application of sociology to the management of human services, and the professional role of the applied sociologist.

SAS President Alex Boros' presidential address on "An Applied Sociologist: Inventing the Future" described six case studies of his own work as a consultant and the social inventions he developed to deal with particular client problems.

The format for Sunday divided the participants into three discussion groups to work on the topics: Reaching Sociologists in Applied Settings, Marketing Applied Sociology, and Interfacing with Professional Organizations. The latter group drafted a survey to SAS members about their responses to the ASA certification program. The results will be ready by December 15, 1985.

The ASA publishes an annual *Journal of Applied Sociology*, available for purchase (\$7.50) or as part of the membership dues for SAS members. Contact co-editor Joyce Iutovich, Keystone University Research Corporation, 434 West 8th Street, Erie, PA 16502.

For information about SAS membership, contact Ruth Pickard, Department of Sociology, Northern Kentucky University, Highland Heights, KY 41076. The 1986 annual meeting will be held in late September in Terre Haute, IN.

■ There is a new book available from the World Bank. *Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development* documents the work of sociologists at the Bank in various development projects.

Michael Cernea, Senior Sociologist at the Bank, edited the book, published by Oxford University Press. It would be a useful reading assignment in courses in rural sociology and applied sociology. The different chapters describe irrigation projects, agricultural settlements, livestock development projects in fisheries, forestry, and rural roads. Additional chapters talk about research methodology and evaluation issues. For more information, contact Cernea at the World Bank, 1818 H Street NW, Washington, DC 20043.

■ The Clinical Sociology Association has a certification process in place and 43 sociologists have been certified. Applicants present a dossier of materials and perform a demonstration session before three CSA certified reviewers followed by a debriefing session with those reviewers. For more information, contact Elizabeth J. Clark, CSA President, RD 2 Box 141A, Chester, NY 10918.

At most of the regional sociological society meetings this spring, the ASA will hold public hearings on the ASA certification program. Representatives from the Executive Office and from the seven certification committees will answer questions and listen to member feedback about the proposed program. Please attend one of these public hearings and share your views or write to the Executive Office.

■ The ASA Section on Sociological Practice is preparing its program for the 1986 Annual Meeting. There are several ways in which practitioners can participate in the program. First, President Matilda White Riley and Mathew Greenwald are organizing special sessions. Second, there are two regular program sessions, one on Clinical Sociology organized by Jan Fritz (American University), and one on Applied Sociology organized by Alex Boros (Kent State University). Third, the section will have its program day. Please send your suggestions for Section Day to the new chair: Joseph P. Morrissey, Office of Mental Health, 44 Holland Avenue, Albany, NY 12229; (518) 474-1446. □

ASA Contributors

ASA is pleased to announce that again this year significant numbers of ASA members have made voluntary contributions to the Association along with their dues renewals. Contributions have been designated for the Fund for the Advancement of the Discipline, Minority Fellowship Program, Teaching Endowment Fund, COSSA, and ASA General Operating Fund by the members listed below. The list is partial; additional contributors will be listed in future issues.

A special story on the American Sociological Foundation appears elsewhere in this issue.

Ronald L. Akers
 Rebecca Bach
 Joanne M. Badagliacco
 Marc L. Berk
 James E. Blackwell
 Thomas O. Blank
 David B. Booth
 Patricia A. Boyd
 Wilbur B. Brookover
 Grainger Browning
 Sandra Charvat Burke
 Paul Burstein
 Elizabeth G. Cohen
 Patricia J. Collette

Patricia Hill Collins
 Susan E. Cozzens
 M. Richard Cramer
 Lawrence J. Cross
 Bennie T. Dill
 Margaret E. Ensminger
 Joe R. Feagin
 William R. Freudenburg
 Mary K. Garty
 Daniel Glaser
 Hilda H. Golden
 Stephen A. Green
 Jeffrey K. Hadden
 Eleanor R. Hall

Nason E. Hall
 Robert C. Hanson
 Robert B. Hill
 Richard O. Hope
 William C. Jenne
 Bruce D. Johnson
 Rogers Johnson
 Betty Jean Jones
 James A. Jones
 Samuel W. Kaplan
 Patricia L. Kendall
 William E. Kneoy
 William B. Lacy
 Jack Ladinsky
 Otto N. Larsen
 Cheryl Leggon
 Richard Levinson
 Hylan G. Lewis
 Robert P. Von Der Lippe
 Elinore E. Lurie
 Coramae R. Mann
 Rosanne T. Martorella
 Armolene J. Maxey
 Penelope L. Maza
 John D. McCarthy
 Reece McGee
 Karen L. McKinney
 Samuel D. McLemore
 Albert J. McCQueen
 Mary H. Metz
 John Mrowczy II
 Franklin W. Monfort
 Dan E. Moore
 Bernhard L. Mortenson
 Jeylan T. Mortimer
 Frederick Mulhauser

Francis P. Naughton
 Thomas F. Pettigrew
 Harold W. Pfautz
 James P. Pitts
 Harry R. Potter
 Jeffrey Prager
 Cynthia A. Robbins
 Carmi Schueler
 Russell K. Schutt
 Anna A. Senyk
 S. Frederick Seymour
 Raghubar Singh
 John J. Sloan
 A. Wade Smith
 Stephen Steinberg
 Stanton B. Towner
 Michael Useem
 Diane Vaughan
 William F. Whyte
 Richard Williams
 Brunetta R. Wolfman
 James J. Zuiches □

Teaching

Applied Curriculum Can Enhance Liberal Arts Learning

by Kathryn Grzelkowski and Jim Mitchell
East Carolina University

In recent years several studies have been conducted to identify ways to enhance the academic curriculum in sociology and make it more relevant to applied occupational settings. These studies focused on students' skills and knowledge development needs, as identified by: (1) potential employers (cf., Lyson and Squires, 1984; Watson, 1982; Watts and Johnson, 1984), or (2) graduates of applied sociology programs (cf., Adamek and Boros, 1983; Jacoby et al., 1984).

In 1984, two studies turned to a new population for assistance in defining curriculum needs—applied sociologists currently practicing inside or outside of academia. In this report we compare the data from these two studies. William R. Brown used five groups of non-academic and academic sociologists to derive data regarding student training recommendations (Brown, 1984). The second study, which we conducted, focused purposefully on only non-academic sociologists.¹ In both of these studies, applied sociologists were asked to identify the "skills and knowledge" (our study) or "competencies" (Brown's study) important for sociology graduates pursuing careers in applied sociology.²

Our study focused on training requirements for undergraduates. Information on Master's applied training was solicited only when respondents reported that Bachelor's Degree students would not be employable in their organization. Brown (1984) did not ask for a designation of competencies specifically by academic level. The amount of em-

phasis that should be given at the Bachelor's, Master's, and PhD levels to competencies which the respondents had identified as "much needed" or "essential" was assessed with a single item. Additionally, Brown (1984) developed his questionnaire with the assumption that social research skills are "crucial" for applied sociology training and he therefore did not include research-related competencies in his lists. Alternatively, we were interested in the level of importance practicing sociologists assign research and statistical skills compared with other skill areas.

Survey Results

Despite the variations described above, it is possible to discuss the combined findings of our two studies. In this report, we are limiting our presentation to those data related to professionally-oriented skills and not personal attributes. Table 1 presents the training areas identified by the "Knowledge and Skills" items in our survey and Brown's "Specific Functional Competencies" items. The items from our survey are ranked from a 17-item list, while the rankings from Brown's (1984) study are drawn from a 37-item list.³

Similar to the results of surveys of employers and sociology graduates, both communication skills and critical thinking and problem solving skills emerge as the most important areas for training needs. The means illustrate that the research/statistics area ranks third in our study.

Items in Brown's study relating to program development ranked much higher than similar items in our study.

This may be because our items are directed toward the importance of a student's ability to evaluate and develop policy options, whereas Brown's items tap the need for more general skills in planning, designing, and evaluating programs. Without the inclusion of the research/statistics items in Brown's study, program development becomes the third most important area according to the rankings of the means presented in Table 1.

Training in formal organizations and group dynamics is viewed as important, but seemingly not as essential as the other areas of skill development. Authors of previous studies have noted that students are expected to apply their knowledge of organizations and groups on two levels: (1) in the intellectual practice of sociological analysis of the organization, and (2) in their personal functioning as part of their work groups and organization.

Responses to a separate question in our questionnaire offer some interesting contrasts to the data presented in Table 1. Respondents were asked to list three things that a program in sociology can do to make graduating sociologists more employable.⁴ The development of (1) statistical and computer skills and (2) research skills were mentioned most often as first and second areas. Internships, or other experiential learning opportunities were the third most-mentioned category for enhancing sociologists' employability. In contrast with the findings from the ranked items, communication skills were the fourth most-mentioned area. Interdisciplinary and specialty area training came in fifth and sixth on this list.

Discussion

These seemingly contradictory results are consistent with the findings of previous studies (Lyson and Squires, 1984; Jacoby et al., 1984). Data from all studies suggest that sociology students are expected to come to the non-academic work setting well-grounded in knowledge and skills that are distinctively sociology. Further, a complete and balanced curriculum requires students to practice the application of sociology in non-academic settings, consequently learning the unique perspectives, skills and insights that they can bring to varied work environments. (Approximately 63% of the applied sociologists in our sample said that internships or practica are very or quite important to employability, whereas only 19.7% said they are of little or no importance.)

First and foremost, however, students need to be able to communicate. If they lack this ability, their other skills will not be apparent, hidden behind a screen of incoherence.

Finally, our respondents reminded us that practicing sociologists will most probably work in environments where they will interact regularly with persons with different training from other disciplines. They suggest that students should be exposed to some of these other approaches to learn to work with persons from diverse backgrounds and apply sociology within a multi-disciplinary context.

Returning to the results in Table 1, previous authors have reviewed similar findings from employer and graduate studies with chagrin, noting that those areas of skill development considered most important are not distinctively sociology. A closer look at all these areas, however, reveals an important differentiation. Whereas formal organizations and research/statistics are distinguished through formal courses, the other areas (communication; problem solving and critical thinking; leading, facilitating and coordinating group activities; goal setting and program development) can be built into the general and substantive courses within a typical sociology curriculum. Many sociologists, for example, use innovative classroom formats to involve students in problem solving and critical analysis. Likewise, we can increase written and oral presentation requirements and balance classroom lectures with participatory learning in small groups. Students, consequently, can learn the content of sociology, while honing their communication skills and learning how to function as group/team members.

We recognize—and know first-hand—the problems inherent in trying to meet the training needs in these skill areas in larger institutions where upper-division classes can average 35-40 students. However, the clear and consistent message from these and other surveys is that we have to consider not just what we are teaching, but also how we are teaching. Therefore, when we address the issue of meeting a growing need for applied training, we are not—as often thought—just facing disciplinary changes, we also are facing pedagogical changes.

Conclusion

Is "applied sociology" becoming the adornment of the discipline, to be worn as punk rockers are wearing the "latest" hairdos? Like wanting to find more colors and techniques for streaking and setting up the hair, we ask: "How do

TABLE 1

GRZELKOWSKI/MITCHELL			BROWN		
Training Area: Items	Rank	Mean*	Training Area: Items	Rank	Mean**
<i>Communication</i>			<i>Communication</i>		
Can communicate by writing	1	4.68	Ability to communicate effectively in work situations	2	3.73
Can communicate orally	2	4.53	Skills in writing manuals/reports	3	3.52
Can organize and present information to a variety of audiences	6	4.21	Ability to communicate the organization's message to relevant publics	13	3.05
			[Ability to write concisely]	[1]	[3.79]
			[Competence in organizing thoughts/information]	[2]	[3.77]
			[Effective speaking skills]	[5]	[3.62]
<i>Critical Thinking/Problem Solving</i>			<i>Critical Thinking/Problem Solving</i>		
Can think critically	3	4.47	Ability to clearly conceptualize realistic problems	1	3.81
			Ability to use various problem-solving techniques	5	3.41
<i>Research/Statistics</i>			<i>Research/Statistics</i>		
Can analyze quantitative data	4	4.43	(No research/statistical questions)		
Has basic statistical skills	5	4.37	Ability to interface with computer technicians	15	2.98
Can use computers	7	4.21	Competence in the use of major computer package programs (SPSS, SAS, etc.)	17	2.91
Can analyze qualitative data	8	4.04			
Has advanced statistical skills	10	3.66			
<i>Formal Organizations</i>			<i>Formal Organizations</i>		
Knows how formal organizations and bureaucracies work	9	3.76	Analytical abilities concerning formal and informal structure of organizations	10	3.10
			Analytical abilities concerning communication systems used by work organizations	14	3.02
<i>Group Dynamics Skills</i>			<i>Group Dynamics Skills</i>		
Can facilitate and coordinate group activity	13	3.39	Developing team work skills among work group members	8	3.11
			Effective group leadership skills	12	3.06
<i>Program Development</i>			<i>Program Development</i>		
Can evaluate policy options	12	3.39	Competence in setting goals/objectives	4	3.42
Can develop policy options	14	3.23	Ability to plan organizational projects	6	3.41
			Evaluation of projects/programs	7	3.24
			Designing new projects/programs	9	3.11

*Means based on scale from 1 (skill "Not Important at All") to 5 (skill "Very Important").

**Means based on scale from 1 ("Not Needed Skill") to 4 ("Essential Skill").

Teaching Workshop on Pedagogy and Practice

The ASA Teaching Services Program will be presenting Brazilian Educator Paulo Freire, sociological practitioner William F. Whyte, Peter Park, and Paul Baker.

July 31-August 2, 1986, Los Angeles. CA Field Experience and Teaching: Learning Through Participatory Research

In this workshop, participants will: review case studies and share views of field experience and participatory research as basic teaching techniques; examine the social and institutional conditions that promote field experience and participatory research; explore ways teachers and students can mutually work together to change their own conditions; and study the process of personal empowerment through social dialogue.

The workshop will be held on the campus of the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA), and the staff of the workshop includes: Paulo Freire; William F. Whyte, Cornell University; Peter Park, University of Massachusetts; and Paul Baker, Illinois State University. The fee for the workshop is \$325. Applications are due by June 1, 1986.

For more detailed information about this workshop and application forms, contact: William Ewens, ASA Teaching Services Program, Department of Sociology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824; phone 517-355-6639. Also: Professor Peter Park, Department of Sociology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003; phone 413/545-0456. □

Teaching, from page 5

we change ourselves so that students will perceive that taking sociology will lead them to jobs...and...help us keep our jobs? Are we seeking a fundamentally new direction or are we looking for cosmetic solutions that will come and go with the "fads" of the job market?

We propose a different question: "How do we keep our sociological knowledge and training current so that graduating sociologists can bring a 'sociological perspective' to varied work settings?" Hans Mauksch argues that "the development of an applied sociology program must be a total faculty concern and not just the business of those who teach so-called applied courses" (1983, p. 316). Likewise, the results of surveys of employers, graduates, and practicing sociologists are clear in their message that those of us who are entrusted with teaching the discipline of sociology are also expected to recognize our larger instructional role in "the business of" liberal arts learning. We should be prepared to make teaching a priority enterprise by which we can develop the necessary learning environments—through curriculum, classroom, and out-of-classroom alternatives—that will reintegrate the core aspects of a liberal arts education into our teaching of sociology.

FOOTNOTES

¹Both studies used similar mail-out questionnaire techniques. Brown re-

Nominations Sought for Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award

The Selection Committee for the ASA Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award invites nominations for the Award, which will be conferred in 1987. (The February 15, 1986 deadline permits the Committee adequate time to collect supporting materials on nominees.) Nominations should be made for outstanding contributions to undergraduate and/or graduate teaching and learning of sociology, and may seek to recognize the career contribution to teaching and learning of an individual teacher, a specific product such as a major textbook, a course or curricular innovation, or a teaching technique. The award may be given to an individual, a department or institution, or some other collective actor. Anyone making a nomination should be aware that the purpose of the award goes beyond recognizing in-

dividual excellence in classroom performance. If an individual is nominated, it should be on the basis of a career contribution to teaching or learning, some effort or activity that went beyond the nominee's particular students and affected the teaching of the discipline as a whole, or some identifiable segment thereof. Nominations should include the name of the nominee, a statement explaining the basis of the nomination, and appropriate supporting materials (e.g., vitae, course materials, textbook, or some other evidence of contribution). Please make nominations no later than February 15, 1986, to: Richard J. Gelles, Chair, Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award Committee, Office of the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, University of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881. □

I nominate the following () individual/() collective actor as a candidate for the 1987 Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award:

Name _____

Address _____

(Signed) _____

I can be reached at the following address to provide supporting materials:

(Print name) _____

Address _____

ceived 315 usable responses (65.8% response rate); 256 usable questionnaires were returned to us (53.8% response rate).

²Brown asked respondents to specify the relative need for 37 "Specific Functional Competencies" and 13 "Specific Personal Attributes." We asked respondents to identify the level of importance of 11 "Interpersonal Qualities" and 17 "Knowledge or Skill" areas.

³There is one exception. We have drawn three items from Brown's 13-item personal attributes section because they coincide with our items and with our emphasis on technical skills training. These items are noted in Table 1 with brackets [].

⁴The term "employable" is used here in a broader sense than asking a respondent to specify training needs applicable to his/her particular organization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamek, Raymond J. and Alexander Boros
1983 "Work Experiences and Educational Evaluations of Applied Sociologists." *Teaching Sociology*, Vol. 11, no. 1 (Oct.), 8-16.
- Brown, William R.
1984 "Identification of Non-research Competencies to Prepare Sociology Majors for Non-academic Careers." Paper presented at annual conference of the Society for

Applied Sociology, Highland Heights, KY.

Jacoby, Joseph E., Meredith D. Pugh, Eldon E. Snyder, and Elmer A. Spreitzer

1984 "There Is Life (and Work) After Sociology: Implications for Curriculum Design." *Teaching Sociology*, Vol. 11, no. 4 (July), 399-417.

Lyson, Thomas A. and Gregory D. Squires

1984 "The Promise and Perils of Applied Sociology: A Survey of Non-academic Employers." *Sociological Inquiry*, Vol. 54, Winter, 1-15.

Mauksch, Hans

1983 "Teaching Applied Sociology: Opportunities and Obstacles." Pp. 312-321 in Freeman, Howard E., Russell R. Dynes, Peter H. Rossi, William Foote Whyte, (eds.), *Applied Sociology*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Watson, J. Mark

1982 "Would You Employ Sociology Majors: A Survey of Employers." *Teaching Sociology*, Vol. 9, no. 2 (Jan.), 127-135.

Watts, David W. and Roland H. Johnson, III

1984 "Employment of Sociology Graduates, 1982." *Teaching Sociology*, Vol. 11, no. 2 (Jan.), 183-204. □

DuBois-Johnson-Frazier Award

The biennial DuBois-Johnson-Frazier Award was created in 1971 to honor the intellectual traditions and contributions of W.E.B. DuBois, Charles S. Johnson and E. Franklin Frazier. The award is given either to a sociologist for a lifetime of research, teaching and service to the community, or to an academic institution for its work in assisting the development of scholarly efforts in this tradition. The 1984 award recipient was Dr. Joyce Ladner of Howard University. The award committee welcomes nominations for the 1986 award, which will be presented at the ASA Annual Meeting in New York City. Please provide a statement indicating why the individual or institution is believed to be eligible for the award. This statement should comment on his/her/its career or achievements, teaching, and publications, and on the way in which these are consistent with the traditions of the aforementioned outstanding Afro-American scholars and educators.

Send nominations to: Dr. Elizabeth Higginbotham, Chairperson, DuBois-Johnson-Frazier Award Committee, Department of Sociology, Memphis State University, Memphis, TN 38152. The deadline for nominations is March 1, 1986.

Send In Your Teaching Materials

The ASA Teaching Resources Center (TRC) now distributes sets of syllabi and instructional materials for 31 courses in the sociology curriculum. Ten others are under development. Please send your syllabus, class exercises, film and textbook reviews and other instructional materials to the editors. When the products are ready, they will be advertised in *Footnotes*.

Syllabi and Instructional Materials for Sociology of the Future, Patricia Weitzel-O'Neill, Trinity College, Washington, DC 20017

Syllabi and Instructional Materials for Social Movements, Andrea Baker, Ohio University-Lancaster, Lancaster, OH 43130

Syllabi and Instructional Materials for World Conflicts, Allen Grimshaw, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 37996

Syllabi and Instructional Materials for Courses in Social Problems, J. Michael Brooks, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY 40506

Syllabi and Instructional Materials for Courses in Social Ecology, Michael Micklin, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 23206

Syllabi and Instructional Materials for Courses in Sexuality and Society, Meredith Gould, 87 Leigh Avenue, Princeton, NJ 08542; or Martin Levine, 200 West 20th Street, #302, New York, NY 10011

Syllabi and Instructional Materials for Sociology of Religion, Madeleine Adrain, 22 Rodman Street, Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

Instructional Materials in Qualitative Research Methods, Kenneth Stoddart, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 2B2

Syllabi and Instructional Materials in Rural Sociology, George W. Oklendorf, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803-5466 □

Sociologists Honored with Grants, Awards

National Science Foundation

Seventy-three awards—59 new and 14 continuing—were made by the Sociology Program of the National Science Foundation for fiscal year 1985. Seventeen of the awards were jointly funded with other NSF programs or other federal agencies. Included in this year's grants were eight for dissertation research.

This year's funding for the Sociology Program shows an increase of over \$1 million compared to 1984. This increase is due entirely to a special initiative at NSF to fund research projects on the teaching and learning of science and mathematics. The seven projects supported by these monies will not be funded beyond the present year. Omitting these funds, budgets for the Sociology Program are projected to continue the downward trend of the past few years, hovering around \$3 million for 1986.

Proposals normally are evaluated by ad hoc reviewers selected from the scientific community for their expertise in relevant research areas. Reviews are also made by an advisory subpanel that meets twice annually. Submission deadlines for regular proposals are September 1 and February 1. Proposals for dissertation research are processed upon receipt and, depending upon their dollar request, can be approved without external reviews.

Members of the Advisory Subpanel for Sociology include Francis E. Korbin-Goldschneider, Brown University; William Bielby, University of California-Santa Barbara; Mark Granovetter, SUNY-Stony Brook; Peter Marsden, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill; Jeylan Mortimer, University of Minnesota; Michael Useem, Boston University; and Lynne G. Zucker, University of California-Los Angeles.

Additional information, program announcements, and application forms

may be received by contacting Mark Abrahamson, Director, or Stanley Preusser, Associate Director, Sociology Program, National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, NW, Washington, DC; (202)357-7802.

New Awards

Paul D. Allison, Frank F. Furstenberg and S. Philip Morgan, University of Pennsylvania, "Effects of Divorce on Children," \$59,999.

Paul D. Allison, University of Pennsylvania, "Productivity and Prestige in Science," \$24,941.

Denise Bielby and William T. Bielby, University of California, Santa Barbara, "Men's and Women's Commitment to Work and Family," \$34,600.

Joseph Burger, Stanford University, "Status Cues: Two Experiments," \$68,881.

Paul Burstein, Vanderbilt University, "Consequences of Equal Employment Opportunity Legislation," \$75,661 (jointly funded).

Clifford C. Clogg, Pennsylvania State University, "Measurement, Consequences and Spatial Distribution of Underemployment, 1969-1986," \$100,331.

Karen S. Cook, University of Washington, "Collaborative Research on an Experimental Test of a Formal Theory of Social Control," \$13,764.

Doris R. Entwistle, Johns Hopkins University, "Growth of Mathematical Competence in Elementary School: A Sociopsychological Accounting," \$450,000.

Richard B. Felson, SUNY-Albany, "Gender Self-Appraisals and Performance in Mathematics," \$90,348.

Mary F. Fox, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, "Research Productivity Among Social Scientists: The Environmental Link," \$71,250.

Roberto Franzosi, University of Wisconsin,

Madison, "Determinants of Temporal Patterns of Strikes," \$40,000.

Noah E. Friedkin, University of California, Santa Barbara, "Collaborative Research on an Experimental Test of a Formal Theory of Social Control," \$37,225.

William A. Gamson, Boston College, "Public Thinking on Political Issues," \$47,190 (jointly funded).

Michael T. Hannan, Cornell University, "Senescence and Competition in the Life Cycles of Organizations," \$196,674.

Barbara Heyns, New York University, "The Changing Contours of the Teaching Profession: Selection, Retention and Attrition Among Math and Science Teachers," \$183,686 (jointly funded).

Susan E. Hirsch and Janice L. Reiff, Northwestern University, "Job Segregation and Community Hierarchies: Creation of a Data Base on Pullman Repair Shop Workers, 1900-1969," \$35,433.

Michael Hughes, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, "Codification of Early Urban Data on Poverty and Overcrowding," \$53,564 (jointly funded).

Jerome Karabel, University of California, Berkeley, "Collaborative Research on Higher Education, Social Structure and the Labor Market," \$30,946.

Alan C. Kerckhoff, Duke University, "Transition to Adulthood in Comparative Perspective," \$72,999 (jointly funded).

Paul W. Kingston and Steven L. Nock, University of Virginia, "Work Schedules and Family Life Among Dual-Earner Couples," \$98,096.

David H. Knoke, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, "Resource Acquisition and Allocation in Associations," \$56,588.

Henry Landsberger, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, "Convergence in the Social Policy Debates of Post-Industrial Societies," \$52,492.

Ivan Light, University of California, Los Angeles, "Labor Force and Self-Employment, 1970-1980," \$50,400.

Barry Markovsky, University of Iowa, "Perceptions of Injustice: Interpersonal

and Informational Factors," \$41,021.

Gerald Marwell, University of Wisconsin, Madison, "A Longitudinal Study of Political Activists," \$38,348.

John D. McCarthy, Catholic University, "The Causes and Consequences of the Citizen's Movement Against Drunk Driving," \$101,000.

John Meyer, Stanford University, "The Origins and Expansion of Mass Education," \$130,000.

John Meyer and W. Richard Scott, Stanford University, "Legalization in Organizations: The Expanding Formalization of the Employment Relation," \$77,000 (jointly funded).

John Meyer, Stanford University, "National Determinants of Science and Math Instruction: A Comparative Longitudinal Study," \$120,000.

Linda D. Molm, Emory University, "Power Processes in Exchange Networks," \$72,457.

Dorothy Nelkin, Cornell University, "Values and Conflict Resolution in Policy Disputes Over Food," \$74,995 (jointly funded).

Susan Olzak, Cornell University, "Dynamic Analysis of Ethnic Mobilization," \$34,360.

Richard N. Osborn, Battelle Human Affairs Research Institute, "Analyzing US/Japanese Joint Research and Development Units," \$79,919.

William W. Pendleton and Sally B. Kilgore, Emory University, "School Effects on the Learning of Mathematics and Science," \$75,000.

Nancy Reichman, University of Denver, "The Role of Computer Matching in Social Control and Surveillance," \$25,000 (jointly funded).

James B. Rule, Center for Policy Research, Inc., "The New Uses of Information: Impact in Organizations," \$195,000 (jointly funded).

Melvin M. Sakurai, Research Information Service, Hawaii, "Competition Tests of Game Theoretic Descriptive Models in n-Person Conflict of Interest Decision Problems," \$64,984 (jointly funded).

Howard Schuman and Philip E. Converse, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, "The Intersection of Personal and National History," \$79,020.

Neil J. Smelser, University of California, Berkeley, Conference on "Theories of Social Change and Modernity," in Palo Alto, CA, 8/86, \$25,292.

Thomas E. Smith, University of South Carolina, "Achievement and Interaction with Younger Siblings," \$109,395.

Lula C. Steelman, University of South Carolina, "Sibship Configuration and Educational Attainment," \$45,782.

Seymour Sudman, University of Illinois, Urbana, "Experiments in Response Error: Estimating the Size of Networks of Neighbors and Relatives," \$85,388.

Ivan Szelenyi, University of Wisconsin, Madison, "Private Economic Activity in Hungarian Society and the Transformation of Social Structure: The Case of Agricultural Production," \$54,997.

Marylee C. Taylor, Pennsylvania State University, "Educational Acceleration of Talented Science and Mathematics Studies: Academic and Socioemotional Benefits and Costs," \$39,672.

Patricia A. Taylor, University of Virginia, "Work Satisfaction in Comparative Perspective: Authority and Ownership in the U.S. and Yugoslavia," \$17,276.

Jay D. Teachman, Old Dominion University, "Life-Course Transitions and Post-Secondary Education," \$28,294.

Bert Useem, University of Illinois, Chicago, "Prison Riots: Causes and Consequences," \$64,043 (jointly funded).

National Institute of Mental Health

The National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) made 62 research grants to sociologists in 1984. These awards totaled just under \$8.3 million. This is an increase in the number of awards and their total sum compared to 1983.

That year, forty-eight awards were made, totaling \$5,943,460. The 1984 dollar total in awards nearly matches the \$8.3 million for 1982. That amount supported seventy-five projects. For additional information, program announcements, and application forms, contact the Grants Management Officer, National Institute of Mental Health, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857.

Recipients of awards, along with project titles and amounts received, are listed below according to NIMH program areas in which the grants are administered.

From the Applied Biometrics Research Branch three awards went to sociologists:

Mary-Jo Delvec Good, Harvard University, "Physician Response to Primary Care Psychosocial Problems," \$76,649.

Janet R. Hankin, Johns Hopkins, "Management of Psychosocial Problems by Pediatricians," \$155,885.

John Landsverk, Maxicare Health Plan (CA), "Mental Disorder, Distress and Use of HMO Services," \$73,666.

The following sociologists secured grants from the Center for Epidemiologic Studies:

Carol S. Aneshensel, University of California, Los Angeles, "Epidemiology of Depression and Help-seeking Behavior," \$153,156.

Janice A. Egeland, University of Miami, "A Study of Affective Disorders Among Old Order Amish," \$205,407.

Baqar A. Husaini, Tennessee State University, "Medical Problems and Life Events as Factors in Depression," \$99,000.

Marvin Karno, University of California, Los Angeles, for work on Hispanics and Anglos in the LA epidemiologic catchment area, \$979,127.

Ronald C. Kessler, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, "Patterns of Differential Response to Stress," \$63,669.

Nan Lin, SUNY, Albany, "A 3-wave Study of Stressors, Social Support and Illness," \$149,707.

Bruce G. Link, Columbia University, "Occupations and Mental Health," \$54,099.

David Mechanic, Rutgers University, "Epidemiology of Adolescent Introspection and Distress," \$196,309.

Jerome K. Myers, Yale University, "Epidemiologic Catchment Area Program," \$394,185.

Leonard I. Pearlin, University of California, San Francisco, "Sources and Mediators of Emotional Disorder," \$112,833.

Robert E. Roberts, University of Texas Health Science Center (Houston), "Psychosocial Factors and Risk of Depression," \$64,894.

Lee N. Robins, Washington University (St. Louis), "Epidemiological Catchment Area Program," \$627,267 (jointly funded).

Three grants from the Survey and Reports Branch went to the following:

Philip J. Leaf, Yale University, "The Mental Health Service System: A Contextual Analysis," \$85,808.

Joseph P. Morrissey, New York State Office of Mental Health, "CHMC Organization and Continuity of Care and CMI Clients," \$38,277.

Thomas W. Weirich, John F. Kennedy Community Mental Health Center, "Performance Assessment in Community Mental Health Centers," \$32,902.

The Behavioral Sciences Research Branch funded the following sociologists:

Duane F. Atwin, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, "Parental Approaches to Child-rearing," \$49,912.

Donna J. Eder, Indiana University, "Early Adolescent Interpersonal Relations," \$23,708.

Hamilton Touts Fulbright Experience

The Fulbright Fellowship program offers scholars a range of opportunities for research and intellectual development seldom matched by other programs funding overseas research. A case in point is the experience of Gary Hamilton, Professor of Sociology, University of California-Davis. He spent the 1984-85 academic year as a Fulbright Lecturer in the Graduate Institute of Sociology at Tunghai University, located near Taichung in central Taiwan.

In the five years before going to Taiwan, Hamilton, who had a background in China studies, had been doing research unrelated to that country. Wanting to get back into China studies, but fearing he would not be able to do primary source research in Chinese language material, Hamilton applied for and received a Fulbright Fellowship. With this fellowship, Hamilton hoped to renew his Chinese language, to learn about developments in sociology and history in the Far East, and to begin some research projects that would return him to his area specialty. On all three counts, Hamilton regards his year as an unequalled success. "I could not have designed," he said, "a sabbatical leave any better than this Fulbright Fellowship turned out to be."

"My first realization that this was going to be a good year came," Hamilton recalled, "when I discovered that Tunghai University had the only PhD program in sociology in the Chinese-speaking world." In the People's Republic of China, sociology is now taught at many universities, but none so far has developed a functioning program beyond the Master's level. The same is true for the universities in Hong Kong, as well as other universities in Taiwan. Tunghai University, however, has had a PhD program for about four years, and is just now at the point of graduating its first PhD students in sociology. "I had the feeling, during the entire year at Tunghai, that the sociological perspective being developed there would have a significant impact upon the future of sociology developing elsewhere in Taiwan and on the Chinese mainland," said Hamilton. "That made the year exciting."

The combined Masters and PhD program at the Graduate Institute has about thirty students. Entrance into both programs is through nationwide competitive examinations in which students must show not only competency in sociology but also reading fluency in English and advanced composition skills in Chinese. According to Hamilton's observations, the students come in with excellent analytic abilities and with great enthusiasm for sociology. The program itself offers advanced training in general sociological theory, in comparative historical sociology, in demography, in quantitative sociological methods, and in applied sociology. "I was amazed to find," Hamilton said, "students who had read all of Max Weber's *Economy and Society*, as well as a half dozen of Weber's other works, and had written sophisticated papers on such Weberian topics as ethical prophecy and hierocracy." Literacy in both sociological classics and the computer is the rule. All classes are organized as seminars, in which students freely participate and frequently debate fine points in theory and method. Contrary to conventional knowledge about Chinese students, Hamilton found students eager to do independent, creative research and willing

to express their own points of view.

In his year in Tunghai, Hamilton taught four seminar courses, two each semester, in the areas of his expertise. In the last semester, he was encouraged to organize his seminars around his research interests. Between four and seven students attended each course. Hamilton taught in English and the seminar discussion usually was in English. "Occasionally we would get stuck on some idea and the students would thrash it out in Chinese, and then we would go back into English. The students were very good. They taught me fully as much as I taught them."

Besides teaching, Hamilton took one-on-one tutorial classes in Chinese language that are taught in the Chinese language program on the Tunghai campus. The Fulbright program paid for most of the lessons.

The high point of Hamilton's fellowship was his research. With the help of

a research assistant, Hamilton was able to cover large amounts of Chinese-language material and was able to start several new projects, the most exciting of which is a historical, comparative study of capitalism in the Far East, a cooperative research project with Kao Cheng-shu, Professor of Sociology in the Graduate Institute of Sociology.

The Fulbright program offers some of the best opportunities for overseas research because it places American scholars within a network of host scholars, provides housing and additional assistance as may be required, and offers considerable flexibility in the timing and duration of one's stay overseas.

For further information on the Fulbright grants, write or call the Council for International Exchange of Scholars, Eleven Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 300, Washington, DC, 20036. The telephone number is (202)939-5401. □

Fulbright Program

Fulbright awards for 1985-86 have been announced by the Council for International Exchange of Scholars, an affiliate of the American Council on Education. Sociologists receiving Fulbright awards and the country where they will study are:

Barbara J. Bank, Associate Professor, University of Missouri at Columbia; Australia

Jerry K. Benson, Professor, University of Missouri at Columbia; Sweden

Lisa F. Berkman, Associate Professor of Epidemiology, Yale University; United Kingdom

Sarane S. Boocock, Professor, Rutgers University; Japan

Richard H. Brown, Associate Professor, University of Maryland at College Park; Colombia

Larry L. Burnmeister, independent scholar, Ithaca, NY; South Korea

Dean W. Collinwood, Assistant Professor, MacMurray College; Japan

Claude S. Fischer, Professor, University of California, Berkeley; Israel

Jane S. Gore, Associate Professor of Human Resources, State University of New York College at Plattsburgh; India

Mark D. Gottdiener, Associate Professor, University of California, Riverside; Greece

Linwood L. Hodgdon, Professor, Colorado State University; Malaysia

Patrick M. Horan, Professor, University of Georgia; Norway

Rita S. Kipp, Associate Professor, Kenyon College; Singapore

Wen-Hsiung Kuo, Professor, University of Utah; China

Harold W. Lemel, independent scholar, Madison, Wisconsin; Turkey

Thomas A. Lyson, Associate Professor, Clemson University; New Zealand

Harsha N. Mookherjee, Professor, Tennessee Technological University, Papua New Guinea

Joane P. Nagel, Associate Professor, University of Kansas; Liberia

Anthony R. Oberschall, Professor, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; China

David Popenoe, Professor, Rutgers University; Sweden

Richard Quinney, Professor, Northern Illinois University; Ireland

Robert E.T. Roberts, Professor, Roosevelt University; India

Lawrence A. Rosenthal, Professor, University of California, Berkeley; Italy

Joseph M. Stycos, Professor, Cornell University; Costa Rica

Ramiro Valdez, Assistant Professor, Texas Woman's University; Uruguay

Robert P. Weber, statistical consultant in the Office for Information Technology, Harvard University; Sweden. □

Gerontological Society

Eleven sociologists were among the 27 researchers selected to participate in the 1985 Research Fellowship Program in Applied Gerontology, sponsored by the Gerontological Society of America (GSA).

Fellows work with selected agencies and organizations across the nation for three months to help solve problems related to development, planning, and delivery of services to the elderly. Among the participants were the following sociologists:

Ralph Cherry, NIMH Postdoctoral Fellow in the Department of Family and Community Medicine at the University of Missouri, Columbia;

Robert John, Haskell Junior College, Lawrence, Kansas;

Tanya Johnson, NIMH Postdoctoral Fellow at the Center of Aging and Human

Development, Duke University;

Rumaldo Juarez, Pan American University;

Paul Luken, NIMH Postdoctoral Fellow in the Department of Family and Community Medicine at the University of Missouri, Kansas City;

Baila Miller, SIR, Inc, Skokie, Illinois;

Victor Scheider, Professor Emeritus, West Virginia University;

Mark Sizemore, University of Texas Health Science Center, Dallas;

Richard Wildman, Bradley University;

Steve Wisensale, University of Connecticut; and

Elena Yu, Pacific Asian American Mental Health Resource Center at the University of Illinois, Chicago.

For additional information and application forms, contact Adrian Walter, Gerontological Society of America, 1411 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20005; (202) 393-1411. □

American Council of Learned Societies

The American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) recently announced awards to scholars in several of its highly competitive programs. Five sociologists were among the recipients in two programs. All programs are jointly sponsored by ACLS and the Social Science Research Council. They are intended to support research that brings a humanistic perspective to the social sciences.

One program, made possible by grants from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, The Ford Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities, drew more than 800 applications; of the 67 awards under this program, four went to sociologists:

Eva T. Morauska, Assistant Professor of Sociology, The University of Pennsylvania, for the project "Insecure Prosperity: Jews in Small Town Industrial America, 1870-1940";

David Popenoe, Professor of Sociology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, to study public policy and changing family patterns in Sweden, 1935-1985;

Lise Vogel, Assistant Professor Sociology, Rider College, for the project "Equality of Women: Studies in Theory and History"; and

Alexander Vucinich, Emeritus Professor of History and Sociology of Science, the University of Pennsylvania, for his project "Science and Soviet Ideology".

Awards in another program, to support dissertation research on East European studies and funded by grants from the Ford Foundation and the National Endowment for the Humanities, are intended to cover foreign and domestic travel necessary to gain access to materials, for clerical and research assistance and for the purchase or reproduction of research materials. One sociologist received an award here:

Szonja Szelenyi, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison. Her dissertation research is a comparative study of the position of women in Hungary and the United States.

Information on programs and application guidelines may be obtained by writing to ACLS at 228 East 45th Street, New York, NY 10017. □

ASA/ACLS Conducts Survey of Scholars

The American Sociological Association is cooperating with several other members of the American Council of Learned Societies in an important survey of scholars in the humanities and social sciences. The survey deals with the experience of scholars in the publication and use of scholarly materials and with the role of libraries and computers in teaching and research. We think the findings of this survey will be of wide interest, particularly to the participating societies.

If you are selected to participate, please complete the questionnaire and return it promptly. The survey, which is being conducted by the Office of Scholarly Communication and Technology of the American Council of Learned Societies, will be placed in the mail later shortly. □

Abrahamson, Presser Share Plans, Advice

NSF's Sociology Program Spearheads Research

by Carla B. Howery

Three months on the job, National Science Foundation Sociology Program Director Mark Abrahamson and Associate Director Stanley Presser were asked about their impressions and plans for the program.

CBH: Mark, please describe the NSF Sociology Program to *Footnotes* readers, what it is, what it does, and how it fits into the larger Foundation.

MA: First of all, it does everything. We have no limitation on the kind of research we can support. The National Science Foundation (NSF) does have a general restriction to separate it from that of the National Institutes of Health in that we would not fund somebody who wanted to go out to provide some kind of treatment. But short of that, we don't have any restrictions. We run the gamut of sociology. I can think of no particular realm in sociology from which we don't get some proposals. In recent years, though, it's not been evenly distributed. The subarea in which we get the most proposals is the sociology of organizations. I think there are probably a couple of reasons. First, for people who want to do basic research in organizations, I know of no other agency one could go to to get funding. Second, I think it's a "hot topic" area within sociology, particularly organizational ecology. The number of proposals we get in such a specialty area reflects the intensity of the interest. Social psychology is also high; all kinds of social psychology. This is always so and it reflects the relatively large number of sociologists who define themselves as social psychologists. We don't receive a lot of proposals in criminology and in deviance, possibly because there are lots of other funding sources who have more money.

CBH: Do you feel the types of proposals you get reflect the future of the field of sociology or is there a lag in the types of proposals coming, relative to the interests in the field?

MA: My sense is that what we're really doing is monitoring the shape of research that most sociologists will see in the major journals five years from now. I think it's our most important role. It's a kind of gatekeeping function. In sociology we can't slam the doors the way it's done in some of the physical sciences where if some program won't fund you for equipment, you can't do the research. It isn't quite all or nothing in sociology. But at least by sliding the gate to a more closed position we do make it harder for people to pass. And I think in that sense we're responding to people's future-oriented interests and I think this is how we see the NSF mandate.

SP: We are seeing proposals that are going to yield the results that will be published in the journals in years to come. Sometimes we are funding things that are truly new and other times they're logical developments of what we know is already out there. Undoubtedly, more of the latter than "the pathbreaking."

MA: By definition, how much really novel can you have at any given time? As an exercise, the readers of *Footnotes* might want to thumb through whatever sociology journals they have on their bookshelves, and that's going to mean that most of them have the *ASR* but there's a lot of *AJS* and *Social Forces* out

there too, and look at the bottom of the front page and notice the acknowledgments to NSF. It would be an unusual issue of a major journal that didn't have some studies acknowledging NSF support.

CBH: I was going to ask you exactly that type of sociology of science question. Do you yourselves monitor the impact of the research you have funded in terms of scholarly publications, or in other ways?

SP: Well, we ask people who we have funded to send us the results of their work, hence we do receive reprints and copies of books. Unfortunately we don't know whether we get 100% of what is published from the projects we fund. Furthermore, I don't have any real feel for how good the books are.

MA: One other thing, though. People sometimes send over and above what they have to send us in terms of the fruits of their labor, such as newspaper clippings in which somebody comes out and talks to them about their research. This serves as a public relations function within the Foundation. We have no way of knowing about these interviews, press coverage, and uses of the research unless people send the information to us. We really appreciate it.

CBH: At the same time, am I right that the social science budget is 4% of NSF's budget? The whole of social sciences, all of them? What about this issue of budgets? What problems does that pose for you in getting your work done?

MA: There are all sorts of ambiguities; so when you ask a bureaucrat, "What's your budget?" it's a simple, straightforward question that ought to get an answer I can't give you. The money comes in to a directorate. You asked earlier where we're located in NSF. We're the directorate for biological, behavioral, and social sciences. The assistant director of the Foundation, who is the director of this Directorate, holds back some funds and the rest of it goes down. The Division of Social and Economic Sciences Director Roberta Miller holds back some of it and then allocates out to the programs. It's comparable to the process that occurs with the budget in most universities where the vice president keeps some and the dean keeps some and the department head may or may not keep some, but at all levels above the department something's been kept back. It's potentially recoverable. Based on what happens to the division in the course of the year, some of that money can be gotten by the sociology program for sociologists depending in part on the number of good proposals we have relative to other programs. Hence, if you ask me, "What's your budget in terms of how much I have to spend?" I either have to say, "I don't know," or give you a figure that's too low because in the course of the year I'm likely to spend a good deal more than that.

SP: In fiscal year '85, sociology funded projects to the tune of approximately 4.5 million dollars. Of the 4.5 million, about 1 million was from a one-time special program on the teaching and learning of science and mathematics. The preceding year we spent about 3 million dollars. So there was a significant increase in the sociology budget aside from the teaching and learning money between fiscal '84 and fiscal '85.

CBH: How has the sociology program made an impact on other units at NSF? Are there any ways in which you have raised the consciousness of your counterparts in the engineering and biological sciences?

MA: We do joint reviewing of proposals. This is one area in which we do make other parts of the division more aware of sociology. It would be most unusual for any engineering program to come and see us about reviewing something. That isn't the sort of thing that they do. But we do get proposals from sociologists that have some content outside of sociology involving engineering, for example. In cases where social scientists are studying phenomenon of interest to engineers such as automation, which is a hot topic in engineering right now, we do bring it to the attention of colleagues in engineering. For example, we jointly review the proposal, then both engineering and sociology make decisions concerning the funding.

CBH: People ask about this review process and what's involved. How do people get to be reviewers, first of all, and what other observations can you make about the review process in the sociology program?

SP: The major way that people get to be reviewers is by having done work that is drawn upon in a proposal that we get. More generally, we are looking for people who have done work in the area. That's the minimum requirement in selecting a reviewer that the individual has conducted research relevant to the proposal. And obviously the more such research that the individual has done and the higher the quality of the research, the more likely the individual is going to be drawn on by us. The reviewers are a very central element in the decision making process, so we need to draw on people in whose judgments we can have confidence.

CBH: And so, are you continually trying to identify reviewers and select them?

MA: Yes. There are ongoing efforts.

CBH: Mark, you asked me to send a list of community college sociologists who might serve in this role. What was your interest?

MA: I'll tell you. One of our concerns in selecting reviewers is that we don't want all reviewers to be within a particular school of thought if we can help it. One thing we do try to do to some degree is select diverse people by way of background. Current ASA directories don't give us enough information. A name and an address. Also, you see, all things being equal, I'd like them to be diverse in terms of young and old. It puts a lot of premium on the use of the *ASA Guide to Graduate Departments* because, when all else fails, if you mention certain realms to me, and I need a reviewer, well, I've got places to look. If it's a proposal in demography and I can't find someone in that general area, there are certain schools that come to mind. But all I'm getting are people in the graduate programs.

CBH: Getting information about people who are from smaller schools would help make more balanced selections of reviewers, wouldn't it?

MA: Exactly. But I worry that we don't get to the people in the junior colleges which is why I asked for research-

oriented people from those schools.

CBH: What about the allegations of the politicization of research? Politicization among sociologists or in national politics? How have politics affected your program? Do those allegations show themselves in some particular way?

MA: My guess is that they don't. If you look at the report of the sociology program which is made public every year, any knowledgeable person who looks sees a diversity of projects by the usual criteria: specialty area; qualitative and quantitative; historical and contemporary; individual level social psych, macro-organizational, and societal. What people don't know would be if the rate of success for each type of proposal is the same or different. And I guess the only way people would know that would be if we could present a list of all proposals received with PI's name and institution and so on. But we can't do that.

SP: We could do something along those lines just in terms of quantitative/qualitative or subject matter to provide an indication of success rate. I don't know just what that would show.

CBH: What advice can you give to applicants to be more competitive in the funding process? What do you wish that you could pull people aside and advise them to do before they send in a proposal?

MA: Explain in enough detail what it is that they're doing and how they're doing it. Lots of people have gotten worse reviews than they think they deserve because they fail to describe in enough detail how they were going to do something and made others make too many assumptions and they weren't prepared to do that.

SP: The best advice I give to somebody who is preparing an NSF proposal is to find a couple of colleagues who are experts in the subject matter and who are the kinds of people that NSF would draw on as reviewers. Give the draft of the proposal to those individuals and say, "If NSF sent you this, what would you tell them?" Then take very seriously their comments and revise the draft.

CBH: How should people appropriately use you? Call, write, see you at meetings, or what?

MA: All of the above. But, the function Stan described, that colleagues who are experts should play, we can do a little of that but not as well. We will enter preliminary proposals. Write out a few pages giving us a sense of what it is that you have in mind. Certainly at the very least we can tell the author whether it's something that would be appropriate to develop for submission to the sociology program and sometimes more. The other thing that we do that is explicitly part of our role is to direct people elsewhere. Sometimes, when somebody has a project that really is not appropriate for the sociology program and we're aware of another agency that is interested in supporting research of that type, we're only too happy to direct them over there. Though we work for NSF, the official policy of NSF is that getting researchers to the right agency is an important part of our job.

SP: I am amazed at some of the questions we do get that it seems to me ought to be directed to the grants and contracts officers at the individuals' universities. They are paid to know a great deal about many different funding agencies. Mark and I have some awareness of other agencies, but I don't think we can do as good a job as most university grants and contracts officers.

See *Interview*, page 10

Interview, from page 9

CBH: So your sense is that people don't work with their own university people early enough or closely enough?

SP: Some people don't.

MA: I have one criticism of grants and contracts people. I've had a number of people call me, sociologists, whose grants and contracts people told them their budget should be a wish list, "Here's everything I'd love to have." The suggestion is not to worry, that NSF will cut back on the budget if it's a success. Beyond a certain point, I think a padded budget hurts one in the review process. Part of the way the budget is evaluated is to see whether the proposer of the research has a pretty good idea of what it will take to do this. If the person is asking for way too much or way too little, it leads us to feel it's one indicator that maybe they really hadn't thought this through, maybe they really don't know what it will take to do this and we don't really want to fund fishing expeditions. We want the spadework done and the budget can be a good instrument for giving us a sense as to whether this is more than a fishing expedition. I think somewhere in grants and contracts school they told grants and contracts officers, "Tell the faculty to make a wish list." Bad advice; they shouldn't listen.

CBH: Let me ask you about your dissertation program. Why don't you describe the dissertation support program?

MA: The dissertation grants are made to students and their advisors. I hope we can keep the funding at current level or increase it. It's important to help these young scientists. People can write to us for a brochure on the program.

SP: I've been taken aback at the number of calls we've gotten from students who don't realize that they cannot submit on their own. This must be an application through a faculty sponsor and it's my hope that faculty in sociology departments are serving as the first screen for our dissertation reviews. Because we are only able to fund the very best potential dissertations.

CBH: What can sociologists do about NSF funding in particular; what political pressure should they bring to bear to keep the funding at its current level or higher?

MA: I don't think that sociologists by themselves can do a whole lot. That's why there's COSSA. Now COSSA monitors all kinds of adverse legislation in the works that would affect the way all of us conduct our research. The social research community frequently is asked to help and to write to members of Congress and sometimes their local leaders. At NSF we don't lobby; we are not allowed to lobby but I personally think as a sociologist that there are issues that sociologists ought to be lobbying about and I think the forum is via COSSA.

SP: We're not allowed to lobby Congress although we can try to lobby within the Foundation to increase the size of sociology's budget.

CBH: You're new on the job, Mark. What ideas have you for what you'd like to do in this program and what initiatives do you hope to take in the next year with the program? Where do you want to leave your impact?

MA: I think it's too early in the planning stages for me to talk about it. However, I think that will soon change, and we look forward to sharing these plans with *Footnotes* readers in the near future. □

NSF, from page 7

Pamela B. Walters, Indiana University, Bloomington, "National Factors Affecting Achievement in Math and Science and Resulting Economic Growth in the Post-World War II United States," \$75,000.

Frederick D. Weil, University of Chicago, "A Second Chance for Liberal Democracy: Popular Support in Post-Authoritarian European Regimes," \$71,182.

Camille B. Wortman and Carol-Ann Emmons, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, "Stress and the Coping Process: Role Strain and Role Conflict in Women Professionals," \$134,997 (jointly sponsored).

Morris Zelditch, Stanford University, "Legitimation and Stability of Authority," \$74,973.

Continuing Awards

Howard E. Aldrich, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, "Collaborative Research on the Creation and Persistence of Business Interest Associations," \$4,099.

Judith R. Blau, SUNY-New York, "Collaborative Research on Metropolitan Social Structures and Cultural Activities," \$23,609.

Peter M. Blau, Columbia University,

"Collaborative Research on Metropolitan Social Structure and Cultural Activities," \$41,391.

Ronald S. Burt, Columbia University, "Inter-Corporate Relationships and Market Constraints," \$62,401.

James A. Davis and Thomas W. Smith, National Opinion Research Center, "The General Survey, 1983-1987," \$635,183.

Joseph Galaskiewicz, University of Minnesota, "Nonprofit Response to Shifting Resource Markets," \$5,859.

Leo A. Goodman, University of Chicago, "Statistical Models and Methods for the Analysis of Discrete Variables in Social and Economic Science," \$96,000 (jointly funded).

Ronald D. Hedlund, William J. Kritek, and Ronald L. Lindgrin, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, "Effects of Organizational, Demand Making and Environmental Variables on State Legislative Policy Making," \$7,490 (jointly funded).

Charles Kadushin, CUNY Graduate School and University Center, "Micro-Computers and Social Networks," \$30,000 (jointly funded)

J. Scott Long, Washington State University, "Sex Differences in the Scientific Career," \$3,857.

Alejandro Portes, Johns Hopkins University, "The Adaptation Process of Cuban and Haitian Refugees in the United States," \$131,512.

Marshall Robinson, Russell Sage Foundation, "The 1980 Census Monograph Series" (partial funding), \$15,300 (jointly funded).

Joe L. Spaeth, University of Illinois, Urbana, "Relational Authority and Resources Control as Determinants of Earnings," \$9,923.

Harriet Zuckerman and Jonathan A. Cole, Columbia University, "Careers and Research Performance of Men and Women Scientists," \$86,579.

Dissertation Awards

Sidney Goldstein and Sally Findley, Brown University, \$2,483.

Robert M. Hauser and David B. Grusky, University of Wisconsin, Madison, \$5,093.

Paul M. Hirsch and Marilyn E. Lashley, University of Chicago, \$3,700.

John Meyer and Frank R. Dobbin, Stanford University, \$4,920.

Robert W. Rice and Virginia J. Vanderville, SUNY-Buffalo, \$2,500.

Harvey K. Schwartzweiler and Andrew P. Davidson, Michigan State University, \$5,143.

W.R. Scott and Batya B. Weinreb, Stanford University, \$4,080.

Teresa A. Sullivan, Dudley L. Poston and Richard G. Rogers, University of Texas, Austin, \$1,041. □

NIMH, from page 7

Glen H. Elder, Jr., Cornell University and the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, "Family Influences and Child Behavior in Life Span," \$89,971 (jointly funded) and "Behavioral Influence of Military Service," \$99,757.

Robert S. Lauffer, Center for Policy Research, New York, "A Study of Veterans: Impact of the Vietnam War," \$47,192.

James L. Peterson, Child Trends, Inc., Washington, "Marital Conflict and Behavior Problems in Children," \$50,067.

Morris Rosenberg, University of Maryland, "Self-esteem and Social Integration in Adolescence," \$76,987.

The Clinical Research Branch funded *Karolynn Siegel*, Memorial Hospital for Cancer and Allied Diseases, New York, "AIDS Risk Groups—Predicting Changes in Sexual Practices," \$49,166.

The Research Scientists Development Programs funded six projects: *Naomi Breslau*, Case Western Reserve University, "Child Disability and the Family," \$38,961.

Mary R. Jackman, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, "Intergroup Attitudes and Group Consciousness," \$52,704.

Ronald C. Kessler, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, "Stress Models for High Risk Populations," \$53,136.

Robert E. Roberts, University of Texas Health Science Center, Houston, "Mexican American Health and Social Factors," \$57,975.

Lee N. Robins, Washington University, St. Louis, "Epidemiology of Achievement and Psychiatric Status," \$56,510.

Roberta G. Simmons, University of Minnesota, "Social Structure and the Self-image," \$54,432.

The Center for Studies of Mental Health of the Aging funded three projects:

Beverly A. Baldwin, University of Maryland, Baltimore, "Research Development in Geriatric Mental Health," \$51,300.

Susan J. Frank, Illinois Institute of Technology, "Aging Parents, Young

Adult Children and Mental Health," \$145,580.

Walter S. Poulshock, Benjamin Rose Institute, Cleveland, "Caring for Elders and Mental Health of Family Members," \$136,787.

Nine projects were funded by the Center for Studies of Antisocial and Violent Behavior. Among these were:

Richard A. Berk, University of California, Santa Barbara, "A Socio-Economic Approach to Family Violence," \$78,127.

Mary L. Durham, University of Washington, "Legal Intervention in Involuntary Civil Commitment," \$91,778 (jointly funded).

Delbert S. Elliott, Behavioral Research Institute, Boulder, "The Dynamics of Deviant Behavior—A National Survey," \$359,182.

Virginia A. Hiday, North Carolina State University, "Civil Commitment Evaluation—Individual Outcome," \$142,514.

Don E. Merten, Northwestern University, "Dynamics of Early Adolescent Development and Delinquency," \$113,417.

Steven P. Segal, Scientific Analysis Corporation, San Francisco, "Indexing Civil Commitment Criteria in Psychological Emergency," \$58,971.

Linda A. Teplin, Northwestern Memorial Hospital, Chicago, "Mental Disorder in an Urban Jail," \$153,334 (jointly funded).

The Center for the Prevention and Control of Rape funded the following projects:

Martha R. Burt, Urban Institute, Washington, DC, "Self-help Groups and Recovery from Rape," \$158,290.

Jennie McIntyre, Eisenhower Foundation for Prevention of Violence, "Rape, Resistance and Injury, a Follow-up Study," \$67,684.

Vicki M. Rose, Southern Methodist University, "The Attribution of Justice in Rape and Sexual Assault Cases," \$16,800.

Nancy M. Shields, Policy Research and Planning Group, St. Louis, "Victim Reaction to Marital Rape and Battering," \$76,832.

The Center for Studies of Minority Group Mental Health funded five projects:

Douglas T. Gurak, Fordham University, "Hispanic Migrants in New York Settlement," \$75,968.

William T. Liu, University of Illinois, Chicago, "The Pacific/Asian American Mental Health Research Center," \$396,133.

Robert E. Roberts, University of Texas Health Science Center, Houston, "Diagnosing Hispanic Psychiatric Patients," \$279,768.

Rafaela R. Robles, University of Puerto Rico, "Assessment of Mental Health Needs in Puerto Rico," \$144,224.

Lloyd H. Rogler, Fordham University, "Hispanic Research Center," \$467,185.

The Center for Prevention Research supported the following projects.

Margaret Ensminger, Johns Hopkins University, "Paths to Adolescent Drug and Mental Health Problems," \$137,810.

Alexander F. Mamak, National Office of Samoan Affairs, San Francisco, "Native American Samoan Preventive Intervention Project," \$122,975.

Sarah L. Rosenfield, University of California, Irvine, "Women and Depression: Relative Power and Risk," \$44,121.

Kenneth I. Spemmer, Duke University, "Work and Self in the Early Career," \$67,628.

William A. Vega, San Diego State University, "Hispanic Social Network Prevention Intervention Study," \$423,872.

Robert S. Weiss, University of Massachusetts, Boston, "Work Setting and the Processes of Relational Support," \$52,910 and "Work and Relational Buffers Against Stress Symptoms," \$55,137. □

Open Forum

Whyte Revisited: Further Thoughts on Improving Annual Meetings

William Foote Whyte's (1981) reflexive approach to Annual Meetings is timeless and was an instant classic. His words have ever since weighed on our minds, most heavily during our annual pilgrimages to and from professional meetings. Just as all conference participants are required to register and be association members, all participants should also be required to read (and re-read prior to every participation) Whyte's sage admonitions. Taking to heart his call for more reflexive sociology, we further consider the functions of professional meetings of sociology as a "...common culture pattern shared by sociologists, anthropologists, social psychologists, political scientists, and economists, at least insofar as it is represented in such Annual Meetings" (Whyte, 1981: 1).

While Whyte (1981: 1) notes that Annual Meetings serve a variety of functions, he focuses on the ostensible purpose of such meetings, "the communication of the results of research and theoretical analysis." However, in acknowledging the propriety of Whyte's advice, particularly his admonition to not burden the audience with data but to reserve that for the written report (Whyte, 1981: 2), this manifest function becomes antiquated, at least in the current format of the meetings. By their very nature, our Annual Meetings then assume the archaic trappings of medieval scholarship when the exchange of ideas and the perusal of single-copy, hand-written manuscripts require travel and an Annual Meeting-type forum. However, with Gutenberg, Alexander Graham Bell, and the interactive compatibilities of personal computers com-

ing of age, such "convention-going" migration seems an archaic, cultural survival, at least for the expressed purpose.

Contributing to the survival of the annual, antiquated, professional reunions is the holy trinity of tenure and promotion: teaching, research, and service. In the bureaucratic structure of the university, vis a vis Whyte's (1981: 1) own assessment, it is quite important for the faculty member to participate professionally even though the quality of that participation is never quite fully measured. Perhaps the "catch-22" is that while session chairs do not want to prevent anyone from attending the meetings by rejecting a paper (Whyte, 1981: 1) or find themselves accepting "marginal" papers or paper proposals to facilitate the session making, the university considers acceptance of a paper sufficient evidence of its merits. It further assumes that if the paper is significant enough for presentation, the presentation itself will be significant by default; i.e., each discipline and its various professional associations are assumed to be doing their own gatekeeping.

If the manifest function of our Annual Meetings is archaic and inefficient, as we suggest, the reflexive response entails an examination of the meetings' other functions, alluded to by Whyte, to explain their survival. In several ways, our professional meetings assume the symbolic and ritualistic functions of religion. Durkheim, in 1912, offered his explanation of religion as a universal institution. Consider the parallels between the functions of religion for a social group and the functions of Annual Meetings for a professional group. The performance of religious rituals serves a

"...disciplinary and preparatory function, ...prepares an individual for social living by imposing on him self-discipline...constraints...controls" (Alpert, 1961:199). In an analogous fashion, our professional meetings, whether regional or national, fulfill a similar socialization function; graduate students and new faculty are encouraged to attend and participate as the way to prepare for living as a sociologist. Such meetings reveal what "real" sociology is all about, providing insight into the self-discipline (of research) required throughout the year to warrant and justify annual attendance and participation. Religious "ceremony brings people together and thus serves to reaffirm their common bonds and to enhance and reinforce social solidarity" (Alpert, 1961:200). Similarly, Annual Meetings provide a consciousness of kind, proclaiming that all in attendance are a part of the congregation of sociology. Religious rituals also serve the function of revitalization. "If society is to be kept alive, its members must be made keenly aware of their social heritage" (Alpert, 1961:200). Within the university as community, the various disciplines are analogous to Greeley's (1972) "denominational society," each discipline reflecting its distinct background. This identity function provides continuity to the past and future and is facilitated by thematic and plenary sessions, Fest-schriften, and so on. Finally, religious ceremony and ritual "...establish a condition of social euphoria, i.e., a pleasant feeling of social well-being" (Alpert, 1961:201). Certainly our hospitality suites and social hours contribute to our euphoria, but perhaps more importantly

Annual Meetings take on an air of a family reunion. The convention town is important for its selection of restaurants to facilitate the reunion of relationships outside the context of the convention proper.

Given these parallels, the survival of our meetings seems assured. However, we suggest that Whyte's proposals (1981:2-3) and one of our own would realize the manifest value of our quasi-religious rituals by increasing the efficiency of the "...communication of the results of research and theoretical analysis" (Whyte 1981:1). Whyte proposes changing the culture pattern within our Annual Meetings. However, if the format of our meetings is antiquated and inefficient, then a new forum is in order. We offer the following alternative, replete with all its own problems and difficulties.

Most regional meetings occur in late March or April. Completed papers with well-developed abstracts could be submitted to session chairs by November 15. Abstracts could be published and distributed with the program by February 1. While this time frame is not generous, it would be sufficient to assess papers and form new sessions if necessary. All Association members would receive copies of the program and abstracts and would then write directly to the authors to obtain copies of the papers (based on their assessment of the abstracts). Many participants already make copies of their papers available at the sessions or provide sign-up sheets for those requesting copies of their papers. Thus, there is no reason to assume that our method would produce an inordinately larger request for

See Meetings, page 12

Barriers Between Sociology

We need to determine the sources of barriers that have been unduly erected between sociology and society and remove those that are inappropriate. In recent years, in area after area in which sociology once made major contributions to the understanding of society and to its change, barriers have risen that hinder sociological research and service to the community. For example, despite some important recent contributions, industrial sociology has almost disappeared over the last years. The "Japanization" of American factories and offices is taking place largely without the benefit of sociological study and guidance.

The resulting losses are not limited to sociology as a discipline (in terms of research sites, resources, and opportunities for theoretical developments) and as a profession (loss of jobs and opportunities to serve). Society also loses. For example, the recent preoccupation by managers with "corporate culture" is often rather naive. Managers tend to assume that corporate culture can be re-directed more or less at will, changed from authoritarian to open by executive order. There is little understanding of the intricate sociological processes that are involved in the formation and evolution of cultures and sub-cultures. The result is that attempts to change corporate cultures often backfire, at a considerable loss to productivity, American ability to compete overseas, and to employees' dignity. Similarly, there are numerous other areas in which sociolo-

gists used to make major contributions but have been less able to do so in recent years: public opinion, criminology, race relations, and socialization, among others.

The reasons barriers have risen are many and to a significant extent unstudied. (The sociological shoemaker's feet are quite bare). In part, barriers have been growing due to internal developments. For example, sociological theory has been more divided in recent years than it used to be twenty years ago. However, to a large extent the barriers that hinder sociological advancement and contributions to society are externally imposed. Legislation and regulations are a case in point. In many public jobs, in which sociologists might well serve, the requirements call for a psychologist.

Job specifications, not set by law but governed by prevailing norms and expectations, are another source of our difficulties. Personnel officers, both in the private and in the public sector, when recruiting for positions that might be well served by individuals with sociological training, learn to look for psychologists, political scientists, economists, or even accountants.

When sociologists are retained, too often it is sub rosa. Otto Larsen reports that in the early 1980 there were 121 sociological positions in the federal labor force, but 418 sociologists worked for the federal government. The reason for the discrepancy is that frequently sociol-

ogists cannot be hired if they present themselves as sociologists and must "pass" by pointing to some other qualifications. It might be said that this is a matter of limited importance; however, the fact that sociologists must work under other labels will tend to lower the visibility of sociology as the source of their contribution, to prevent them from serving as role models for other sociologists, and to generally reflect—and reinforce—the lack of acceptance of sociology.

In other areas, ignorance is a root cause. The contributions sociologists may make are not known. For instance, until recently the arm of Congress that examines and evaluates hundreds of government programs, including numerous social ones, the General Accounting Office (GAO), retained no sociologists, although it employs some 4,350 professionals. (It now has about four). GAO uses large numbers of accountants and people trained in the FBI's school of investigations. They examine "transactions" in order to assess the effectiveness of programs such as mental health community centers, Head Start, and bi-lingual education. These professionals are typically neither trained nor interested in system-analysis (as we understand the term), nor particularly versed in organizational sociology. The result is often inadequate analysis, poor input to program managers, poor service to their clientele, and a loss of major opportunities for sociology to

develop relevant parts of our discipline.

There are other factors that come to mind, ranging from a blurry public identity (most people seem not to know what sociology is all about) to fuzzy presentations of self. My purpose here is not to provide an analysis of the various barriers, but to highlight the need for systematic action-studies on the issue. By action-studies I mean that we should, as an association, promote and support the study of barriers between sociology and society, and act to remove those that are inappropriate. We may start modestly by examining those in one major public agency and one private sub-sector. Once we are successful in overcoming barriers, in opening new vistas, and re-opening old ones to sociologists, we may expand our reach.

Throughout this discussion I discussed barriers as impediments. One qualification is called for. I do not hold that all barriers are inappropriate. There ought to be some separation of society and science; a discipline should not be expected to be always (or prematurely) on call to serve; and academic freedom requires a measure of protection. Hence the efforts to reduce barriers must proceed selectively and carefully. However, those based on discriminatory laws, regulations, ignorance, and so forth, should not be allowed to stand, for the sake of our discipline and the society.

Amitai Etzioni
George Washington University □

Open Forum

Communicating Sociology as a Useful Humanistic Science at the State Level

State sociological associations traditionally have been seen as playing a more circumscribed role, than national and regional associations, in focusing on teaching, local research and issues of concern to small colleges. While these issues are undeniably important, the time has passed when we can afford to limit the interests of state associations in this way.

For a number of years, sociologists have been reevaluating the social role of the practitioners of the discipline. Before it ceased publication, *The American Sociologist* provided some especially useful discussions of this issue (see especially Gelfand, 1975; Street and Weinstein, 1975; Gray, 1979; Costner, 1979; Ewer, 1979; Klein, 1982). There are arguments for sociology that is important to human beings (Gray, 1979), for a sociological vision (Costner, 1979), for working on our image in the mass media (Ewer, 1979) and for theory and research with policy implications (Gibbs, 1979). These discussions describe the public understanding of the sociology as ambiguous at best.

As we continue to discuss the social roles of sociologists in the abstract, real problems for the discipline have developed. The recent discussions of the certification or licensing issue (Footnotes, 1984), in which we may find our ability to do applied sociology severely limited, provides an important example. The future may present one such "crisis" after another unless we move swiftly to communicate to the members of the society in which we live that sociology is a useful humanistic science. Although it is important that we confront this issue on national and regional levels, state associations are in a particularly advantageous position to deal with it. Members of state associations may interact on a one-to-one basis with people or groups who could use sociological knowledge and may share community concerns with these people or groups.

The North Carolina Sociological Association (NCSA) developed one

approach which other state associations might find useful. The NCSA is working toward moving sociology into the community by providing opportunities for sociologists, both academic and applied, to interact with potential "consumers" of sociology in three ways: 1) Sociologists and non-sociologists discussed the question "what can sociology offer society?" at an annual meeting; 2) a vita file is being generated by the state association; 3) a pamphlet describing "what sociology is" in a scholarly but readable manner is under development for distribution along with the vita file to business, government, human service organizations, mass media, and the interested public. In addition, methods are under exploration to deal with legislative issues that could potentially affect sociologists.

State Vita File

Sociologists need to take a positive approach to increasing their visibility. One method to deal with this problem is to generate a vita file on the state level. In the NCSA, the form for the vita file was published in the state newsletter, *Sociation*. Forms were also distributed at state meetings. Letters advising that the vita file is available are sent to business, human services organizations, the mass media, and public policy makers at the local, state and federal levels. A pamphlet will be made available along with the vita file explaining what sociology is and outlining the various areas in which sociology can provide useful information.

State Meetings

State meetings can provide a forum for communicating sociology to potential consumers of sociology and to raise the visibility of sociologists on the state level, as well as a context for discussion of the discipline. For example, the annual one-day state meeting centered on the theme, "Communicating Sociology as a Useful Humanistic Science." Hans Mauksch provided the keynote address, "What Can Sociology Offer Society?"

would force authors to commit themselves to final drafts earlier, due to the necessity of detailed abstracts. Session chairs and discussants under the current format often resent the surprise of significantly different versions, and since abstracts would not appear until the first of February, authors would have until the middle of February to make revisions. Further, since papers would benefit from such discussion, all papers would be seen as working, not final drafts; the emphasis is on discussion of paper topics and a particular presentation. The benefits of congregational (bilateral) participation far outweigh those of the unilateral preaching that we do annually.

Gary S. Foster
Richard L. Hummel
Eastern Illinois University

REFERENCES

- Alpert, Harry
1961 *Emile Durkheim and His Sociology*. New York: Russell and Russell.
- Greeley, Andrew M.
1972 *The Denominational Society*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Whyte, William Foote
1981 "Whyte describes common culture pattern of annual meetings." *ASA Footnotes* (January): 1-3. □

followed by panel discussions in which academic and applied sociologists talked with people in business and industry, public policy, human service organizations, and television and newspapers as a means of communicating sociology to the community and representatives of other disciplines, especially those where sociologists might get involved with "territory questions," such as business.

Some of the ideas emerging from the discussions that should be considered by members of the discipline are: (1) Sociologists must adjust to the expectations of non-sociologists, not by "selling out," but by broadening the base of those with whom we communicate our findings. This means, for example, writing clearly, using less jargon and using research skills to address questions with practical, as well as theoretical and methodological, implications. (2) Sociologists should learn to "fit into" the society in which they live and work—not by playing the role of a chameleon, but by behaving in ways that could facilitate communication. One of our board members, an applied sociologist, suggested that sociologists have not "paid their dues," meaning that improving the image of sociology in society might require considerably more time and effort than has been expended in the past. (3) Sociologists on the state level must work toward increasing their visibility as a discipline. Geographic closeness between sociologists and potential consumers of sociology, state and community problems in common and a common cultural milieu at the state level could facilitate increased communication between sociologists and the community.

What Should Sociologists Communicate?

Sociology has a much-discussed image problem (see Gelfand, 1975; Walum, 1975; Ewer, 1979; Klein, 1982). To clarify what we do as sociologists, we should communicate the sociological perspective emphasizing theory, methodology, and the liberal arts nature of the discipline. One limiting image of the discipline described by Ewer (1979) illustrates the problem: Sociologists are seen in the mass media as people who deal with some social problem, usually having to do with sex, violence or drugs. Sociologists are seen as "tolerant of deviants, tending to blame society rather than the person..." (Ewer, 1979:78).

Sociology includes a wide range of substantive areas, most of which are potentially useful and interesting to human beings (i.e., complex organizations, the sociology of the family and the economic order). We should raise our visibility in the mass media in terms of these substantive areas. One way to do this is to make literature available at state and local levels, outlining the sociological perspective and the substantive areas in the discipline.

Finally, we need to value what we do as sociologists. This goes beyond believing that what we do as consultants should have high monetary value (which we should believe and expect). It means understanding our discipline as a useful humanistic science and communicating a positive attitude about it toward the profession.

Catherine T. Harris
Wake Forest University
Winston-Salem, North Carolina
President, North Carolina State Sociological Association □

Good Ideas

Compiled by Carla B. Howery

■ The Department of Sociology at the State University of New York at New Paltz offers a Master's degree to inmates at the Eastern New York Correctional Facility. Nineteen inmates are currently working on their degrees. They turn to the subject matter at hand and, like many students, use their sociology to understand their personal experiences. One master's thesis is being written on the function of religious group members in prison; another on what kinds of behavioral changes occur among men approaching parole; and a third on a comparison of ethnic group identification inside and outside the prison.

The prison has a computer laboratory with IBM-PCs. The students use the Systat package to analyze data taken from a survey administered in the prison. Susan Philliber is the instructor for the data analysis course. The program was written up in the October 14, 1985, issue of *InfoWorld* computer magazine. For more information about the computer program or the prison program, contact Philliber at the Department of Sociology, SUNY-New Paltz, New Paltz, NY 12561.

■ Jim McCafferty is the chief of the Statistical Analysis and Reports Division of the United States Courts. He recently attended the annual meeting of the Society for Applied Sociology and the workshop on "Teaching Applied Sociology." He commented to his fellow sociologists that the courts have been one of the last government institutions studied by social scientists and not many sociologists at that. The courts have an intern program and if a student would like to work as an intern, inquiries should be sent to the Personnel Division, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, DC 20544. McCafferty also wrote a paper on ethics and work experience which outlines his duties at the court. He is willing to send copies of the paper and a list of court publications to interested persons. □

Rossi, Gallego Appointed to Council on Aging

Alice S. Rossi, University of Massachusetts-Amherst, and Daniel T. Gallego, Weber State College, are two of the five new members of the National Advisory Council on Aging, appointed by T. Franklin Williams, Director of NIA.

Rossi was selected for her outstanding work on adult development, family theory and gender roles, her past service on the Labor Citizens Council on the Status of Women, family Law and Policy, and for serving as advisor to the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.

Gallego has made significant contributions to gerontology at the state, regional and national levels during the past 10 years. He is a former member of the Board of Directors of the Western Gerontological Society and a founding member and past president of the National Hispanic Council on Aging. □

Meetings, from page 11

papers. Having the papers in advance would permit those interested to peruse and study them and develop questions, comments, and critiques. The meeting could then occur in late March or April. Since the papers would have already been presented in writing, they could then truly be discussed, with the audience serving the role of the discussant. As Whyte (1981:2) notes, keeping formal discussants off the platform would increase audience involvement, and the variety of comments and questions could be even more beneficial to the author(s). Certainly it is reasonable to assume that the audience would have a substantive interest in the session topic, and we can even imagine that some would attend sessions for these informed discussions.

Some might respond that our proposal would diminish attendance since the audience would already have copies of papers. Attendance now is not a prerequisite to obtaining papers, and we would hope that there would be a shift in emphasis from presenting papers to frankly discussing papers and issues. Others might respond that our proposal

Brajuha, from page 1

with a new-found attorney, Simon Wynn. Mr. Wynn argued that the subpoena be quashed based on Mario's two amendment rights and on the New York State "shield law" protecting certain types of disclosure. The judge agreed to hear arguments and held court until 6:30 p.m. the first day. All parties returned the following week with briefs on the legal questions. At this time it was difficult to make certain arguments due to the lack of knowledge of most participants as to what fieldnotes were in a concrete sense, i.e., their style, tone, form, and typical content. Mario and Attorney Wynn decided to permit in camera inspection of the notes by the judge but not by the D.A. When the judge heard some of the content he was convinced that Mario's claim to protect subjects from embarrassment was realistic.

While Judge Ain considered the case, Mario continued to negotiate with the Assistant D.A. and attempted to reach agreement to drop the subpoena by engaging in other investigative activities. This was unsuccessful but relieved some of the pressure from the D.A.'s office until the judge's decision. Judge Ain ruled against Mario and renewed pressure to surrender the notes. Attorney Wynn's strategy was to gain a stay of execution on the subpoena pending a full appeal on the first amendment and shield law questions. A few days after the stay was granted, the Federal District Attorney issued a subpoena for the same materials. After several bleak days, a new legal team headed by New York University Law Professor James Cohen took the federal case and initiated arguments based on the first amendment, fourth amendment "privacy rights," the state shield law and federal court rules capacity to create testimonial privileges.

Attorneys argued before Federal Judge Jack Weinstein who ruled for Mario declaring that "Serious scholars are entitled to no less protection than journalists." (583 F. Supp.: 993). The Federal D.A. appealed and after arguments before the U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, a three-judge panel reversed Judge Weinstein and remanded the case back for additional evidence. They did not reverse on the merits but required additional evidence to weigh the significance of the "scholar's privilege" as a legal innovation, and to determine Mario Brajuha's ability to claim standing. Along these lines, Mario's attorneys made preparations for additional established scholars to testify on the importance of confidentiality and the scholarly status of graduate students, and for Stony Brook faculty to testify on Mario's scholarly status and his research procedures. The Justices also contended that a scholar's privilege could not be absolute and therefore, Mario would have to declare which parts of his data were protected by confidentiality and personal privacy concerns, and which parts were not protected. Along these lines, Mario and several legal interns went over the notes line by line to prepare a redaction.

While these preparations were underway, the Federal D.A.'s office went through an organizational change and the new head decided to reevaluate the case. This led to several continuances after which they agreed to accept the redacted notes as fulfilling the subpoena. Shortly thereafter, negotiations with the county D.A. resulted in a similar agreement. A recent inquiry into the case by local reporters revealed a low likelihood

of continued investigation since the principles in the investigation had died during the over two year legal battle.

The Conclusion and Its Meaning

Both prosecutors avoided the possibility of establishing a scholar's testimonial privilege by withdrawing their subpoenas prior to a full-fledged argument. However, the case as it developed does have some use to scholars and offers suggestions on likely future litigation. The following briefly outlines these matters.

The case is useful in the early stages of legal difficulties. Since no clear legal protection exists, each researcher in a particular jurisdiction must convince legal authorities that confidentiality claims matter. Many have succeeded, but for those who find themselves in court, these reported cases give credibility to several legal bases for a motion to quash a subpoena.

Language in the Appeals Court decision offers an outline form of what is necessary to show for a scholar's privilege:

"Surely the application of a scholar's privilege, if it exists, requires a threshold showing consisting of a detailed description of the nature and seriousness of the scholarly study in question, of the methodology employed, of the need for assurances of confidentiality to various sources to conduct the study, and of the fact that the disclosure requested by the subpoena will seriously impinge upon that confidentiality." (750 F. 2d.: 225)

Exactly how these showings shall be made and what a "threshold" will be is not clear, of course, but at minimum, scholars entering court can prepare documentation and testimony on these aspects with some confidence of being heard.

In addition, the Justices extended the bases for protection by giving credibility to personal privacy concerns for the scholar. The argument here was that revelation of the scholar's work product would expose thoughts and speculation that are protected by that person's right to privacy. By permitting redaction of the notes to take privacy concerns into account, a more extensive base for protection is built.

Moreover, in permitting Mario and his attorneys to make determinations on both the confidentiality and privacy claims for the redaction, the court granted the researcher power to make those decisions. Since the trial did not recur, the extent of this is unclear. Judges have supervisory power over evidence and redacted notes before accepting them. Certainly, had the matter continued, the D.A. might have contested this. While it would be ludicrous to give the D.A. rights of review, it is unlikely that all judges will grant witnesses total power to prepare evidence. In any event, one could argue that the scholar has a major role in this process based on this result.

Along with these gains, there were tradeoffs and losses. Problem areas include the following, non-exhaustive account.

The courts were very clear that any scholar's privilege would be a limited or qualified one. That is, in the balancing test between protection of research and legal investigation, no absolute protection for scholars is likely. That means a case by case determination subject to the facts of the case, jurisdictional practices, legal practitioner idiosyncrasy and a host of other influences that affect

judicial decision-making.

That balancing test would not protect some evidence. For example, Mario gave testimony on his observations that he deemed not protected by confidentiality. That he did so was part of the argument that other data be granted protection. Absent blanket protection, the courts will weigh the relevance and significance of researcher testimony, the degree to which it will impinge on research to disclose, the availability of alternative sources for the same evidence. In this case, neither D.A. made a clear argument for needing Mario's fieldnotes for their investigations since they did not know what was in the notes or what fieldnotes were like. Not all researchers will be able to trade off testimony and some research data is likely to be perfectly clear with relevance easily established.

Since the state and federal investigations were founded on different laws pertaining to the same event, each had jurisdiction but which would be controlling regarding the privilege is not clear cut. Certainly constitutional protections would control but a federal decision to limit evidence based on court procedures to supervise evidence would not necessarily affect any other court. In this case, the county D.A. awaited the outcome of the federal case since some of its arguments would preempt any state claims.

It is unclear who can claim a scholar's privilege. One of the arguments by the Federal D.A. was that Mario was not a serious scholar and Judge Weinstein had asserted this protection for serious scholars. While the D.A. had conceded this matter at trial, it successfully emerged later. We are of the opinion that Mario would be protected since he was working on dissertation research. However, it is not clear who would fit the definition of serious scholar. Would an undergraduate research assistant fit? Do graduate students not yet researching the dissertation fit? Must a researcher be part of a university? Do commercial researchers qualify as scholars? Are program administrators collecting data for evaluation purposes serious scholars? Who is protected and how a claim to privilege would be established remain murky.

Even with a successful claim to serious scholar status, not all evidence pertaining to research may be protected. Nejeleski and Pysner (1975) discuss four types of evidence: subject identities, content of subject revelations, researcher observation and researcher work product. Some decisions regarding statutory protections have granted privilege to one type and not to others. Since much of confidentiality is based on protection of specific persons, problems arise when legal authorities want overviews of a place. For example, at one point, the County Assistant D.A. suggested that he might find evidence of changes in popularity of the restaurant in Mario's notes. This might aid in developing circumstantial evidence for an arson charge. No particular person would be identified in the data. Further, it is not clear whether information learned in the researcher role but incidental to the research plan would be protected. Certainly researchers will have to include this possibility in their documentation of confidentiality assurances or be subject to having it rejected.

Most legal questions involving research have arisen in criminal investigations. It is less clear what position the courts will take with respect to

criminal defense. Indeed, Federal Judge Weinstein explicitly mentioned subpoena on behalf of a defendant as shifting the balance and possibly requiring disclosure. That point was never reached in this case due to the unfortunate coincidence of both key suspects dying. It is possible that sixth amendment rights to a full defense may outweigh scholarly concerns. In one limited case this seems appropriate. Since the courts make it clear that protections are accorded to relationships rather than objects, it might be desirable to waive confidentiality when disclosure would benefit a research subject, i.e., when a subject is a defendant in a criminal action. This could lead to the irony of a defendant forcing the disclosure of evidence damaging to his or her case. This prospect might limit the likelihood of defense commands.

Overall, the case resulted in positive gains but celebration is subdued by the questions and problems that remain. It is likely that more researchers will face subpoenas, but, as in the past, few cases will move to the appellate level. Since the law is a fluid and changing phenomenon, scholars will have to fight to retain what positive developments this case offers as prosecutors are likely to chip away at every word. This will probably be done best outside of court through better preventative and educative measures.

Lyle Hallowell
SUNY-Stony Brook

REFERENCES AND CASES

- Nejeleski, Paul and Howard Pysner. "A Researcher's Shield Statute: Guarding Against the Compulsory Disclosure of Research Data." Appendix B in Committee on Federal Agency Evaluation Research. *Protecting Individual Privacy in Evaluation Research*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences, 1975.
- 750 F. 2d. 233 (1984) "In Re Grand Jury Subpoena Dated January 4, 1984." United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit.
- 583 F. Supp. 991 "In Re Grand Jury Subpoena Dated January 4, 1984." United States District Court, Eastern District of New York. □

Teaching Materials on Death and Dying Sought

Materials are requested for the following ASA Teaching Resources Center publication: *Syllabi and Instructional Materials for Sociology of Death and Dying Courses*. Any of the following contributions would be appreciated: syllabi, course outlines, classroom exercises, research projects, bibliographies, films, etc. Interdisciplinary and cross-cultural materials as well as sociological materials are sought. Materials used in the publication will be identified according to contributor and institution. Please send materials to Gerry R. Cox or Ronald J. Fundis, Department of Sociology, Fort Hays State University, 600 Park Street, Hays, KS 67601-4099. □

Annual Meeting

The Section on Comparative Sociology organizes organizers for 1986 program sessions: (1) "Gender and Social Reproduction," Barbara Laslett, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455. (2) "Organization and Social Structure," Jon Miller, Department of Sociology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA 90098-0032; and Thomas F. Gieryn, Department of Sociology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405. (3) Invited Panel Discussion: "Historical Continuity as Explanation and the Explanation of Historical Continuities," Dietrich Rueschmeyer, Department of Sociology, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912.

The Medical Sociology Section invites papers for an evening session on "Dispersions in Progress," sponsored by the section's student representatives. Graduate students in medical sociology, medical anthropology and related health sciences are invited to submit papers, prepared as a 15-minute presentation on substantive content and process issues related to doctoral research. Eligible students should not have received their degrees earlier than December 1985. Submissions must be received in duplicate by April 1, 1986. Send one copy each to: Adele Clarke, Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences, N631, University of California, San Francisco, CA 94143, (415) 821-4162; and Jane McLeod, 2511 Pittsfield Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48104, (313) 763-5035.

A session on "The Sociology of Taxation" has been added to the 1986 Annual Meeting program. Papers are being solicited on the structure of tax non-compliance, tax history and tax protest movements, value systems and tax laws, cross-national comparisons, and the politics of taxation. Papers should be sent by February 1, 1986 to: Dr. Pat White or Dr. Bruce Wiegand, Internal Revenue Service, 1111 Constitution Avenue NW, PM:PPFR, Room 3129, Washington, DC 20224.

Call for Papers

CONFERENCES

Academy of Management Annual Meetings, August 13-16, 1986, Chicago, IL. Original papers and symposia are invited on issues related to health care organization and management. Papers must be no more than 21 pages including title page, abstract, footnotes, etc., and should follow the Academy's format. Symposium proposals must include a 3-5 page overview statement, as well as a statement from each participant. Four copies should be submitted by January 14, 1986 to: Martin P. Charns, Program Chair, HCA Division, Academy of Management, c/o Health Management Programs, Boston University School of Management, 685 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215.

Arkansas Undergraduate Sociology Seventh Annual Symposium, April 4, 1986, Hendrix College, Conway, AR. Interested participants should send abstracts of no more than 200 words indicating topic and summary of intended remarks. Abstracts will not be returned and must be received no later than March 17, 1986. For further information, contact: James R. Bruce, Department of Sociology, Hendrix College, Conway, AR 72032; (501) 329-6811, x307.

Center for the Study of Local Issues Second National Conference, May 16-17, 1986, Brookdale Community College, Lincroft, NJ. Theme: "Local Research and Local Research Centers."

Proposals are invited for papers, poster sessions, research designs or questionnaires, discussion sessions, and workshop, display or other innovative presentations. One-page proposals should include type of presentation, abstract and media or other support needed. Submit by January 30, 1986 to: Coordinator, CSLI/Second National Conference, Center for the Study of Local Issues, 101 College Parkway, Arnold, MD 21012.

First National Freestanding Clinical Sociology Association Annual Meeting, June 19-22, 1986, Thornfield Conference Center, Cazenovia, NY. All proposals must be submitted in triplicate and be received no later than January 15, 1986. Submit abstracts to: Jean Thoresen, Department of Sociology and Applied Social Relations, Eastern Connecticut State University, Willimantic, CT 06226; (203) 456-2231, x7532 or 6870. For further details, contact: Jonathan Freedman, Education and Training, Hutchings Psychiatric Institute, P.O. Box 27, University Station, Syracuse, NY 13210; (315) 473-4980.

Culture and Communication Sixth International Conference, October 9-11, 1986, Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, PA. The conference schedules approximately 250 presentations (panels and individual papers) involving the following themes: Communication Theory; Research Methodology and Philosophy of Social Science; Interpersonal Interaction; Government, Industry and Culture; Mass Media and Acculturation; and Art as Cultural Artifact. Deadline for submissions is March 3, 1986. For proposal forms and further information, contact: Sari Thomas, Director, Institute of Culture and Communication, Temple University (RTF), Philadelphia, PA 19122; (215) 787-8725.

International Congress of the International Institute of Sociology, June 16-20, 1986, Albufeira, Portugal. Papers are solicited for a panel on "Revolution and Reaction in Contemporary Central America." Submissions from non-members and non-sociologists and from those living and working in Central America are sought. Send papers or a detailed abstract to: Harvey Williams, Department of Sociology, University of the Pacific, Stockton, CA 95211; (209) 946-2101.

Inter-University Consortium for International Social Development 1986 International Symposium, August 23-27, 1986, Tokyo, Japan. Theme: "Development for Peace: Strategies for Action." Abstracts of papers for plenary, workshop or other sessions must be typed, double-spaced, and must not exceed 300 words. Five copies of each abstract should be sent by December 31, 1985 to: Rama Pandey, Co-Chair, Program Planning Committee, School of Social Work, University of Minnesota, 400 Ford Hall, 224 Church Street, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Society for the Study of Social Problems 1986 Annual Meeting, August 27-29, 1986, New York, NY. The Educational Problems Section invites contributed papers or panel proposals on educational problems of theoretical, research or political orientation. Send completed manuscript or two-page proposals by January 1, 1986 to: Rozanne M. Brooks, Chair, SSPS Educational Problems Section, Department of Sociology/Anthropology, State University of New York College, Cortland, NY 12045.

World Congress of Sociology, August 26-28, 1986, Calcutta, India. Papers are invited for a post-congress workshop on "Ideology, Social Formation and Transformation." Of particular interest are papers reflecting empirical research in the sub-themes "Social Formation and Ideology," "Ideology

and Social Transformation" and "Ideology in Society," but purely theoretical formulations are also welcome. Contact: Suraj Bandyopadhyay, Coordinator, Indian Statistical Institute, 203 Barrackpore Trunk Road, Calcutta 700 035, India.

1986 Conference on Science in the National Parks, July 13-16, 1986, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO. Papers are invited that discuss, evaluate and present the results of research in the social, cultural and natural sciences in the National Park system. Abstracts are due January 1, 1986, and should be sent to: Raymond Herrman or Calvin R. Cummings, Conference Co-Chairs, 339 Aylesworth Hall NW, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523; (303) 491-7573 or (303) 221-5341.

Social Stress Research Second National Conference, June 2-3, 1986, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH. A major theme of the conference will focus on the stress of boredom, loneliness and loss. Completed papers or abstracts are invited and should be received by January 17, 1986. For more information, contact: Kimberly Vogt, Conference Coordinator, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Horton Social Science Center, University of New Hampshire, Durham, NH 03824.

Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction 1986 Annual Meeting. Papers are invited for sessions organized around the following topics: symbolic interactionism and deviant behavior, women and fieldwork, interactionism and community life, and new empirical investigations in symbolic interactionism. Deadline for submission of papers is March 1, 1986. For further information, contact: Peter Adler, Department of Sociology, University of Tulsa, 600 South College, Tulsa, OK 74104.

Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction Annual Symposium, April 30-May 2, 1986, University of Iowa. Theme: "Information, Communication and Social Structure." Tentative sessions include interpersonal communication; communication and information in non-industrial societies; formal theories of communication; communication, information flow and morality; information and the construction of scientific knowledge; and telecommunication, computers and social structures. Completed drafts of empirical or conceptual papers should be submitted no later than February 15, 1986 to: Carl J. Couch or David R. Maines, Department of Sociology, University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242.

Western Anthropology/Sociology Undergraduate Research 13th Annual Conference, March 8, 1986, Santa Clara University. Empirical, theoretical and review papers are invited. Drafts of papers or detailed abstracts (statement of problem, theoretical perspective, key literature, methodology, findings, and conclusions) with names of student author(s) and faculty sponsor(s) should be submitted by February 5, 1986 to: Alma M. Garcia, Department of Anthropology/Sociology, Santa Clara University, Santa Clara, CA 95053; (408) 554-4511.

PUBLICATIONS

Ethnicity and Aging: Current Perspectives invites papers for a new volume. Major topics will include theoretical perspectives, social issues, and policy and practice. Papers should address these topics as they relate to any aspect of ethnic elderly. Papers on recent immigrant groups are especially welcomed. Send a one- to two-page prospectus to: Donald E. Gelland, School of Social Work and Community Planning, University of Maryland, Baltimore, MD 21201; or Charles M. Barresi, Department of Sociology, University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325.

India: Contemporary Issues, an upcoming anthology, has issued a second call for papers. Papers should be relatively jargon-free and geared to advanced undergraduates. Theoretical and research oriented papers on a variety of topics are sought. Send completed papers in ASR format by February 1, 1986 to: Linda Lindsey, Department of Social Sciences, St. Louis College of Pharmacy, 4588 Parkway Place, St. Louis, MO 63110.

International and Intercultural Communication Annual invites manuscripts for Volume 11, tentatively titled "Current Research in Cross-Cultural Adaptation." Manuscripts should be typed double-spaced using APA style, not exceeding 30 pages. Submit four copies along with a 100-150 word abstract to: Young Y. Kim, Editor, College of Arts and Sciences, Governors State University, University Park, IL 60466; (312) 534-5000, x2302.

Journal of Family Issues invites reports of research and "think pieces" for the September 1986 issue, devoted to "Death and the Family." Four copies of papers should be sent by February 15, 1986 to: Nancy Wedemeyer, Editor, Department of Home Economics, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712.

The Journal of Voluntary Action Research invites manuscripts for a special issue on "Homelessness: The Voluntary Response to Unemployment, Deinstitutionalization, and Gentrification." Manuscripts should be between 3,000-5,000 words, double-spaced and in the journal's style. Authors should submit four copies of manuscripts and a 50-word abstract to: Ann A. Abbott, Guest Editor, Rutgers University, Social Work Department, 327 Cooper Street, Camden, NJ 08102.

Studies in Communications invites original papers on the theme "The Chilling Effect: Censorship and Libel" for Volume IV. Papers of up to 10,000 words will be considered. Contributions should be sent to: Thelma McCormack, Department of Sociology, York University, 4700 Keele Street, Downsview, North York, Ontario, Canada M3J 1P3.

University of Florida, Graduate School Monographs in the Social Sciences, seeks high-quality unpublished works on any theoretical and/or empirical social scientific topic. The accepted manuscript will receive an offer of publication through the University Presses of Florida. Manuscripts should be 125-225 pages double-spaced; authors should first submit a brief prospectus on the analysis and conclusion of the work. Deadline for submission is February 15, 1986. Contact: George E. Pozzetta, Department of History, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611.

Meetings

March 6-9, Second Annual Parenting Symposium, Franklin Plaza Hotel, Philadelphia, PA. Contact: Parenting Symposium, P.O. Box 1344, Oak Brook, IL 60522; (312) 969-0318.

March 13-14, Independent Sector/United Way Institute Spring Research Forum, Vista International Hotel, New York, NY. Theme: "Philanthropy, Voluntary Action and the Public Good." Contact: Independent Sector, 1828 L Street NW, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 223-8100.

March 19-22, Southwestern Sociological Association 1986 Meetings, Menger Hotel/Convention Center, San Antonio, TX. Theme: "Human Rights and the Quality of Life." Contact: Al Short, Program Chair, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Southwest Texas State University, San Marcos, TX 78666-4616; (512) 245-2113.

March 20-21, Seventh Conference on the Small City and Regional Community, University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point. Theme: "Economic Development: Sources, Issues and Impacts." Contact: Center for the Small City, 451 Collins, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point, WI 54481.

March 23-26, Census Bureau Second Annual Research Conference, Sheraton International Conference Center, Reston, VA. Theme: "Nonsampling Error." Contact: Center for Survey Methods Research, Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC 20233.

March 26-29, Midwest Sociological Society 50th Annual Meeting, Marriott Hotel, Des Moines, IA. Theme: "Social Change: Its Origins, Direction and Consequences." Contact: John Clark, President-Elect/Program Chair, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, 1114 Social Science Building, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

March 27-29, University of Michigan Women's Studies Program Conference, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Theme: "Women and Memory." Contact: Martha Vicinus, Director, Women's Studies Program, 234 West Engineering, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109.

Funding

Brown University, Population Studies and Training Center, invites applications for postdoctoral fellowships beginning in 1986 for a period of 6-12 months. Fellows receive free tuition, a monthly stipend, office space, and support services. Applications are invited from university faculty or government research and policy officials, foreign social scientists, or social science faculty who would benefit from a year of research and study in population studies. Applications are due January 15, 1986. For further information, contact: Sidney Goldstein, Director, Population Studies and Training Center, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912; (401) 863-1115 or 2668.

Center for Russian and East European Studies announces the availability of a Mellon Foundation-funded postdoctoral fellowship to support significant research projects in any area of the Center. Fellows must be in residence in Ann Arbor. Stipend will be \$18,000. Applications must be received by February 15, 1986 and should include a curriculum vitae, statement of teaching/research interests, and a proposal describing how these interests would be pursued under an award. Applicants should also arrange for three letters of recommendation to be sent to the Center. Applications should be sent to: William G. Rosenberg, Director, Center for Russian and East European Studies, University of Michigan, 208 Lane Hall, Ann Arbor, MI 48109.

Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin, is sponsoring a Small Grants Program for research on a variety of poverty-related topics. The grants will fund research for the summer of 1986. Application deadline is February 15, 1986. Contact: Elizabeth Evanston, Institute for Research on Poverty, 1180 Observatory Drive, 3412 Social Science Building, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706.

The National Science Foundation's EVIST Program has established a target date of January 1, 1986 for submission of preliminary proposals to examine ethical or value issues associated with current U.S. scientific or engineering research or its use. Preliminary proposals are 3-5 page letters that identify an area of inquiry, methods and prior work, contributions expected, dissemination and

evaluation plans, investigators' credentials and term and budget for the project. Letters should have a cover page with name and address for further correspondence and should be sent to: Rachel Hollander, Directorate for Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC 20550; (202) 357-7552.

The National Science Foundation, Program for Law and Social Sciences, supports social scientific studies of law and law-like systems of rules. The primary consideration is that the research aims to advance a fundamental understanding of law and legal processes. The review process for the Program takes six to nine months and includes the appraisal of proposals by ad hoc reviewers selected for their expertise. The next target dates for the submission of proposals are January 1, 1986 for proposals to be funded after July 1986 and August 15, 1986 for proposals to be funded after January 1987. For further information on the Program, contact: Felice J. Levine, Program Director, Law and Social Sciences Program, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC 20550; (202) 357-9567.

The National Science Foundation announces Grants for Improving Doctoral Dissertation Research. Grants are awarded for support of dissertation research in the environmental, behavioral, neural, and social sciences and are intended to provide funds not normally available from the student's university or other sources. Allowable items include travel to specialized facilities or field research locations, sample survey costs, specialized research equipment, and other forms of unique data, etc. Funds may not be used as a stipend, tuition, textbooks or typing of the dissertation. For submission procedures and further information, contact: Data Support Services Section, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC 20550.

The Newberry Library, a privately endowed independent research library, has a number of fellowships in the humanities available for 1986-87, including short-term resident research fellowships, National Endowment for the Humanities Fellowships, Monticello College Foundation Fellowships for Women, and ten other specialized fellowships. For further information on all fellowships, contact: Committee on Awards, The Newberry Library, 60 West Walton Street, Chicago, IL 60610.

People

Becky Beisecker is now at the University of Kansas Medical Center in the Department of Allied Health Services, where she will lead a Long-term Care Administration Program.

Rita Bratton is now at the University of Missouri-St. Louis.

James Christenson, University of Kentucky, is the President-Elect of the Rural Sociological Society. He will take office at the Society's 50th anniversary celebration in 1987.

Arlene Kaplan Daniels, Northwestern University, has been elected President of the Society for the Study of Social Problems for 1986-87.

Tim Diamond will be a visiting scholar at Douglass College, Rutgers University.

Jean Faley, University of Wisconsin-River Falls, is the 1985 recipient of the ASA/Wisconsin Sociological Association Award for Outstanding Contributions to Teaching.

Jennie Farley will be on sabbatical leave from Cornell University to study at Uppsala University in Sweden.

Donald P. Irish received the 1985 Sociologists of Minnesota Distinguished Service Award.

Dale Jaffe is teaching at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Richard Kania was named the 1985 recipient of the Margaret Lang Willis Award as Outstanding Criminal Justice Educator in North Carolina. The award is given annually by the North Carolina Association of Criminal Justice Educators.

John Lammers has joined the sociology faculty of the University of Louisville.

Elinore Lurie is the new Executive Officer of the Society for the Study of Social Problems.

Emily Mumford, Columbia College of Physicians and Surgeons, has been appointed to the 15-person advisory council of the National Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Agency. She also was recently appointed to the National Accrediting Agency for Clinical Laboratory Sciences Review Board.

Sherly Ruzek is now at Temple University.

Herm Smith, University of Missouri-St. Louis, recently returned from a sabbatical year as a Visiting Scholar at Doshisha University in Kyoto, Japan, where he researched the Japanese self-concept and changes in naming practices.

Barrie Thorne, Michigan State University, is the 1986 SWS-Cheryl Miller Lecturer on Women and Social Change.

Donald Warwick, Harvard University, is spending the academic year as Visiting Professor of Political Science at the National University of Singapore.

Obituaries

Rose K. Goldsen
(-1985)

Rose Goldsen received the BA from New York University (1943), the MA from Yale University (1944) and the PhD from Yale (1953). She started her career at Cornell in 1949 as Research Associate, became Senior Research Associate, Associate Professor and Professor, a post she held at the time of her death on August 2, 1985.

Rose had friends and admirers around the world. She taught in Bogota, Columbia at the University of the Andes and the National University; in Argentina at the University of Buenos Aires, and in France at the University of Rennes and the University of Bourdeaux. From 1968 to 1972 she was a consultant to the Ford Foundation for Latin America. She was also a Visiting Research Fellow at the University of Barcelona, and a Visiting Fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, DC.

Rose's academic interests (and sentimental attachment) to Latin America began with a visit to Puerto Rico in the 1940s which led to her doctoral dissertation on Puerto Rico and a lifelong intellectual involvement with Latin America. She learned fluent Spanish and, indeed, presented papers and gave lectures throughout Latin America in Spanish. Her research among the Puerto Rican community in New York City (1948) led to the publication of the now classic *The Puerto Rican Journey* (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950) with C. Wright Mills and Clarence Senior.

In recent years Rose described her specialty as the analysis of the institutions that form human consciousness; she earned distinction in the scholarly world on this and other

topics through her books, articles, and essays. Her home area—Ithaca, NY—knew her through a weekly radio program, "Blowing the Whistle on Broadcasting", her newspaper column, "The Show 'N' Tell Machine", and her frequent public lectures. Language mattered uncommonly to Rose. Her vivid short stories appeared in such literary magazines as *Praxis* and *Cornell Review*. For years she regularly taught Freshman Writing Seminars.

Rose made everyone feel more alive. She often said she had the best job in the world. Students flocked to her classes, to her office, to her afternoon sherry hour. After being exposed to her probing questions, her buoyant laugh, and her deeply personal concern, students wandered away smiling, challenged, touched. And back they came, especially in the last months of her life, to tell Rose how much she had meant. Rose was a person of strong moral and intellectual convictions, strongly expressed, but the warm blast of her affection overwhelmed mere differences of opinion. For her students, colleagues and friends, Rose Goldsen stretched horizons and warmed hearts. We rejoice in having been part of her remarkable life.

Stephen Caldwell and Hector Velez
Cornell University

Reuben L. Hill
(1912-1985)

Reuben Hill died in his sleep on September 21, 1985. He was in Norway on a Fulbright Scholarship at the time. He had retired from the University of Minnesota just two years earlier. I have known Reuben one way or another throughout my professional life. I will not detail his professional accomplishments but rather I will present my personal remembrances of Reuben.

My acquaintance with Reuben's work began when in my first year of teaching I selected his revision of Willard Waller's classic text for the course I was asked to teach on the sociology of the family. A few years later in April of 1959 when I was teaching at William and Mary I met Reuben in person at the Groves Conference on the family in Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Our orientation to sociology was rather different. Reuben had an interdisciplinary perspective and his interest in the application of sociological knowledge to social problems was stronger than mine. His work on family stress, family planning, intergenerational changes and life transitions all have contained a strong problem solving focus.

Although we had different professional emphases we both had genuine respect for each other as professionals and as human beings. One basis for this was that we shared a very strong commitment to the improvement of the sociology of the family field. That uniting of different approaches with mutual respect was one of the most rewarding aspects of our relationship. I was present when Reuben was honored with the first Burgess Award given by NCFR in 1963. Years later when I received the Burgess Award it was Reuben who presented it to me. In 1969 Reuben asked me to come to Minnesota and take over the directorship of the Family Study Center which he had founded some 12 years earlier. By then he had built the Center into an institution which was recognized as the top family study center in the country.

Reuben has received many other professional honors but there is one that stands out. I remember when in 1973 Reuben became a Regent's Professor—an honor bestowed only upon a handful of the professors at Minnesota. Reuben walked back across the Washington Avenue bridge with the medallion around his neck. He was so proud that I was sure he could have crossed that river with-

out the bridge.

Reuben was at the international hub of the professional network in the sociology of the family area. From 1964-66, he worked for the Ford Foundation in their international population programs. Partially as an outgrowth of his many trips abroad, he became very influential in the International Sociological Association. He helped found the Committee on Family Research of that organization and headed it from 1959-70. In 1970 he was elected President of the International Sociological Association. As part of this office and in many other ways he increasingly became the peripatetic ambassador for the study of the family.

He was a fountainhead of knowledge and of help to many who wanted to join him in building the sociological study of the family. He truly deserves the label so often bestowed upon him as the father of family sociology. When he entered the field in 1938 there was no organized family area of sociology. There were some books by Ernest Burgess, Ernest Groves, Willard Waller and a few others but very little else. Reuben's work served as a springboard for the launching of this new specialty. His students and others who read his work joined together and gave vital impetus to the development of the sociological approach to the family. It was the recognition of this work that led to Reuben Hill being selected to come to the University of Minnesota in 1957 and found the Family Study Center. Under his influence the Center grew into an international home for scholars from all parts of the globe. He received grants for research projects and government support for doctoral and post doctoral students.

Our mutual interest in theory construction did lead us to do some joint professional writing. Together with two other colleagues (Wes Burr from Brigham Young University and Ivan Nye from Washington State University) we labored for seven years on a two volume set of books on theories explaining the family. Here as everywhere, his dedication, his intensive desire to achieve whatever goals he had set and his strong loyalty to causes and to people helped all of us finish this task.

In 1979 the National Council on Family Relations initiated the annual Reuben Hill Award for the best published article which advanced the theory and research aspects of the family field. Reuben's friends wanted him to know how respected he was and so this award was set up in his name during his lifetime. Reuben's personal signature was to treat others with respect and concern and this made him loved and respected by many throughout the world. A personal illustration of how he related to others comes from my children who told me that they always liked Reuben because he was one of the few adults who came to our house and really seemed interested in them.

For sixteen years I have had my office near Reuben's and even now as I enter my office, I glance next door where Reuben was for so many years. I miss his strength, his loyalty, his collegiality but above all I miss his friendship. I share with all of you the grief in his loss but I also feel that he can look back on his life and say, with justified pride, "well done!"

In addition to his wife Marion, Reuben Hill is survived by daughters Judith Wright (West Lafayette, IN), Susan Oppegaard (Oslo, Norway), Paulena H. McBeth (San Diego, CA); sons David R. Hill (Denver, CO) and G. Richard Hill (Seattle, WA); and 10 grandchildren. Contributions in his memory may be sent to the National Council on Family Relations, 1910 West County Road B, Suite 147, St. Paul, MN 55113.

Ira L. Retts
University of Minnesota

Werner Stark
(1910-1985)

Werner Stark, Professor Emeritus of Sociology at Fordham University, died after a long illness in Salzburg, Austria, on October 4, 1985. He was 75 years old. He taught at Fordham University from 1963 until his retirement in 1975 when he returned to Salzburg. During the period of his teaching in the United States, he was an active member of the American Sociological Association and also of the Association for the Sociology of Religion.

During his scholarly career in England and the U.S., he had become internationally known for his studies in sociological theory and the sociology of religion. His study, *The Sociology of Knowledge*, was published in 1958, followed by *The Fundamental Forms of Social Thought* in 1962 while he was a Reader at the University of Manchester, England. After coming to Fordham, he completed his monumental five volume study, *The Sociology of Religion* in 1972. He began his other outstanding six-volume study, *The Social Bond* while he was at Fordham. He was working on the sixth volume at the time of his death.

In England, he also published *The Ideal Foundations of Economic Thought: The History of Economics in Its Relation to Social Development; America: Ideal and Reality: Social Theory and Christian Thought; and Montesquieu: Pioneer of the Sociology of Knowledge*. In addition, he published numerous articles in sociological journals.

During his tenure at Fordham, he was a member of the Editorial Board of *Thought*, the Fordham University quarterly, and was Associate Editor of *Sociological Analysis*.

Stark brought to the sociology of religion an extraordinary erudition in history, theology, philosophy, art and literature. As a result, his analysis of religious institutions was extensive and deep. He took issue with Troeltsch who asserted that there were only two basic types of religious organizations: conservative church and revolutionary sect, each exclusive of the other. Stark always asserted that the Catholic Church embodied both.

Commenting on Weber's concept of charisma, Stark insisted that in addition to "personal charisma" there was also the "collective charisma" of institutions. Personally he had found this in the Catholic Church. He was a devout Catholic and he claimed that his Catholic perspective gave to him an insight into religious values that enriched his study and revealed the deepest meaning of social relations in the human family. His death is a great loss to the scholarly community.

Joseph P. Fitzpatrick
Fordham University

Contact

The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) has undertaken a study of threats to academic freedom in the 1980s, particularly with respect to researchers/teachers concerned with social issues. If you have experienced a policy or practice that limits your academic freedom with respect to research, teaching methods or your political activities, please write detailing these experiences. Particular policies or practices that would have been helpful in protecting academic freedom when social issues are involved would also be of interest. Contact: Michelle Fine, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania, 3700 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104; (215) 898-7019.

Mass Media

Patrick J. Ashton and Peter Iadicola, Indiana University-Purdue University, were quoted in the *Wall Street Journal* regarding a recently-completed study of the impact of the closing of International Harvester's Fort Wayne plant.

Fanos D. Bardin's letter, entitled "Artemisia II," on the great woman botanist and ethnicity, was published in the October 18 issue of *Science*.

Robert N. Bellah, University of California-Berkeley, was the subject of an October 1 *Portland Oregonian* article about his research into "sect allure."

Arlene Kaplan Daniels, Hans Mauksch and Roberta Mauksch were quoted in a *Milwaukee Journal* article about their personal experiences with "commuter marriage."

Doris Entwisle and Susan Doering, Johns Hopkins University, were cited in an August *Parents* article on "Fathers as Birth Attendants."

Glenn Fugitt, University of Wisconsin, was cited in a recent *New York Times* article on the effect of the farming crisis on rural towns.

Frank Howell, North Carolina State University, was quoted in a recent article entitled "Computer Game Helps Pedophiles Woo Children for Sex."

R. George Kirkpatrick's research on neo-Pagan witchcraft was the subject of newspaper articles and San Diego area television shows.

Lois Lee's work was featured on the CBS show, "Children of the Night," shown October 26.

Sol Levine, Boston University, had his research on the families of the handicapped reported in a UPI news story, which was published in several newspapers across the country.

Floyd Martinson, Gustavus Adolphus College, was quoted at length in a regular column for parents, "Tender Years," in the *Minneapolis Star and Tribune*.

Richard Moran, Mount Holyoke College and Harvard University, authored an article on the inhumanity of the death penalty which described his observation of an execution by injection.

Craig Reinerman, University of California-Berkeley, was interviewed by the *Oakland Tribune* and *San Francisco Examiner* about his research on the trend toward moderation in alcohol consumption.

Eugene Rochberg-Halton, University of Notre Dame and University of Tuebingen, was interviewed in a *Philadelphia News* article about the effects of the "Move" tragedy on residents of the West Philadelphia neighborhood.

Lenore J. Weitzman authored a recent *Los Angeles Times* article on "No Fault, No Fairness for Women: The Damage of Divorce Law."

New Publications

Corrections Compendium—The National Journal for Corrections Professionals has been expanded to include feature articles and profiles in addition to legal summaries and surveys. A subscription to the journal includes free access to Contact Center, Inc.'s clearinghouse information service. For a sample copy and subscription information, contact: *Corrections Compendium*, Contact Center, Inc., P.O. Box 81826, Lincoln, NE 68501; (402) 464-0602.

Independent Sector, an organization formed to encourage the fullest possible development of philanthropy and voluntary action in America, has two new publications available. *Dimensions of the Independent Sector: A Statistical Profile* provides an overview, financial trends and a list of organizations in the independent sector. *Research in Progress: 1983-84* is a compilation of over 400 research projects on philanthropy, voluntary action and non-profit activity. For information on either publication or the organization, contact: Independent Sector, 1828 I Street NW, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 223-8100.

Inventory of Longitudinal Research on Childhood and Adolescence, compiled by Frederick Verdonik and Lonnie R. Sherrod, is now available from the Social Science Research Council. The 343-page paperback inventory summarizes the information on 116 studies identified through reference sources in child development, education, psychology, and sociology. Information is organized according to: topical do-

main covered, substantive topics, characteristics of the original sample, years of completed waves, information on sample attributes, instruments used for data collection and constructs measured, future plans, representative references, and current status. Copies are available for \$2/each for postage and handling from: Lonnie R. Sherrod, Social Science Research Council, 605 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10158. A 1981 companion volume, covering longitudinal samples of middle and old age, is also available from the same source.

Sociological Viewpoints, the new journal of the Pennsylvania Sociological Society, has published Volume 1, Number 1. Subscriptions to the journal are \$5 for individuals and \$3 for students. For information, contact: Charles E. Babbitt, Department of Sociology/Anthropology, Edinboro State College, Edinboro, PA 16444.

Summer Programs

The University of California-San Francisco will sponsor the third annual Women, Health and Healing Summer Institute on the University's Berkeley campus June 20-July 2, 1986. Forty participants will hear a wide range of speakers; view films, new curriculum and books; and take field trips to feminist and minority community organizations. The two-week session will conclude with a session on how to integrate teaching improvements into curriculum and funding programs. For further information or application materials, contact: School of Social and Behavioral Sciences, School of Nursing, N-631-Y, San Francisco, CA 94143. Application deadline is March 15, 1986.

The Family Research Consortium First Annual Summer Institute on "Regulation of Emotion in the Family: Depression and Aggression" will be held June 2-9, 1986 at Teton Village, WY. The Institute is supported by NIMH and will feature research training, presentations and consultations. For further information, contact: Judy Piemme, Executive Coordinator, George Washington University Medical Center, 2300 Eye Street NW, Room 613, Washington, DC 20037; (202) 676-5606.

The Latin American Institute of the University of New Mexico will hold the Summer Institute of Brazil July 7-August 6, 1986, designed to meet the public need for increased knowledge and understanding of Brazil. Participants will be given the opportunity for extensive study of beginning and intermediate Portuguese in courses designed for those familiar with Spanish. In addition, a curriculum development seminar of Brazilian culture and society will be offered during the five-week course. Application is open to university and college instructors currently teaching in Spanish-American studies; each applicant's home institution is expected to pay a \$225 fee to the University of New Mexico. Awards will be made to participants for food, lodging and travel expenses. For further information, contact: Latin American Institute, University of New Mexico, 801 Yale NE, Albuquerque, NM 87131; (505) 277-2961.

The National Endowment for the Humanities will again offer Summer Seminars for College Teachers, a program of 56 seminars providing teachers at undergraduate and two-year colleges with the opportunity for advanced study or research in their own fields of interest. In 1986, places will be offered to 672 participants at 28 different institutions in the U.S., plus two in Italy. Participants will receive a stipend of \$3,000 for each eight-week seminar and will have full access to the institution's facilities. For a brochure describing the content of each seminar, contact: Division of Fellowships and Seminars, Room 316, National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, DC 20506. Application deadline is March 1, 1986.

The Society for Research in Child Development will offer the Summer Institute on Child Development and Social Policy at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, June 14-27, 1986. Emphasis will be on integration of research and policy at national, state and local levels. Faculty, postdoctoral scholars and advanced legislators and/or staff assistants to state legislators are encouraged to apply. Application deadline is February 15, 1986. Contact: Washington Liaison Office, Society for Research in Child Development, 100 North Carolina Avenue SE, Washington, DC 20003; (202) 543-9582.

Section News

The Section on Environmental Sociology has prepared a booklet titled "Resource Dependency," containing three papers presented at the 1983 ASA Annual Meeting. The papers are: "The Garden of Eden Revisited: Resource Depletion in Ecological and Evolutionary Perspective," by Gerhard Lenski; "Problems of Diachronic Competition on a Finite Planet," by William R. Catton, Jr.; and "Dependence on Former Dependents," by Frederick H. Buttel. The booklet is available for \$3 from: Marvin E. Olsen, Department of Sociology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48828.

The Section on Undergraduate Education invites nominations for the 1986 Hans O. Mauksch Award for Distinguished Contribution to Undergraduate Sociology. The nominee may be an individual, program or organization. To place a name in nomination for this award, send a letter describing the nominee's contribution and an address where the nominee may be reached. Forward information as soon as possible to: Josephine A. Ruggiero, Chair, Awards Committee, Department of Sociology, Providence College, Providence, RI 02918. The decision will be made by vote of the Section Council members; the award will be presented at the 1986 ASA Annual Meeting in New York.

Classified Ads

I'll bring out the best in your book or paper. Expert editing for style, clarity, mechanics. Twenty years' experience with sociological material. Karen Feinberg, 5755 Nahant, Cincinnati, OH 45224; (513) 542-8328.

Editor Wants Work—From You! Former *Footnotes* managing editor, freelance writer/editor will clean up your manuscripts. Experience with Prentice-Hall, ASA, Council of Social Work Education, University of Houston, Notre Dame, Washington University. Mss. must be typed or word-processed, double-spaced. \$2/page. References available. Contact Ruth E. Thaler, 2100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #708, Washington, DC 20008; (202) 483-5978.

Footnotes

Published monthly except June, July and September. Distributed to all persons with membership in the ASA. Annual Subscriptions to non-members: \$13. Single copy: \$1.50.

Contributions to "Open Forum" should be limited to 800 words; "Obituaries," 500 words; and "Letters to the Editor," 400 words. News items and announcements are due the first of the month preceding publication (e.g., April 1 for May issue) and are printed once only on a space available basis.

Editor: William V. D'Antonio
Associate Editors: Carla Howery, Bettina Huber,
Lionel Maldonado
Production: Karen Gray Edwards, Stephen C.
Warren
Secretary: Theodore Caplow

Send communications on material, subscriptions and advertising to: American Sociological Association, 1722 N Street NW, Washington, DC 20036; (202) 833-3410.

Copyright 1985, ASA. Third class postage paid at Washington, DC and additional mailing offices. ISSN 0749-6931.

Non-profit Org.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
Permit No. 504
Washington, D.C.