President's Message:

Yes We Can

By Joey Sprague
SWS President

As I write this, my last column as your president, we are still basking in the warm glow of the Obama victory. What had seemed impossible just a couple of years ago, has happened. And while there are also disappointments and even heartbreaks associated with this election—the rejection in some places of other than heterosexual people's right to marry the person they love or to adopt children and the continuing absence of women in the highest offices of our government—there have been many victories large and small for progressive social change. A better future seems more possible now.

There is also a resounding lesson for our organization.

It is not insignificant that Barak Obama put in some time as a community organizer before running for office. His campaign was strategically brilliant. They could have been using the strategy chart that Judy Hertz of the Midwest Academy walked us through at last year's Winter Meeting. They deftly identified their potential political allies including many folks that others had ignored. They neutralized potential opposition, campaigning in many states that conventional wisdom would have advised them to ignore. Obama built an organization that made it easy for millions of people to do their part, no matter how little time they had to give and used their preferred channels of communication to reach them. He rejected a political discourse built on highlighting divisions among us and addressed our better selves. Rather than trying to be all things to all people, he focused on a few highly salient issues that evoked our common interests. And—this is crucially important—he planned for the next steps after the election, organizing the campaign in a way that built a grassroots movement with staying power, making it more likely that he can achieve his policy goals in spite of the likely strong opposition of entrenched interests.

Obama's election, along with other changes in Congress, should give us hope about the possibility of getting universal access to health care, the issue we decided to focus on as an organization. And to the degree we follow in the footsteps of his grassroots organizing campaign, we can once again help make the seemingly impossible a reality. It will take all of us pulling together, each of us doing our share in the effort and in helping our organization be creative in support of our work. It will take commitment and persistence and yes, believing. But we can do this, yes we can.

Heather L. Hartley

1969-2008

Heather Hartley: mother, partner, mentor, teacher, scholar, activist, and friend, died October 4, 2008.

Heather Lynne Hartley was born on July 18, 1969 in St. Charles, Missouri. She earned her bachelor's degree at the University of Missouri and her PhD in sociology at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. There, she received a dissertation award for her research on the influence of managed care on certified nurse-midwives.

Heather was a tenured professor of sociology at Portland State University, where she earned a reputation for excellence in feminist pedagogy. Students and colleagues remember her as a wonderful listener, a community-builder, an LGBTQ ally, and a brilliant professor with a delightful sense of humor. During her nine-year stint at PSU, she introduced six new courses, and specialized in gender, health and medicine. Throughout her short career, Heather was an ardent advocate for women's health, concerned about expanding influence of medicine and its implications for all Americans. She was a creative and gifted medical sociologist, publishing in Health, Sociology of Health and Illness, Journal of Health and Social Behavior, and Teaching Sociology.

Heather was a public sociologist. She was a founding member of the New View Campaign, challenging the medicalization of sex. She also spent many hours speaking with journalists and penning op-ed pieces about the expanding influence of medicine, drawing examples from direct-to-consumer advertising, to the recent social construction of FSD (female sexual dysfunction), to the pressures American medicine places on women.

Besides being a committed educator, a tireless activist, and an award-winning scholar, Heather was warm and generous colleague, a dedicated mother and wife and an inspiring humanist who cared deeply about the suffering of others. She is survived by her husband Jeff Gersh and her daughter Maya. She is survived by her husband Jeff Gersh and her daughter Maya. She is survived by her husband Jeff Gersh and her daughter Maya. She is survived by her husband Jeff Gersh and her daughter Maya.

Heather will be memorialized in the Portland State University "Walk of the Heroines," and in a special sense, the upcoming meetings in San Francisco.

Written by Meika Loe, with help from Peter Conrad, Tricia Drew, Kristin Barker, and Veronica D...
THANK YOU...

The following people made 2008 donations to our operations and programs. SWS is grateful for the support.

Margaret Abraham                          Judith Howard                          Tola Olu Pearce
Beverlyn Lundy Allen                      Miliann Kang                           Karen Pyke
Susan Belair                               Diana Kendall                         Nicole Raeburn
Joan Biddle                                Laurel Kent                           Helen Raisz
Sharon Bird                                Sheri Kunovich                       Cecilia Ridgeway
Toni Calasanti                             Judith Lasker                         Elizabeth Rudd
Esther Chow                                Heather Laube                          Victoria Russo
Shelley Correll                            Aldora Lee                             Edwin Segal
Mary Jean Cravens                          Lora Bex Lempert                      Jessica Holden Sherwood
Donald Cunnigen                            Lynette Logan                         Cecile Shore
Vicky Demos                                Judith Lorber                         Jacqueline Skiles
Paula Dubec                                Karyn Loscocco                        David Skubby
Charlotte Dunham                           Betsy LuCal                           Kathleen Slobin
Hester Eisenstein                          Eleanor Lyon                           Deborah Smith
Elizabeth Erbaugh                          Suzanne Maurer                        Tamara Smith
Susan Farrell                              Pamela McMullin-Messier               Vicki Smith
Razelle Frankly                            Julia McQuillan                      Joan Spade
Roxanne Friedenfels                        Scott Melzer                          Peter Stein
Irene Friese                               Michael Messner                      Lindsay Stutz
Naomi Gerstel                               Krista Lynn Minnott                   Veta Taylor
Angela Ginorio                              Joya Misra                             Jan Thomas
Judith Gordon                               Mairead Moloney                       Ronni Tichenor
Karen Hansen                               Gwen Moore                            Mieke Verloo
Amy Hansen                                  Virginia Olesen                      Mary Vinnoche
Lisa Hickman                                Mary Osirim                           Faye Wachs
Elizabeth Higginbotham                     Susan Ostrander                      Shang Luan Yan
Janet Hood                                  Diana Pearce                           

Most of these donations were received with 2008 membership dues; therefore, some were made at the end of 2007. Donors who need a receipt for tax purposes may email sws@etal.uri.edu.
Sa-van-nah: 1) A treeless plain or grassland in a tropical or subtropical region; 2) a 314 mile river that forms the border between Georgia and South Carolina; 3) the largest city in and first capital of Georgia; 4) a city known for magnolia trees, stately antebellum mansions, fountains, riverboat rides, and historic buildings; 5) location of the 2009 Sociologists for Women in Society’s winter meeting.

President Elect’s Message:
Greetings SWS Members
By Shirley Hill
SWS President Elect

Let me take this opportunity to invite, encourage, and urge you to attend the SWS winter meeting, which will be held in Savannah, Georgia, February 5-8, 2009. Why Savannah? I wanted to have the meeting in the South, and Georgia is a great historic state. I visited Savannah a couple of years ago and thoroughly enjoyed it. My favorite memories are of walking down River Street in the old historic district—and having a wonderful pot roast dinner at the Dockside Restaurant. There will still be a chill in the air by February, but the weather (low 60s) should be ideal for walking and sightseeing. I know you’ll enjoy the city and the wonderful meeting we have planned for you.

Our meeting will be held at the Hampton Inn & Suites—the exact address is 201 MLK, Savannah, GA 31401 and the phone number is 912-721-1600. We have also reserved a little extra space for meetings at the nearby Coastal Georgia. The theme is “Reflecting Back & Moving Forward: Milestones and Mountains on the Road to Equality,” and we’ll just do that: Recapture some past successes and forge ahead with new policy initiatives and plans. Expect all the activities that have now become traditions at our meetings—the welcoming reception, hosted dinners at area restaurants, scholarly panels, research paper presentations, and a banquet and auction. Several committees are presenting professional development roundtables, as is Kerry Ann Rockquemore (University of Illinois-Chicago), who will share her personal experiences on managing time and research productivity.

I want to highlight two sessions that will be especially valuable for graduate students and faculty members who are interested in obtaining research funding. Two sessions, led by Regina Werum (Emory University), Maxine Thompson (University of Colorado State University) and Ann Schulte (Scientific Review Administrator, NIMH) will provide information on how to submit grant proposals to both public and private funding agencies, answering questions such as “where should I apply for the type of project?” “how do you write a good proposal?” and “how do reviewers evaluate proposals?” These presentations will bring an impressive amount of expertise to the task: Dr. Werum will discuss governmental funding opportunities, while the Mellon Foundation, Spencer Foundation, especially grants available to graduate students, and lead a didactic workshop during several of our research process.

Dr. Thompson has served on the Dissertation Grant Review Commit
will focus mostly on getting dissertation improvement grants. Dr. Schulte will discuss how to submit an application to NIH/NIMH and navigate their Peer Review Process. If you'd like to have your proposal or paper included in the didactic session, please send it to us before November 30 (swsmeeting@ku.edu).

Plan to arrive at least by Thursday (February 5) so you can participate in the welcoming reception and enjoy a local restaurant. Friday is devoted to the issue of universal health care. Our President, Joey Sprague, suggested that we maximize our influence by choosing one policy issue to focus on, and members voted to make that issue health care. What a timely issue: Recent census data show that 45.7 million Americans (15.3%) were without health care in 2007 and with the new administration the time is ripe for change. Mary Zimmerman, University of Kansas, is an internationally known scholar in the field of health care and has agreed to do a keynote address for us on the issue. Following her talk we will have several roundtables devoted to different aspects of the health and health care, especially as they pertain to women.

Another objective I have for the meeting was to highlight some of the accomplishments of feminism and SWS, and a group of very notable feminists have agreed to help me do so. So here's the history quiz question: What do Chris Bose, Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Myra Marx Ferree, Mary Fox Frank, Judith Lorber, Pat Martin, and Mary Zimmerman have in common? Yes, they are feminists, trailblazers, and stellar scholars—but they are also the founding members of Gender and Society. They will do a panel presentation for us, to be facilitated by the Journal's current editor, Dana Britton. I know it will be informative and fun, and I plan to have the presentation videotaped and stored with our archival materials at the Schlesinger library.

Mainstreaming feminist scholarship is relatively new initiative at SWS, and to help equip us to do so Stephanie Coontz will present a media workshop entitled "Writing Op-Eds." Stephanie, a Professor in History and Women Studies at Evergreen State College, is a nationally known speaker and prolific writer. Among her publications are The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap and, more recently, Marriage, A History: From Obedience to Intimacy, or How Love Conquered Marriage—some of the most popular books in family sociology. Stephanie regularly publishes articles in major newspapers, including the New York Times and the Washington Post. So, who better to teach us the art of writing op-eds?

There are so many people to thank for help with this program, but let me start with our Executive Officer, Jessica Sherwood Holmes, and her assistant, Kristen Baxter. Many thanks to Corie Hammers, who so graciously agreed to chair the local arrangements committee, and Melissa Freiburger for organizing the research roundtables and handling an array of other details.

See you in Savannah!
Walking and Talking Academic Justice:
Strategies for Success in Hostile Work Environments

By Kris De Welde and Andi Stepnick

Welcome to our third Network News column where we share with the broader SWS membership collective insights and advice generated in the Committee on Academic Justice (CAJ) workshops on managing a variety of workplace problems and ultimately prevailing over hostile workplaces. These ongoing sessions are part of CAJ’s broader mission, which is: to collect data on the issues facing women in higher education, coordinate and communicate with other organizations addressing these issues, and organize information on best practices for creating a just academy in formats that will be useful for our members and for the organization as a whole as we work with others to transform the structure and culture of the academy to make it one of justice for all (http://www.sowomen.org/page.php?sss=44).

Update on Professor Jones

As a reminder, our columns are based on experiences of SWS members who have confidentially submitted their personal stories of hostility in the academy. Because of the sensitive nature of these narratives, we use pseudonyms, and remove identifying information and/or details. In our previous column, we shared Dr. Jones’ experiences at Small College USA (SCUSA). In her first year, Dr. Jones had generated considerably increased interest in the major, and was developing important partnerships between the college, students, and community organizations. She had settled in nicely, despite the overt resistance on the part of the college administration to progressive student programs, speakers, and campus conversations (e.g., about sexually transmitted infections, or advising a gay-straight alliance). In her second year at SCUSA Dr. Jones and some of her colleagues had been silenced by the college’s administration when it was discovered that her chair had been dating students, and another member of her department knew about it, but did not report it. As it turns out, this other professor was manipulating students to obtain periodic updates on the “dating,” purely out of curiosity.

She knew her job was in jeopardy as the “radical” on a very conservative campus, and knew that no one was going to do a thing about the sexual harassment of students (her own efforts had been prevented by the administration). Her health had been negatively impacted, her family life was rife with stress due to the high teaching load, and the ongoing emotional upheaval at school. Dr. Jones struggled with a decision about what to do, and decided it was best for her to leave SCUSA. Dr. Jones fled to a large public university where her teaching load is manageable, the administration is progressive and supportive of faculty AND students, and issues important to her are taken seriously. She has never looked back, saying “I feel in some ways like this is the perfect job for me, but it wasn’t available while I was at [SCUSA]. I just had to bide my time until it was. Here, I am supported, my colleagues are wonderful, and the campus-wide commitment to social and environmental justice is inspiring. I have found my home.” Her scenario, like Dr. Smith before her, demonstrates that leaving a hostile environment can be good for your personal and professional health, despite the risks.

SWS Case Study (#3)

At the 2008 summer meetings in Boston, we explored the following case study in CAJ’s “Walking and Talking Academic Justice” workshop. Although CAJ’s commitment is to institutional equality, we recognize that individuals need to cope with their immediate realities in the process, and may not always have information or advice on how to do so. Past columns have addressed hostile workplaces for faculty. In this column we follow a Ph.D. student’s experiences, and simultaneously raise important issues about faculty mentoring. Following Student Smith’s description, we offer a summary of the advice generated by participants who discussed courses of action she could take on the individual, institutional, and extra-institutional levels to deal with her hostile environment in search of academic justice.

Meet Student Smith

Student Smith is a graduate student at State University (SU). Before attending SU, Smith’s life experiences included being in foster care for some of her teen years, being homeless once, holding a series of low-wage low-skill jobs, attending community college and completing her undergraduate degree at a small college. Student Smith, who was the same age as most graduate students in her first generation college graduate with social or academic capital. However, Smith was a good student during her graduate career and performed well on the GRE. She was accepted by more than one graduate school and was excited to find herself moving up in the world.

Soon after starting SU’s graduate program, Student Smith was assigned to work with Professor Brown. Professor Brown demonstrated a keen interest in Student Smith’s ambitions, academic interests, and life experiences, and she had a warm personal relationship with Student Smith. Professor Brown told Student Smith that she had to take Graduate School and that Student Smith must attend all her classes, take all her tests, and do all her assignments. Student Smith was flattered and happy. Professor Brown invited Student Smith to dinner and coffee, talked to her about personal issues, and took Student Smith out for dinner and to see plays. Student Smith felt honored to receive the attentions of a graduate school faculty member. Student Smith, who was not a co-equal student when she entered the program, to feel more confident.

As part of her funded position, Student Smith was charged with helping Professor Brown with classroom related tasks. Student Smith was learning a great deal and completing the work but came to realize that she was being asked to work more hours than the students, more hours even than the duties of graduate teaching assistants. At first, she attempted to limit her time in keeping with the departmental guidelines, however, Professor Brown asked her to start putting in more and more hours, adding more and more duties to Student Smith’s growing list of things to do for Professor Brown. Student Smith was coding data for Professor Brown, reviewing some of her work being done by other researchers, helping Professor Brown move personal residence, and also spending time with her. Professor Brown in conversations that were increasingly too personal. Student Smith was uncomfortable with many aspects of the situation with Professor Brown but had told her that she was a feminist mentor and that she wanted to fulfill her duties to mentor her. Student Smith, who was business student, wanted to achieve...
graduate school, and did not want to displease Professor Brown. Student Smith suspected that the reason she was uncomfortable was that she wasn’t familiar with graduate school culture and so she tried to adjust her thinking and her expectations. She continued to work the extra hours and spend personal time with Professor Brown, even when she was asked personal questions and when Professor Brown disclosed personal and professional information that made Student Smith feel uneasy.

Over time, Student Smith began making stronger connections with others in her program. She met another professor who was doing intriguing work that was of interest to Student Smith. In addition, Student Smith developed friendships with other students in the program and became less isolated. She learned that no other students were working as many hours as she was working for Professor Brown. When she asked Professor Brown if she could reduce her hours, Professor Brown replied: “You can, but you should make that decision with your future in mind. Other students aren’t getting the kind of mentoring you’re getting. You work extra but you’re getting something far more valuable in exchange.” Professor Brown acted annoyed with Student Smith and for the next few weeks treated Student Smith without her usual personal warmth. Student Smith felt both relieved and worried about this change in Professor Brown’s demeanor.

Before a new semester began, Student Smith told Professor Brown of her interest in another area of sociology and showed her the list of courses she might take during the upcoming semester. Professor Brown reviewed Student Smith’s list and frowned. Student Smith assured her that she remained interested in gender but wanted to consider it in relation to another area of sociology. Professor Brown continued to frown as she suggested that Student Smith not take one of the courses on her list—the one Student Smith most wanted to take. Professor Brown told her that the professor for that course was hard on new students and was not known for being a good feminist mentor like herself. “You can take the class, of course, but I think we can do better,” said Professor Brown as she crossed that class off Student Smith’s list. “I’ll give you some books to read about that subject to get you started but don’t take this class right now. Wait on that. I think you’ll change your mind once you know more about people here and how things work.”

At the end of Student Smith’s first year, having not taken the course that she wanted, Student Smith felt that Professor Brown was exploiting or limiting her—even as she felt that Professor Brown was genuinely interested in her as a student and a person. She also became aware that Professor Brown had a reputation among the more tenured students for being punitive when a student burned a bridge with her. Student Smith faces some choices. She would like to remain a student of Professor Brown’s, would like Professor Brown on her thesis committee, and does not want to hurt Professor Brown’s feelings; however, Student Smith also wants to form ties with other professors and she wants to reduce her work hours to meet the department’s guidelines. What should Student Smith do?

**What Can We Learn From This Scenario?**

We should begin by saying that the CAJ workshop participants, who ranged from senior faculty to graduate students, were very upset by what Student Smith had experienced. They expressed concern that Smith was being emotionally manipulated by Dr. Brown. It was unanimous that ideally she should detach from Brown and trust herself in the process. In the interim, workshop participants generated multiple strategies for coping with and changing her situation.

**Individual strategies**

If this is a Masters program, consider staying, but move on to a new university for the Ph.D.

Document EVERYTHING! For example, keep a diary that includes dates and incidents that Student Smith finds troubling. Consider taking a course in “assertiveness training.” Student Smith’s lack of cultural capital puts her at a disadvantage and assertiveness training will help her feel more confident while establishing healthy boundaries.

As diplomatically as possible, talk to other trusted graduate students. Seek their support, but also warn them!

Consider her own boundaries, and express them to Dr. Brown. Talk to other trusted faculty about how to discuss her boundaries. Consider changing her specialty area or her mentor.

**Institutional Strategies**

Organize or request mentoring workshops that include students and faculty (thereby dissipating attention to her issues).

Consider finding a mentor outside the department.

Ask questions, and then consider acting on the answers you receive:

In what ways does the department support students that are marginalized or have little social capital? (Consider joining or perhaps organizing a group.)

What other institutional support systems exist? For example, an ombuds office, graduate student government, mediation. (Consider approaching someone from these offices.)

Is there a union for graduate students, or a “Bill of Rights” that stipulates how many hours students should work? What is the process by which the university handles infringements to such contracts?

Do faculty in the college or department have guidelines for their roles as mentors/advisors? Are there rules Prof. Brown is violating? If guidelines aren’t in place, can Student Smith, the graduate union, or trusted faculty put guidelines into place?

Organize! Reach out across ranks, departments, colleges...focus on changing how graduate student expectations are communicated, (to graduate students AND faculty), how mentoring is monitored, how expectations for mentoring are communicated to faculty, or how students report grievances.

**Extra-Institutional Strategies**

Talk to trusted SWS “seniors.” Ask for help, or consider signing up for the SWS Professional Needs Mentoring Program (http://www.socwomen.org/index.php?ss=6).

If Smith is a student of color, seek out specific resources, such as the university’s Affirmative Action, or Equal Opportunity offices.


Connect with ASA’s Committee on the Status of Women. Contact SWS’s Discrimination Committee: (http://www.socwomen.org/page.php?sss=5). They can offer letters of support, help defray costs of an attorney, and more.

What do you think of this advice? If you have additional suggestions, or have a “hostile experience” to share, write to Kris at: kdwelde@fgeu.edu or Andi at stepnic-ka@mail.belmont.edu. Stay tuned for our next column, which will include an update about the SWS member featured in this column.
Deadline, March 1, 2009:
Nominate Your Colleagues for SWS Awards!

SWS Feminist Mentoring Award
Time to nominate a fabulous feminist mentor for the SWS Mentoring Award! The mentoring award was established in 1990 to honor an SWS member who is an outstanding feminist mentor. While the word “mentoring” is commonly used to describe a faculty-student relationship, this award has shown the breadth of ways that feminists do mentoring. In establishing the award, SWS recognized that feminist mentoring is an important and concrete way to encourage feminist scholarship. Feminist mentoring includes not only anticipating needs and providing concrete guidance and feedback for junior colleagues, but also: compassion and guidance with regard to feminist concerns, helping colleagues (junior and senior) to write and effectively communicate as authors, activists and teachers; providing support, strategies and models for balancing family and work; offering gendered understandings of institutional biases and strategies for overcoming them; building formal and informal institutions that support feminist interests (personal, career research, and teaching); and a philosophy and practice of inclusion inside academia, especially with those most marginalized.

Nominators should gather supporting letters from people with a variety of perspectives about the nominee and include a cover letter summarizing the supporting material. Current officers and officers-elect of SWS are not eligible for nomination for this award, nor is the Editor of Gender & Society. Please remember that the nominee must be a current member of SWS. The award will be presented during the SWS summer banquet during the ASA Annual Meeting. Committee members are past winners Linda Grant, Barbara Risman, and Marcia Tessler Segal. If you have questions about the materials or procedures, please contact me at jwittne@luc.edu. Nominations and supporting materials should be sent to:

Judith Wittner, Department of Sociology, Loyola University, 6430 North Kenmore, Chicago, IL 60626

SWS Feminist Activism Award
The Feminist Activism Award is presented annually to an SWS member who has notably and consistently used sociology to improve conditions for women in society. The award honors outstanding feminist advocacy efforts that embody the goal of service to women and that have identified nomination and any supporting material to:

Rebecca Bach, Department of Sociology, Box 90088, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708-0088, Email: rbach@soc.du.edu, Fax: 919 660-5623

SWS 2010 Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
Lisa D. Brush, Committee Chair
It is time to nominate your scholar for the 2010 Distinguished Feminist Lectureship Award. The Feminist Lectureship program was founded in 1985 as a way of recognizing our members’ contributions to the field. The award provides a feminist perspective and recognizes the contributions of scholars who have made significant contributions to feminist scholarship and to the broader understanding of women’s experiences and lives. The recipient will receive an honorarium of $1000 and will present a lecture at the annual meeting of the SWS. The award recognizes the achievements of women in the field of sociology and aims to promote the advancement of feminist research and scholarship.

Please submit electronic nominations (or hard copies if necessary) by June 1, 2011. Nominations should include a letter of recommendation, a CV, and any additional materials that support the nomination. Please send your nominations to the committee chair, Lisa D. Brush, at lbrush@pitt.edu.
Cheryl Allyn Miller Award Recipient Amrita Pande
Honorable Mention Sarah Damaske

By Ivy Ken

Amrita Pande (University of Massachusetts at Amherst) is the winner of the 2008 Cheryl Allyn Miller Award, for her paper "At Least I'm Not Sleeping With Anyone: Resisting the Stigma of Commercial Surrogacy in India." This award recognizes a graduate student's outstanding contribution to the field of women and work. The type of workers that Pande researches are not the secretaries, CEOs, and insurance agents we may be accustomed to reading about. Pande studies commercial surrogate mothers. In prose as compelling as a New Yorker article, Pande explains how couples around the world have found clinics in India where they can pay $3000-8000 to hire a woman to work as a surrogate who gestates and gives birth to a child. "Work," in this arrangement, takes on very interesting meanings that call into question some of the traditional boundaries we take for granted. Part of what Pande does so well in her analysis of an enormous amount of oral history and fieldwork data is to demonstrate how these workers both resist and reinforce gender hierarchies, framing themselves not as immoral or disposable, as others try to frame them, but as selfless, dutiful mothers who work to serve their families. This is fascinating and original work, and SWS is pleased to recognize the contributions it makes by awarding Amrita Pande the 2008 SWS Cheryl Allyn Miller Award.

In addition, the Award Committee would like to make honorable mention of a paper by Sarah Damaske of New York University. Her work, entitled "For the Family: How Women Account for Work and Family Decisions," is also poised to make a substantial contribution to the study of women and work in its analysis of how women are obliged to frame their labor market participation in terms of their families' needs rather than their own. In this finding, Damaske's work complements Pande's quite nicely, albeit in quite different labor market contexts. The Award Committee is grateful for the opportunity to think about the issues facing women workers from the perspectives of this new generation.

---

Sociologists for Women in Society
Feminist White Paper Award

Prize: $1000.00
Deadline: January 1, 2009

"Research on Policies for Providing Universal Access to Healthcare in the United States"

We invite social science scholars familiar with health care policy research to provide an accessibly written critical overview of the policy options available to the United States in providing universal access to healthcare. We are particularly interested in coverage of relevant feminist scholarship, including consideration of the impact of various policy options on women. The white paper should include a data-based analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of models adopted in other industrialized nations as well as a consideration of the logistics and costs of providing health care in the United States.

Limit: 10 pages, exclusive of references and tables

Papers: Should be submitted electronically in a Word document or RTF format to
Email: sws@etal.uri.edu On Subject Line put: Feminist White Paper Competition
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What and Who is...
The Executive Office and Budget Committee (EOB)?

By Jessica Holden Sherwood
SWS Executive Officer

At the annual SWS executive office site visit in October, EOB committee members continued clarifying their committee’s charge and membership. Please see “What Are We Voting On, Anyway” in the previous (Fall 2008) issue of Network News for background. Here is a summary of the committee’s conclusions, which lead us to a new vote, upcoming at the Winter 2009 meeting, on changing EOB’s entry in the SWS Bylaws.

WHAT:

EOB has two missions: to supervise the SWS executive office, and to monitor SWS’s overall financial health and make recommendations to the Executive Council. This includes both a) preparing a draft budget for Council to review and forward to the membership for approval, and b) advising Council on the financial implications of policy questions. Using the recommendations of EOB, the Executive Council has the final fiduciary responsibility for SWS. (Council consists of the president and the eight people listed with her in the Network news masthead.)

WHO:

Part of the discussion about who should serve on EOB concerned the site visits themselves. Presently these visits are in the Fall, and for the last three years, the visitors have been EOB members, with a Council conference call. It was decided that—though a date should probably be set earlier—at the Summer meeting each year, the upcoming site visit agenda will be reviewed, and attendance at the site visit decided depending on the agenda. In other words, it’s possible that in a very routine year, only the treasurer would make a site visit; and possible that in a very intensive year, the entire Council should visit.

The SWS Bylaws have stated that the members of EOB are: the Treasurer (chair), Deputy Treasurer, Chair of the Publications Committee, President, Past President, Journal Editor, and Executive Officer. After thorough and extensive discussions, EOB members recommend removing the Journal Editor and adding the President-Elect. This way, each President will begin her term with more fiscal and operational knowledge.

PROPOSAL:

To amend Bylaws Article XIII, Sec 4. Current Text: “Members of the Executive Office and Budget Committee shall be: Treasurer (chair), Deputy Treasurer, Chair of the Publications Committee, Past President, with the Journal Editor and Executive Officer serving ex officio.”

Proposed Text: “Members of the Executive Office and Budget Committee shall be: Treasurer (chair), Deputy Treasurer, Chair of the Publications Committee, Past President, President-Elect, and Executive Officer. The duties of the committee will be supervised by the executive office, and to SWS’s overall financial health and relevant recommendations to the Executive Council.”

“Ex officio” means by virtue of the position someone holds, as opposed to “at large.”

Since everyone on EOB is serving a term with a voting position, the existing wording created confusion.

SWS members will vote for this proposal at the Winter Business Meeting in St. Louis. We hope to see many of you there.

Student Concerns Committee Report

By Wendy Christensen
Student Representative
wchriste@ssc.wisc.edu

At the SCC meeting we discussed how to make SWS resources (and other resources) available to graduate students online. This is really important for a couple reasons—to make all the useful material SWS has easy to find, and to make it easier for graduate students to help each other by providing an archive of advice and information.

To do this we need a way for SWS grad students support one another on an ongoing basis, and have a structure for that support so that it continues year after year. We talked about the importance of two student resources, and a proposal for a third:

1. The SWS Yahoo list. The list has been more active in the past few months, and we hope that continues. It is a great resource for getting advice about all sorts of things (as is the primary SWS list, although students may feel more comfortable asking for advice from other students on some matters).

2. The SCC website (http://www.sswomen.org/page.php?sss=8). This has been updated to include material on Career Development/Student Career, Workshop on mentoring that took place at the summer meeting in Boston. Other resources have also been added, including some of the most useful information on other parts of the SWS website for students.

3. SWS student wiki. To be able to access more resources available to graduate students, we are considering setting up an SWS graduated student wiki. Any student would be able to edit and add to the site to include resources such as: SWS publications, reading lists and film lists that come from the SWS listserv, links to websites about digital recorders, advice about market etc.

We are currently looking into how to start a wiki. If you're savvy, you can help get this launched, let us know.
SWS and Investing with Rainbow Solutions

By Tracey Steele
SWS Treasurer

Those of you at the summer meeting may recall the announcement that SWS is now working with Rainbow Solutions to manage the organization’s investment assets. This piece is written to share more about the rationale and process that lay behind this move.

First—the rationale. In the past, our organization invested some of our surplus assets into a few socially responsible funds. Over time, however, the composition of those funds changed and SWS found itself owning shares of mutual funds that included stocks that were decidedly less than socially responsible (e.g. Halliburton). In addition, due largely to the success of Gender & Society; we found ourselves to be in the very enviable position of possessing a very healthy budget surplus.

So, in 2007, under the leadership of Treasurer Kathleen Slobin and past President Chris Bose, members of the Executive Office and Budget Committee (EOB) initiated the decision to move towards active investment of our growing surplus. The goal was to grow our financial capital in responsible ways to allow us to engage in even more activities in service of the SWS mission. The priority that emerged was to move our organization back to active and socially-responsible investing.

The process. Once this decision was made, the EOB undertook a long and deliberate process to choose the right firm to manage our surplus assets. Two financial managers from two large firms were invited to make presentations at the 2007 EOB site visit. Though neither firm specialized in socially-responsible investing, both indicated they were willing and able to address our interests in socially-responsible funds. However, one of these firms soon withdrew because of a potential conflict of interest.

We learned quite a lot about investing from the experience, both from the financial managers and from one another. We determined the level of risk that the members of EOB shared for investing the organization’s funds (fairly conservative) and eventually decided that we wanted to also speak with firms that specialized in socially-responsible investing. Subsequently, we found and conducted conference calls with managers from two such companies. The first of these companies provided us with a social screening questionnaire that helped us to identify the issues that were most significant for the organization vis a vis our investments (e.g. companies with a proven record of diversity hiring and companies that were not involved with weapons, nuclear energy, animal testing, etc.).

The 2008 EOB continued the work on this important task and conducted interviews with references for all three remaining contenders (all were overwhelmingly positive). In the final analysis, it was decided that while each of the companies would have been acceptable, we strongly preferred one of the specialist firms; Rainbow Solutions. We chose Rainbow because they were a company dedicated to socially responsible investing, were woman-managed, and their references stressed qualities which were important to us, namely professionalism, performance, and communication. This recommendation was passed on to executive council and Rainbow Solutions was officially approved. It was a very difficult decision but once we are confident will best meet the needs of our organization.

Procedurally, all investment activity will be overseen by EOB and council. The EOB met with Rainbow at last month’s site visit and, as you can imagine, were interested in their advice on how to proceed in such turbulent times. We were happy with their judiciousness—buying slowly based on careful analysis of the fundamentals of the company and its long-term performance patterns. Nonetheless, we want to let you know that we will continue to prudently monitor and manage our investments and we will report on their performance in our biannual treasurer’s report.

Women of Color Dissertation Scholarship Recipient Renee Byrd

By Patricia Warren
Committee Chair

Sociologists for Women in Society has worked hard to build a coalition of women scholars who share concerns about the status of women both domestically and internationally. In keeping with that mission, SWS established a Women of Color Scholarship at its annual meeting in February 2007. The primary purposes of the scholarship are to offer support to female scholars who are from underrepresented groups and are studying concerns that women of color face domestically and/or internationally. The winner of this prestigious award receives a $15,000 scholarship, a plaque and an SWS membership for one year. In addition the recipient receives free registration for both the summer and winter meetings, along with an additional $500 grant to enable attendance at the winter meeting.

SWS is pleased to announce that Renee Byrd is the recipient of the 2008 of the Women of Color Dissertation Scholarship Award. Ms. Byrd is currently a doctoral candidate in the Women’s studies department at the University of Washington. Her dissertation investigates the salience of the state as a mechanism for organizing power through the study of encounters between sex workers in San Francisco’s Mission District and the police. This study specifically examines how police violence is legitimated through gendered and racialized neoliberal logics which exclude certain populations from the realm of humanity. Her research uses a mix-method approach which brings together applied visual methods, in-depth interviews with sex-workers, police and advocates, as well as use of documentary analysis of news articles and government publications.

Ms. Byrd is an extraordinary young scholar who hopes to use her scholarship to impact the social world more broadly. Upon completion of her dissertation work she will secure an academic position where she will continue her commitment to the rights of women domestically and internationally. Again, please congratulate our 2008 Women of Color Dissertation Scholarship recipient – Renee Byrd.
Nominate Your Students for SWS Awards!

Call for Papers: Cheryl Allyn Miller Award for Research on Women and Work
Deadline: April 1, 2009

Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) has established an award for graduate students and recent Ph.D.s working in the area of women and paid work — employment and self-employment, informal market work, illegal work. The award is supported by a bequest from the family of the late Cheryl Allyn Miller, a sociologist and feminist who studied women and paid work. The purpose of the award is to recognize a sociology graduate student or a recent doctorate whose research or activism constitutes an outstanding contribution to the field of women and work. This contribution may take the form of scholarly or policy research or activism. It may be completed work or work in progress, but should not be a proposal for future work, and should be sufficiently close to completion that the applicant can concisely describe and contextualize the contribution to the field. The award is $500, and will be presented at the Banquet at the August SWS meeting (held in conjunction with the annual meetings of the ASA). In addition to the $500 award, air travel to the meeting and a ticket to the banquet will be paid by SWS.

Guidelines for applications:
Applicants must be graduate students or have received their Ph.D. in 2008 or 2009. Applicants must belong to SWS, and may join at the same time they apply for the award. For membership information go to www.socwomen.org.

Submissions must include a 2-3 page curriculum vitae, a cover page with the author’s name, affiliation, and contact information, an abstract and paper of article length (no more than 30 double-spaced pages, including bibliography) in a style suitable for submission to a scholarly journal. The abstract/corresponding should include applicant’s name, address, telephone number, email address, and, for applicants with their Ph.D., the date the Ph.D. was completed. Applicants must submit materials on their own behalf. Do not include any nominating letters. Please submit the files as one PDF document if possible. Contact Anastasia Prokos (aprokos@iastate.edu) to inquire about other file formats. Please e-mail a copy of all materials to Anastasia Prokos (aprokos@iastate.edu).

Call for Nominations for SWS Scholarship Awards
Deadline: April 1, 2009

Beth B. Hess Memorial Scholarship

The Beth B. Hess Memorial Scholarship will be awarded to a new or continuing graduate student who began her or his study in a community college or technical school. A student accepted in an accredited PhD program in sociology in the United States is eligible to apply if she or he studied for at least one full academic year at a two-year college in the US before transferring to complete a BA. The Scholarship carries a stipend of $3500 from SWS to be used to support the pursuit of graduate studies as well as a one-year membership in Sociologists for Women in Society (including a subscription to Gender & Society). The Scholarship will be awarded at the Annual Meeting of SWS, ASA, and SSSP in New York, NY, August 1-3, 2008. The awardee’s economy class airfare, train fare or driving mileage/tolls will be paid by SWS, SPS and ASA (applicants for this award should also apply for an ASA student travel award; more than one such award may be given). Each association will also waive meeting registration and provide complimentary banquet or reception ticket for the awardee.

To honor Beth Hess’s career, the committee will be looking for: Commitment to teaching, especially at a community college; Research and/or activism in social inequality, social justice, or social problems, with a focus on gender and/or gerontology being especially positive. Service to the academic and/or local community, including mentoring. High quality research and writing in the proposal and letter of application. An application for the award should contain: a letter of recommendation (no more than 2 pages) that describes the student’s decision to study sociology, career goals, research, activism and service that would help the committee to see how the Scholarship would be a fitting honor.

A letter confirming enrollment in or admission to a sociology Ph.D. program (and aid award if any); a letter of recommendation from a sociologist (in a sealed envelope, signed on the seal); full name and vitae, including all schools, awarded, years of study, and full time; (Optional) a one-page letter of recommendation from a colleague who can contribute to the decision to study sociology or pursue higher education. A copy of: Name and full contact information including phone and email; Current or organizational affiliation; If not currently enrolled, graduate school and date of expected completion; Community college attended, with credits taken OR transcript; Name of honors/awards included, name of honored faculty member. Six complete copies of the application should be submitted to: Prof. My Ferree, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Observatory Drive, Madison WI.

Women of Color Dissertation Scholarship

Scholarship Purpose: Sociologists for Women in Society, has worked to build a coalition of women schol¬ing and share concerns about the status of women of color both domestically and internationally. Keeping with that mission, SWS established a Women of Color Scholar¬ship annual meeting in February 2007. The purpose of the scholarship is to offer support to female scholars from underrepresented groups studying concerns that women of color face domestically and/or internationally.

To increase the participation of women of color in SWS. Selection Criteria: Students must be a woman of color, and their racial/ethnic group facing racial inequality in the United States; 2) Their work must be sociologically relevant and demonstrate the students decision to study sociology, career goals, research, activism and service that would help the committee to see how the Scholarship would be a fitting honor.

A letter confirming enrollment in or admission to a sociology Ph.D. program (and aid award if any); a letter of recommendation from a sociologist (in a sealed envelope, signed on the seal); full name and vitae, including all schools, awarded, years of study, and full time; (Optional) a one-page letter of recommendation from a community college faculty who can contribute to the decision to study sociology or pursue higher education. A copy of: Name and full contact information including phone and email; Current or organizational affiliation; If not currently enrolled, graduate school and date of expected completion; Community college attended, with credits taken OR transcript; Name of honors/awards included, name of honored faculty member. Six complete copies of the application should be submitted to: Prof. My Ferree, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Observatory Drive, Madison WI.

Funding: The winner will be awarded $15,000 scholarship, a plaque, and expenses for the SWS Annual Meeting.
membership for one year. In addition, the recipient will receive free registration for both the summer and winter meetings, along with an additional $500 grant to enable attendance at the winter meeting. **Student Application Process:** Complete application packets should be sent to the SWS Executive Office at the address below. Each packet must include: 1) A personal statement which details short and long term career and research goals. The letter must also state which racial/ethnic group(s) the applicant represents; 2) A resume or Curriculum Vitae; 3) Two letters of recommendation addressing the content and quality of the student's work and progress in the program. One of these letters must be from the Graduate Director or Advisor, who should address the financial need of the applicant as well as certify the date on which the applicant became or will become ABD. Each letter should be placed in a sealed envelope with author's signature over the seal. **LETTERS NOT INCLUDED IN THE PACKET WILL NOT BE Accepted:** 4) Proposal (not to exceed 5 pages) for the dissertation research which outlines: Purpose of research; Work to be accomplished through scholarship sponsorship; Time line for completing dissertation. **Responsibilities of Recipient:** The recipient should attend the summer and winter meetings. Free registration and a $500 stipend will be available to the winner for this purpose; submit a brief report (3 pages max) on the work completed during the scholarship year, no later than 1 month after the end of the award period. This report should be submitted to the SWS executive office at the attention of the "Women of Color Scholarship Committee." **Barbara Rosenblum Cancer Dissertation Award** Applications are invited for the **Barbara Rosenblum Cancer Dissertation Scholarship.** The scholarship was established by SWS with a bequest from Dr. Barbara Rosenblum, an active and longstanding member, who died February 14, 1988 after a long battle with breast cancer. The purpose of the scholarship is to encourage doctoral research in sociology, anthropology, psychology and related fields on women's experience of breast cancer and other reproductive cancers and the prevention of these cancers. Another goal of the scholarship is to encourage scholars to make this type of research accessible to the public through speaking and publishing for lay audiences. $1,500 will be awarded to support any aspect of doctoral research and/or publication and presentation of results from the date advanced to candidacy through one year after receiving the doctorate. The award will be presented at the annual meeting of SWS in August. All applicants will have the opportunity to discuss their work with a member of the committee. The candidate will be a woman: With a feminist orientation who is sensitive to studying breast cancer and its impact on women of color as well as white women, on lesbians as well as heterosexuals, and women from diverse social classes and cultural backgrounds. With approval of prospectus for doctoral research on breast cancer that will be useful not only academically but which will have pragmatic and practical applications. Such applications would include research that could be used to inform and empower women and demystify the disease and/or prevent disease. Planning to present her research findings and applications to lay audiences as well as to social scientists. The application for the Scholarship can be accessed on the SWS website: www.socwomen.org. Send materials are to committee chair Susan W. Hinze (susan.hinze@case.edu).

**Paula England**

**Campus Visits of 2009 Feminist Lecturer**

By Lisa D. Brush

Committee Chair

2009 Distinguished Feminist Lecturer Paula England is available to visit two U.S. college/university campuses during the 2009-2010 academic year. Dr. England will deliver her lecture on two U.S. campuses that are isolated, rural, located away from major metropolitan areas, bereft of the resources needed to invite guest speakers, and/or characterized by hostility to feminist scholarship. A key goal of the Feminist Lecturer program is to provide a feminist voice on campuses where such a perspective is unusual and/or unwelcome. (Please see the Fall 2002 *Network News* issue & column by Patricia Martin on the award, criteria, and past awardees.) Professor England’s lectures can be scheduled anytime between August 2009 and June 2010. SWS will pay at least a portion of the expenses for the two site visits; institutions should not let resource scarcity prevent them from applying. Applications (consisting of a letter that gives a rationale and specifies tentative dates) from institutions interested in hosting Professor Ridgeway are due by March 1, 2009, to Lisa D. Brush, Department of Sociology, 2425 WWPB, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh PA 15260; phone 412-648-7595; email lbrush@pitt.edu. Electronic applications are preferred. Inquiries welcome.

**List of Cheryl Miller/Feminist Lecturers, 1985-2009:**

1985 Janet Chafetz, SWS Cheryl Allyn Miller Distinguished Lecturer
1986 Barrie Thorne, SWS Cheryl Allyn Miller Distinguished Lecturer
1987 Barbara Reskin, SWS Cheryl Allyn Miller Distinguished Lecturer
1988 Barbara Katz Rothman, SWS Cheryl Allyn Miller Distinguished Lecturer
1989 Maxine Baca Zinn, SWS Cheryl Allyn Miller Distinguished Lecturer
1990 Arlene Kaplan Daniels, SWS Cheryl Allyn Miller Distinguished Lecturer
1991 Francesca Cancian, SWS Cheryl Allyn Miller Distinguished Lecturer
1992 Judith Lorber, SWS Cheryl Miller Allyn Distinguished Lecturer
1993 Myra Marx Ferree, SWS Cheryl Allyn Miller Distinguished Lecturer
1994 Mady Segal, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer in honor of Helen McGill Hughes
1995 Rose Brewer, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer in honor of Ruth Shorel Cavan
1996 Ronnie Steinberg, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
1997 Vera Taylor, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
1998 Kathleen Gerson, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
1999 Michael Kimmel, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
2000 Mary Frank Fox, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
2001 Patricia Yancey Martin, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
2002 Barbara Risman, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
2003 Cheryl Townsend Gilkes, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
2004 Margaret Anderson, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
2005 Joan Acker, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
2006 Michael Messner, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
2007 Evelyn Nakano Glenn, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
2008 Cecilia Ridgeway, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
2009 Silver Anniversary — Paula England, SWS Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
2010 *Name your nominee!*
SWS Winter Meetings
Savannah, Georgia
February 5-8th, 2009

WINTER MEETING INFORMATION:
http://www.socwomen.org/meetings

About the photo: One of Savannah’s favorite stories. Florence Martus (1868 - 1943), who was known as the Waving Girl. The daughter of a sergeant stationed at Fort Pulaski, Florence later moved to stay with her mother along the river near the entrance of the harbor with her brother. She worked as the Cockspur Island Lighthouse keeper.

The remote cottage was lonely for Florence whose closest friend was her devoted collie. At an early age, she developed a close bond with the passing ships and welcomed each one with a wave ofer kerchief. Sailors began returning her greeting by waving back a blast of the ship’s horn. Eventually Florence started greeting ships arriving in the dark by waving a lantern.

Florence Martus continued her waving tradition for 44 years, estimated that she welcomed more than 30,000 ships during her lifetime. The facts, however, about why she started and continued the tradition for so many years remain a mystery. In any event, Florence Martus grew into a Savannah legend, known far and wide. On September 19, 1943, the SS Florence Martus, a Liberty ship, was christened in honor of her.

The Waving Girl Statue by renowned sculptor Felix De Weldon was a gift from the United States Marine Corps Memorial in Virginia (also known as the Iwo Jima Memorial) depicts Florence Martus and her loyal collie.

The Waving Girl Statue is also the first statue of a woman in a public city park.

Deadline, March 1, 2009:
Nominate Your Colleagues for SWS Awards

SWS Feminist Mentoring Award
Time to nominate a fabulous feminist mentor for the SWS Mentoring Award! The new award was established in 1990 to honor an SWS member who is an outstanding feminist.

SWS Feminist Activism Award
The Feminist Activism Award is presented annually to an SWS member who has not only used sociology to improve conditions for women in society.

SWS 2010 Distinguished Feminist Lecturer
This program was founded in 1985 as a way of (a) recognizing our members who have contributed to feminist scholarship employs a feminist perspective and (b) making this feminist scholarship available to campuses that are isolated, rural, bereft of the resources needed to invite guest speakers or characterized by hostility to feminist scholarship.

To update address or contact information with SWS please log in to www.socwomen.org/members Click "Update Contact Information"
GROWING PAINS

I can’t help but take time to write about California’s Proposition 8 and discuss growing pains, not for me, but for many African Americans, like my sister Dee. For many in our community, which has been steeped in ‘religious tradition,’ the focus is on ‘deliverance,’ reflecting our hopes for a wider form of social acceptance across racial lines. I was surprised to hear my sister, a Pentecostal Christian, express her disappointment in the failure of Prop 8. Dee does not have the benefit of a college education, so she cannot talk about ‘Loving v. Virginia’, but she does talk about “loving” -- about the friendship and love she has found with her employers, who shared in her 60th birthday party in Albany, New York. This was new for me to hear! Before I left upstate New York for Ohio, she had not reached this stage of social acceptance and understanding, despite our family’s gay nephew and uncle.

So, I was bowled over as she stated ‘It’s not right! It’s just not right!’ I thought back to how I have tried to inform her about understanding human and civil rights not just across racial lines, but across boundaries of sexuality, despite our religious upbringing. I had not been successful and felt this religiously-centered part of our community still needed work to prepare their hearts and minds for inevitable change. But the couples I will call James and Terri, a gay brother and sister, and their partners, Jackson and Barbara, who happen to be White, have successfully done this work with her.

She then helped me grow, as I saw her tears, heard her speak of the love she shared with these couples and of her willingness to fight for their rights in every way that she could, beginning with her congregation. That really surprised me, because Dee was a committed member of the Church of God in Christ, a strongly evangelical church. Because I could see that she has jumped this religious hurdle and no longer speaks in terms of biblical prohibitions of same-sex relationships, I also grew in my beliefs about her religiosity. Knowing that she grew, and continues to grow, and has risked a step that she feels is important for her, her congregation, and the world in general I appreciate how she finishes every conversation with ‘judge not lest ye be judged’ and ‘love one another as I love you’. So during Christmas break, she and I will work together at making a change in this church community to help them to send her and my sentiments forward into the wider church. We know the challenge is great, but we are ready. Despite the pains of potential rejection and opposition, I expect to grow even more helping my sister and her congregation grow.

Send your brief observations to the Sister-to-Sister Taskforce c/o mferree@ssc.wisc.edu for them to be edited anonymously by this group and presented here.

---

1 Pseudonyms are being used rather than real names of these individuals.
Calling All Students:
Join Us In Savannah!

By Melissa Freburger
Presidential Assistant

Thinking about attending the SWS winter meeting for the first time? Join us! Although I have been a member of SWS for several years, I will attend this year’s winter meeting as a first-timer. To get a better sense of what it will be like, I had the good fortune of discussing SWS meetings with experienced graduate students Shelley Koch and Liz Legerski. After hearing their enthusiastic reviews, I am looking forward to the meeting with even more excitement.

My goal is to get you excited, too, so that you will join us in Savannah for the 2009 winter meeting. Thus, I will share with you what I discovered through my conversations with Shelley and Liz. The following are seven great reasons why you should make the 2009 winter meeting your first (or even second or third!) meeting, too!

1. Size. ASA and regional association meetings can be big and overwhelming. SWS meetings are much smaller, making them less intimidating and much more intimate. Shelley described the winter meeting as a relaxed setting with many opportunities to meet other SWS members informally.

2. Networking. Meet other SWSers! Because SWS meetings are more intimate than other conferences, they provide more opportunities to meet people with whom you will likely share intellectual and political interests. No need to fear that you won’t know what to talk about when meeting others. Liz told me, “You’re almost guaranteed to share an interest with someone there, making it easy to talk to people.” Shelley not only connected with other students at the two meetings she has attended, but formed relationships with established SWSers, to whom she can turn when she has questions. What a great resource!

In addition to informally meeting other graduate students and experienced members, SWS offers many organized opportunities to meet other members. The Hand program matches first-time SWSers with experienced members to have a meal or cup of coffee during the meeting. Other ways to network include attending an organized dinner out with other members, participating on an SWS committee, and sharing a room with other members. Roommate matching was highly recommended by Shelley; she shared a room with another graduate student and formed a long-lasting friendship. Look for information about the Hand program and roommate matching on the SWS website.

3. Professional Development. The winter meeting offers several ways to cultivate your professional skills. The conference program includes professional development workshops and research roundtables. The research roundtables were described by Liz as a “low pressure opportunity to a session with the founding members, SWS speakers on healthcare, development workshops, and silent auction. President-elect Hills has planned a great get-together on-line at: http://www.socsci.org/socsci/Documents/WSW08_PP.pdf.

5. The Location. Immerse yourself in southern charm! Savannah, the “city of the south” is famous for its historic architecture and is full of cultural adventures. The Hampton Inn is the heart of Savannah’s historic district, just steps away from restaurants, dining, and entertainment.

6. Cost. Attending the meeting is more affordable than you think. The room doesn’t have to break the bank; you can share a suite with several others. You can also book a room online and get a discount. The bill can be as low as $30 a night sharing with five other people in a room, or as high as $60. If you must fly, be sure to purchase your ticket as soon as possible. I was pleasantly surprised to find that right now the bill is $200.00 for a round-trip ticket from Kansas City, MO to Savannah. If you fly, you save some money.

For more information regarding flight prices, visit the SWS website for a list of hotels.

7. So Many Ways to Get Involved! Shelley told me, “SWS is the place to be if you want to get involved.” Here are some ways to get involved.

- Meet with other students and professionals. SWS offers many organized opportunities to meet other members. The Hand program matches first-time SWSers with experienced members to have a meal or cup of coffee during the meeting. Other ways to network include attending an organized dinner out with other members, participating on an SWS committee, and sharing a room with other members. Roommate matching was highly recommended by Shelley; she shared a room with another graduate student and formed a long-lasting friendship. Look for information about the Hand program and roommate matching on the SWS website.

Savannah, the “hostess city of the south” is famous for its historic architecture and is full of cultural activities and adventures.

share your research with other SWS members and gather invaluable feedback.” Another opportunity cited by both Shelley and Liz is committee involvement, which is not only a great way to network but demonstrates your commitment to service, a positive attribute to any vita! The Program. Liz attended her first SWS meeting last winter and admitted that she was hesitant to attend a “business” meeting, “. . . because I thought it would be just that - a whole lotta business! But the sessions were energizing and inspiring and there were plenty of opportunities to socialize and network in addition to participating in the decision-making of our organization.” Indeed, you will find a range of enjoyable activities in this year’s program, including
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Savannah, the “hostess city of the south” is famous for its historic architecture and is full of cultural activities and adventures.
Single Women
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Over the past decades, the place of people who are single in contemporary American society has changed markedly. From 28% in 1970, the group of divorced, widowed, and always-single Americans has grown to nearly 42% in 2007. Currently, there are fewer households consisting of mom, dad, and the kids than of singles living on their own. However, ways of thinking about single and married people have not kept up with these rapid social changes. In the academy, much research and teaching is based on the outdated assumption that marriage and nuclear family dominate adult life. As a result, people who are single, and perspectives not based on conventional marriage, are greatly underrepresented in scholarship and public policy.

As with other groups considered to be outside the mainstream of society, singles are often targets of stereotyping, discrimination, and exclusion. In federal statutes, for example, marital status is a factor in 1,138 provisions for determining rights, benefits, and privileges. Attempts to expand access to those protections have focused on the legalization of same-sex marriage. However, even if those efforts were entirely successful, the growing number of people who are single would still be excluded from full protection under the law.

**Who Counts as Single?**

- **Legal definition.** People are single if they are not legally married. This legal definition includes people who are currently divorced, widowed, or have always been single, as well as unmarried cohabitators.
- **Social definition.** People who cohabit with a romantic partner are typically viewed as socially coupled (rather than socially single), and that criterion can be regarded as definitional. However, many people in sex-linked relationships who are not cohabiting are also viewed and treated as socially coupled. Self-identities do not necessarily coincide with social or legal identities.

**How Many Single Women (and Men) Are There in the U.S.?**

Marital Status in the United States: 2007 (Ages 18 and Older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL ADULTS</th>
<th></th>
<th>MEN</th>
<th></th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(millions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(millions)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(millions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>124.8</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMARRIED*</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always-single</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (all categories)</td>
<td>222.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>114.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From U.S. Census Bureau, Housing & Household Economic Statistics Division, Fertility & Family Statistics Branch*
The category of all legally unmarried Americans has many subcategories:

- It includes cohabitators and single parents. As of 2006, there were 6 million unmarried-partner households; 5.2 million included other-sex partners and 780,000 were comprised of same-sex partners. There were 12.9 million single parents in 2006; 10.4 million were single mothers.
- The percent of unmarried Americans (41.7% overall) varies by group: 34.3% of Asians, 39.0% of Non-Hispanic Whites, 42.6% of Hispanics, and 58.5% of Blacks in the U.S. are legally single.
- The percent of unmarried American women is 46.1 for women earning under $25,000; 37.9 for women earning between $25,000 and $74,999; and 33.4 for women earning more than $75,000.

Did you know…?

American women now spend more years of their adult lives unmarried than married.

- The trend toward spending more time single is not specific to the United States. Across 192 countries, people who, by age 30, had always been single, increased from 15% in the 1970s to 24% in the 1990s. The increase was greater for developed countries: In the 1990s, 38% of the women and 57% of the men reached the end of their 20s without ever marrying (World Fertility Report, 2003).

What Are Some of the Myths and Realities about People Who Are Single?

MYTH: Older women who have always been single are alone and lonely.
FACT: They have very low levels of loneliness (Dykstra, 1995; Dykstra & de Jong Gierveld, 2004).

MYTH: Single people are unhappy, and they become happier if they marry.
FACT: Single people are generally happy (DePaulo, 2006). Those who do marry and stay married report small increases in happiness around the year of the wedding (a honeymoon effect), then go back to the same level of happiness they had when they were single. Those who marry and later divorce do not experience the honeymoon effect (Lucas, Clark, Georgellis, & Diener, 2003). Happiness levels of people headed toward divorce drop more for men than for women.

MYTH: Single people are responsible for weakening interpersonal and community ties.
FACT: Adults who have always been single are more likely to visit, contact, advise, and support their parents and siblings, and to maintain intergenerational ties, than are the currently or previously married. Singles are also more likely to socialize with, encourage, and help their friends and neighbors (Sarkisian & Gerstel, 2006, 2008). Many single women maintain networks of friends who have been in their lives for decades (Simon, 1987; Trimberger, 2005).

MYTH: Single mothers raise their children single-handedly.
FACT: They are often interdependent with friends, family, and other social network members, sharing care-work and support (Hertz, 2006; Hertz & Ferguson, 1998; Trimberger, 2005).

MYTH: In order to have good outcomes, children need to be raised by two parents.
FACT: The quality of the relationship between a parent and a child, and the degree of conflict in a household, can be more important than the number of parents (DePaulo, 2006; Lansford, Ceballo, Ab & Stewart, 2001; Repetti, Taylor, & Seeman, 2002).

In What Ways Are Single People Excluded or Underserved by Current Laws and Policies?

People who are legally single and do not have children are excluded from benefits and protections such as the ones described in this section. A separate point about parental (rather than marital) status – that no parents who have caregiving responsibilities should have the same benefits as parents – is discussed in Young (1996).
• Access to care and to opportunities to provide care. The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) allows married workers to take time off to care for an ailing spouse. Single workers, however, cannot take time off under FMLA to care for important peers in their lives, nor can any of their peers take time to care for them.

• Access to health insurance. In some workplaces, married workers can add their spouse to their health care plan at a reduced rate. Single people cannot add a person to their plan, and no other worker can add a single person to their plan. When married workers can add someone to their plan and single workers cannot, single workers are receiving unequal compensation for the same work.

• Estate tax exemptions. Upon death, the estates of married people go to their spouse, tax-free. When single people bequeath their estate to someone, their estate is taxed.

• Social Security benefits. The Social Security benefits earned by married workers go to the spouse upon the death of the worker. The benefits earned by always-single people who do not have children go back into the system.

• Testimonial privileges and immunities. Spouses can be protected from testifying against one another, but single people have no similar protections with regard to the most important persons in their lives.

• There are other protections that accrue automatically to married people that single people can obtain by contracting for each of them individually, and at their own expense. Proceeding in such unwieldy and costly ways, single people can, for example, designate a close friend, relative, or other important person to have power of attorney or hospital visitation rights, or to be beneficiaries of their estate.

• In a number of important domains, singles are targets of discrimination (DePaulo, 2006). For example, studies of housing discrimination have shown that married couples are preferred as tenants over single men, single women, unmarried couples, and pairs of friends (Morris, Sinclair, & DePaulo, 2007). Studies of pay disparities have documented that single men are paid less than married men for the same work, even when their accomplishments are comparable.

What Are Some of the Policies and Practices that Would Protect All Dependent and Interdependent Caring Relationships?

• Extensions of policies such as FMLA to include people beyond nuclear family members would provide single people (and others, including siblings, aunts, and nieces) with important opportunities for caring and receiving care.

• Where civil unions are recognized, qualified couples can register and thereby receive all of the available benefits and protections. The process allows couples access to an entire package of privileges and protections, without needing to contract for each of the benefits individually. A comparable registration process that is not restricted to people who are sexual partners would extend basic benefits and protections to all citizens.

• In the workplace, cafeteria-style benefit plans, whereby all employees can choose the particular benefits that fit their needs, would be useful to single workers and all other workers, too. Some corporations already offer such plans (Trimberger, 2002).

• Scattered legal reforms in specific locales, such as the 2007 Virginia law that permits patients in hospitals to see whomever they wish, should be extended nationally (Polikoff, 2007).

Sources for Further Information and Other Resources

The Singles Studies website, http://issc.berkeley.edu/singlessudies/.
The Alternatives to Marriage Project (AtMP), http://www.unmarried.org/.
The information service at Unmarried America, http://www.unmarriedamerica.org/.
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Report Card on Gender Scholarship and Equity in Sociology Departments
(Among PhD Granting Institutions):
Revision to the Report Card on Gender and Women Friendly Institutions (2004)

Barbara Risman and Lisa Berube
University of Illinois at Chicago

In 2004, Sociologists for Women in Society released a report on the state of women sociologists and gender scholarship in the discipline. The SWS Report Card on Gender and Women Friendly Institutions (2004) offered an additional ranking system to those created by the National Research Council and US News and World Report rankings of departmental prestige and merit. Unlike these ranking guides, the SWS report’s goal was to recognize sociology departments that excel in creating a climate that is welcoming to women and feminist scholars. This is an update revised to recognize those sociology departments who now excel in gender scholarship and equity and also to show how the discipline has changed, or not, in the past four years.

We took the challenge offered by Chait and Trower (2001) when they suggested:
If, for example, a civil rights or feminist group widely disseminated a report card or ranking of faculty compositions, broken down by race and gender, of the top colleges and universities, these schools might be spurred into constructive competition to improve (2001b).

Even in the 21st century, the under-representation of women in the academy increases the higher one moves up the institutional ladder of prestige. Women now earn 51 percent of doctoral degrees (National Science Foundation, 2005), yet they make up only 25 percent of full professors in graduate programs and they are overrepresented among low level instructors and lecturers in doctoral granting departments (Chait and Trower 2001a, Kulis, Sicotte, and Collins 2002). Women at every rank earn less than their male counterparts, and women hold a disproportionate share of the lowest-paid part-time academic positions (Kulis, Sicotte, and Collins 2002). In sociology, women earn 64 percent of doctoral degrees (NSF, 2005), yet they make up only 26 percent of full professors in graduate programs and they are overrepresented (at 61 percent) among instructors and lecturers at doctoral-granting institutions (American Sociological Association 2003a).

The research presented here ranks gender-friendly departments and grants the SWS SEALS OF APPROVAL based on data collected from the 2007 ASA Guide to Graduate Departments. In order to assess the reliability of the data, we contacted the Directors of Graduate Studies in each PhD granting institution to verify the data. We coded two variables:
--percentage of tenure track faculty who are women
--percentage of tenure track faculty with research and teaching specialties in the areas of gender and inequality (e.g. intersectionality).

Just as the methods used by NRC and US News are imperfect, we recognize that our measures have weaknesses. There is no simple, unambiguous, or fully “objective” means to measure the
gender-friendliness of any department. We also recognize that women students and students interested in gender issues can receive excellent training from one or two outstanding scholars even in departments with few women or feminist scholars. Yet, prior research suggests that under-representation of women faculty operates as a systematic structural impediment to the intellectual and professional success of women students and faculty (ASA Committee on the Status of Women 1990).

We recognize that the correlation between these variables and "gender-friendliness" is by no means absolute. We also want to note that we see a clear distinction between the number of women faculty and the number of faculty who do research on gender and inequality. Thus, these measures are independent. We suggest that these measures, taken together are useful for determining a department's overall openness to women and to gender- and diversity-sensitive teaching and research.

We use the already established three SWS SEALS OF APPROVAL. The SWS SEAL OF APPROVAL FOR FACULTY GENDER EQUITY will be awarded to those departments in which 40 percent or more of the faculty are women. THE SWS SEAL OF APPROVAL FOR GENDER SCHOLARSHIP will be granted to those departments in which over 25 percent of the faculty specialize in gender or inequality scholarship. Finally, the seal we hope will be the most widely coveted—the SWS SEAL OF EXCELLENCE—will be awarded to those departments that meet SWS standards for both faculty equity and representation of gender scholarship.

In the few years between the original report and our current revision, the presence of women in gender scholarship in the discipline has changed dramatically. There have been marked improvements on each measure while there remains a clear underrepresentation of both women tenure track faculty and gender scholarship in the most prestigious departments (as determined by the National Research Council and the US News and World Report). Still, many more departments are awarded these seals of honor in 2008 than four years ago, indicating positive changes in the discipline for women, feminists, and gender scholars.

**SWS SEAL OF APPROVAL FOR FACULTY GENDER EQUITY**

For the last twenty years, over 40 percent of the doctoral degrees in sociology have been awarded to women. Since 1994, women have received over half the doctorates in sociology; by 2005, 64 percent of new sociologists were women (NSF, 2005).

Based on the pool of available sociology PhDs, along with the recognition that labor market organizational barriers impact the employment of new faculty, the SWS SEAL OF APPROVAL FOR GENDER EQUITY is awarded to all those departments in which 40 percent or more of the faculty are women.

Seventy-three graduate departments, representing 65 percent of the doctoral-granting sociology departments in the country, meet the standards for this seal of approval. This is now the norm in sociology departments. In 2004, only thirty-seven graduate departments, representing 33 percent of the sociology departments in the country, met this standard (Hays and Risman 2004). This nearly doubling of departments which meet these criteria is clear evidence of the feminization of the discipline. Only one third of PhD granting departments do not now have at least 40% female faculty.
Over 50% Female Faculty
University of California- San Francisco 64%
Wayne State University 64%
Bowling Green University 61%
Arizona State University 60%
University of Colorado at Boulder 60%
Kent State University 58%
University of Central Florida 57%
Syracuse University 57%
Temple University 57%
University of Utah 57%
University of Nebraska-Lincoln 56%
University of Oklahoma 56%
South Dakota University 56%
Brandeis University 55%
Washington State University 55%
Iowa State University 54%
Fordham University 53%
University of Iowa 53%
University of New Hampshire 53%
Rutgers University 53%

40%-50% Female Faculty
University of Southern California 50%
Boston College 50%
University of California-Santa Cruz 50%
Case Western University 50%
University of Illinois at Chicago 50%
John Hopkins University 50%
University of North Texas 50%
University of Pittsburgh 50%
Florida State University 48%
Boston University 47%
University of Miami 47%
University of California-Irvine 46%
University of California-Santa Barbara 46%
Emory University 46%
Georgia State University 46%
Northwestern University 46%
Southern Illinois University 46%
Tulane University 46%
University of California-Davis 46%
University of Minnesota 45%
Duke University 44%
Howard University 44%
University of Kansas 44%
University of Maryland 44%
North Dakota State University 44%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Berkeley</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada Las Vegas</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern University</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland University</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York-Albany</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama-Birmingham</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uni. of Illinois Champaign Urbana</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts-Amherst</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By contrast, thirteen percent of sociology departments (14 departments) have fewer than 30 percent women among their ranks. This compares to nearly one third of sociology departments with so few women only four years ago. Given the dramatic change in the sex composition of the discipline, it seems useful to identify those departments where women are still underrepresented at 20% or less. They include:

**Under 20% Female Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Chicago</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana State University</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SWS SEAL OF APPROVAL FOR GENDER SCHOLARSHIP**

The next seal of approval is designed to identify departments with a central focus on gender and inequality research with an intersectional approach. The SWS SEAL OF APPROVAL FOR GENDER SCHOLARSHIP is awarded to all those departments in which over 25 percent of the faculty name gender or inequality among their specialties.

1 Specifically, this includes those faculty who listed “Gender,” “Feminist Theory,” “Sex and Gender,” “Inequality,” “Race/Class/Gender,” “Gender Inequality,” “Gender and [blank] Inequality,” “Feminist [blank],” “Gender and [blank],” or “Women and Men and [blank]” in the 2007 ASA Guide to Graduate Departments.
In 2004, twenty-four departments, representing twenty-one percent of sociology departments, won this seal. In four years, the number of departments meeting SWS standards for gender scholarship increased to thirty-seven, representing thirty-three percent of the sociology departments in the country. The following departments win this seal in 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Over 40% Gender Scholarship</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama-Birmingham</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30% to 40% Gender Scholarship</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Washington State University</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada-Las Vegas</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Pittsburgh</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New York-Albany</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston College</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Massachusetts-Amherst</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Riverside</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas State University</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Santa Barbara</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado-Boulder</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25% to 30% Gender Scholarship</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York-Albany</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green University</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma State University</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois University</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York-Buffalo</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York-Stony Brook</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Davis</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By contrast, there are still departments with very few women and little gender scholarship. Departments with 10 percent or less of faculty specializing in gender or inequality include:

- Florida International University
- Miami University
- John Hopkins University
- Pennsylvania State University
- Boston University
- Howard University
- University of California San Diego
- University of South Carolina
- University of Pennsylvania
- Columbia University
- University of Norte Dame
- Baylor University
- Princeton University
- University of Chicago
- Texas Women’s University

**SWS SEAL OF EXCELLENCE**

Finally, SWS would like to recognize those departments that excel in both the proportion of faculty who are women and in the representation of scholarship on gender inequality. To recognize them, we offer the SWS SEAL OF EXCELLENCE.

To be awarded this seal, a department must meet the SWS standards for BOTH representation of women faculty and representation of gender/inequality scholarship. We suggest that such departments are likely to be the most gender-and women-friendly departments in the country.

Twelve doctoral-granting sociology departments received this honor in 2004. Today, twenty-nine doctoral-granting departments, more than twice as many departments, meet these demanding criteria. In alphabetical order, they include:

- University of Alabama-Birmingham
- Boston College
- Bowling Green State University
- University of California-Davis
- University of California-Santa Barbara
- University of Cincinnati
- University of Connecticut
- University of Colorado-Boulder
- Cornell University
- Florida State University
- Georgia State University
- University of Illinois at Chicago
- University of Iowa
- University of Kansas
- Kent State University
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts-Amherst
State University of New York-Albany
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
University of Nevada-Las Vegas
Oklahoma State University
University of Pittsburgh
Rutgers University
University of Southern California
Southern Illinois University
Stanford University
Syracuse University
Utah State University
Washington State University

Of these twenty-nine doctoral-granting institutions recognized by the SWS for their excellence in gender-friendliness, 18 are ranked among the 60 most prestigious sociology departments in the country by *US News and World Report* (2008). They include (with their *US News* rank):

Stanford University (6)
Cornell University (14)
University of Maryland (25)
State University of New York-Albany (25)
University of California-Davis (29)
University of California-Santa Barbara (29)
Rutgers University (31)
University of Iowa (34)
University of Massachusetts-Amherst (34)
Washington State University (38)
University of Southern California (42)
Florida State University (42)
University of Illinois at Chicago (46)
Boston College (49)
University of Pittsburgh (49)
University of Colorado Boulder (55)
University of Connecticut (58)
University of Kansas (58)

**Women, Gender Scholarship, and Institutional Prestige**

To what extent is there overlap between departments who both have women faculty and support in gender scholarship and institutional prestige? As previous research has suggested, there is good reason to believe that the higher one moves up the ladder of institutional prestige, the fewer women one will find, the less diversity overall, and the less concern with gender and inequality scholarship. We find a great deal of departmental variation, even among the upper ranks.

Of the 20 most prestigious departments in the country (as ranked by *US News and World Report*), nine departments receive the SWS SEAL OF APPROVAL FOR FACULTY GENDER EQUITY. This triples the departments receiving the seal in 2004.
University of California-Berkeley
University of Michigan
Stanford University
Indiana University
Northwestern University
Cornell University
Duke University
Ohio State University
Yale University

Of the 20 most prestigious departments in the country, two doctoral granting institutions receive the SWS SEAL OF APPROVAL FOR GENDER SCHOLARSHIP. This is a slight improvement from 2004, where no departments ranked in the top 20 in the *Us News and World Report* were awarded this particular seal.

Stanford University
Cornell University

In comparison to the 2004 report in which none of the most prestigious departments received the highly coveted SWS SEAL OF EXCELLENCE, we proudly award this seal to two departments:

Stanford University
Cornell University

Hence, to the extent that organizational cultures and academic practices continue to favor men, many women scholars and students interested in gender research will continue to be faced with a trade off—seeking work and education in the most prestigious departments, or choosing to surround themselves with women faculty and scholars interested in gender and diversity teaching and research. However, perhaps the most important finding of this report is that this tradeoff is not absolute. As our data suggest, there are many highly ranked sociology departments that demonstrate a commitment to equality by promoting gender scholarship and the representation of women among their faculty.

Although this is only one assessment and there are many other criteria that could be used to measure gender-friendliness, we offer this SWS ranking system as one piece of information. We urge all those departments receiving SWS SEALS to proudly note this fact in department brochures, announcements, and future *ASA Guides to Graduate Departments*.

We hope that this report card will be a helpful tool in guiding prospective graduate students towards women, gender, and feminist friendly sociology departments. For those on the job market, this report card offers suggestions on where feminist academics will be more likely to find welcoming and supportive departments. We also suggest that feminists in other disciplines consider similar ranking schemes. Our hope is that department leaders in sociology departments across the country will use these findings to advertise their strengths and to identify and overcome their weaknesses.
References


Opportunities to Participate

University of Kansas

Professors Mary Zimmerman, University of Kansas, and Jan Thomas, Kenyon College, will again be leading a study abroad course, June 7-June 21, 2009, to study health care and related social policies in Sweden. The course, based in Stockholm, is open to faculty as well as students (both graduate and undergraduate). Students receive 3 academic credits in Sociology, granted through the University of Kansas. For information, contact either Zimmerman (mzimmerman@ku.edu) or Thomas (thomasj@kenyon.edu).

UCCS Knapsack Institute: Transforming the Curriculum

Summer 2009 - University of Colorado ~ Colorado Springs

June 3-6, 2009

The Knapsack Institute: Transforming the Curriculum supports faculty across the nation as they create or revise courses to integrate race/ethnicity, gender, sexuality, class and other forms of social inequality. The Knapsack Institute is a program of The Matrix Center for the Advancement of Social Equity and Inclusion, the home of the White Privilege Conference. The Knapsack Institute provides educators with a framework for teaching about the matrix of privilege and oppression. The Institute welcomes all faculty! Alumni include faculty, teachers and educators at many levels, from a wide range of disciplines. For more information and/or an application please visit: http://www.uccs.edu/~knapsack/

Subscribe

http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/SWS-Grad

This list is open to all members of Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS), with a primary focus on graduate student members. To subscribe, please send a blank email to SWS-Grad-subscribe@yahoo.groups.com.

10th Annual White Privilege Conference

April 1-4 2009 Hilton Memphis
Registration Begins January 19th, 2009
More information: www.uccs.edu/wpc

Keynote Speakers: Amy Goodman, Francie Kendall, Paul Kivel, Dorothy Roberty and Tim Wise. Other speakers include Peggy McIntosh, Allan Johnson, Robert Jensen, Becky Thompson, Abby Ferber and many others TBA.
Local Chapters

Tallahassee, FL Chapter
Janice McCabe

The Tallahassee chapter met twice this fall. Both meetings were exceptionally well-attended. In September we met to discuss the presidential election. Carol Weisssert, professor of political science at FSU, guided a discussion on this exciting topic, focusing on the impact of gender, race, class, age, and religion on perceptions of the candidates and patterns in the polls. In November Doug Schrock and Janice McCabe, faculty in sociology at FSU, led a discussion about gender and language. At this meeting we also discussed topics for upcoming meetings, the recently released SWS Report Card on Gender Scholarship and Equity in Sociology Departments, and plans to attend the SWS Winter Meetings by several of our members. Find out more about us and our meetings at: www.sociology.fsu.edu/sws

Akron/Kent Chapter
Katrina Bloch

The local Akron and Kent SWS sister chapters hit the ground running in our opening collaborative meeting held August 29th. The group welcomed two new faculty advisors, Sarah Swider (Akron) and Tiffany Taylor (Kent), along with a host of new students and returning members. The high turnout was exciting and propelled us to move forward in our plans for a rewarding and busy semester. The sister chapters are enthusiastic and energetically planning a speaker series to complement the visit of Cecilia Ridgeway as part of the feminist lecture series. Kent State graduate, Betsy Lucal has already agreed to give a lecture on The Feminist Revolution in the Academy and a workshop on teaching transgender issues. We are all looking forward to the spring semester and the enriching lectures and discussions that will ensue.

We have also been active in the local community, participating in Akron’s Take Back the Night Walk and facilitating a very successful underwear drive to benefit local women’s shelters and organizations. Some of our members are also currently involved in the upcoming productions of The Vagina Monologues. The local chapters are also planning an assessment of the Akron and Kent Women’s Health Centers, through the collection of narratives. Plans for the production of a survey to distribute more widely across campus are also in the early stages. Finally, the group formed committees to plan and execute another service project for the upcoming winter season.

Five members are currently working on a paper to present at the roundtables at the national SWS Meetings in Savannah. The paper examines the history and development of the local chapter. As we move forward and negotiate new challenges, we wish to better understand the feminist shoulders on which the organization was built. One co-author Jodi Ross notes, “Our hope is that other sisters working in local chapters or wanting to build a local chapter will come and share in a dialogue about feminist organizing.” We invite you to come to our roundtable, learn about our history, and share yours. United in Sisterhood.

SWS-Tucson
Sarah Strand

SWS-Tucson will be hosting a conference entitled “Bringing in the Body,” to be held April 3-4, 2009 at the University of Arizona. The conference will be interdisciplinary, joining scholars both on and off campus with an interest in the social constructed body, and is being organized in conjunction with faculty Louise Roth and Jennifer Croissant from Sociology and Women’s Studies. Sociology graduate student Cindy Cain, Sarah Strand, and Wright have received a grant from Graduate and Professional Council’s Professional Oppor Development Fund to help cover conference expenses. A call for papers is out in December, and we welcome scholars locally and around the country to participate. We especially encourage undergraduate students to join us. We would like to foster mentoring relationships with budding scholars, and the paper sessions will give students the chance to present their research in a supportive environment.

Chicago SWS
Jenny Korn
http://tech.groups.yahoo.com/group/chicago

We are the Chicago chapter and we’re in the area & would like you to list to learn of upcoming local information pertinent to Women in Society (SWS), a blank email to SWSC@yahoogroups.com.

People and Places

Jeanne Flavin, Associate Professor at Fordham University, has been awarded a Fulbright Scholar grant to do research at the Gender, Health and Justice Research Unit of University of Cape Town, South Africa during the 2008-2009 academic year. Jeanne will undertake a study of women, crime, and family.

Mimi Schippers was named Director of the Gender and Sexuality Studies Program at Tulane University.
Members' Bookshelf

Body Panic
By Shari L. Dworkin and Faye Linda Wachs
New York University Press, 2009

Increasingly, Americans are being sold a fitness ideal—not just thin but toned, not just muscular but cut—that is harder and harder to reach. In Body Panic, Shari L. Dworkin and Faye Linda Wachs dissect the images, the workouts, and the ideology in ten years of health and fitness magazines to determine the ways in which bodies are “made” in today’s culture. Body Panic considers both women’s and men’s bodies side-by-side and over time in order to offer an in-depth understanding of this pervasive cultural trend that links health, morality, citizenship, and identity.

Our Bodies, Our Crimes: The Policing of Women’s Reproduction in America
By Jeanne Flavin
New York University Press, 2008

The intense policing of women’s reproductive capacity places women’s health and human rights in great peril. Poor women are pressured to undergo sterilization. Women addicted to illicit drugs risk arrest for carrying their pregnancies to term. Courts, child welfare and law enforcement agencies fail to recognize the efforts of battered and incarcerated women to care for their children. Pregnant inmates are subject to inhumane practices such as shackling during labor and poor prenatal care. And decades after Roe, the criminalization of certain procedures and regulation of abortion providers still obstruct women’s access to safe and private abortions.

In this important work, Jeanne Flavin looks beyond abortion to document how the law and the criminal justice system police women’s rights to conceive, to be pregnant, and to raise their children. Through vivid and disturbing case studies, Flavin shows how the state seeks to establish what a “good woman” and “fit mother” should look like and whose reproduction is valued. With a stirring conclusion that calls for broad-based measures that strengthen women’s economic position, choice-making, autonomy, sexual freedom, and health care, Our Bodies, Our Crimes is a battle cry for all women in their fight to be fully recognized as human beings. At its heart, this book is about the right of a woman to be a healthy and valued member of society independent of how or whether she reproduces. (Author’s proceeds benefit National Advocates for Pregnant Women.)

The Sexuality of Migration: Border Crossing and Mexican Immigrant Men
By Lionel Cantú
Edited by Nancy A. Naples and Salvador Vidal-Ortiz
New York University Press, February 2009

The Sexuality of Migration is an innovative study of the experiences of Mexican men who have sex with men and who have migrated to the United States. Cantú situates his analysis within the history of Mexican immigration and offers a broad understanding of diverse migratory experiences ranging from recent gay asylum seekers to an assessment of gay tourism in Mexico. The Sexuality of Migration complicates a fixed notion of sexual identity and explores the complex factors that influence immigration and migration experiences. Lionel Cantú, Jr., was Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Santa Cruz, with an affiliation in Latin American/Latino Studies; his work is published posthumously and edited by Naples and Vidal-Ortiz.

Sister-2-Sister Program

Welcomes our newest member Maggie R. Ussery of the University of Delaware’s Black Studies Department. All others who are interested in becoming a member of Sister-2-Sister, please contact me at Marlese.Durr@wright.edu.

Sister-2-Sister began as a dialogue between SWS/ABS in August 2002 to start a dialogue about building relationships across race/ethnic lines for women within the academy. In August 2003, Sister-to-Sister had its first meeting on the campus of Spellman College in Atlanta where over eighty women attended. Then, in January 2004, during the SWS Winter Meetings we met to engage in a discussion of how race and ethnicity shape the experiences of junior and senior women faculty in the academy and explore long term goals of the task force.

Since this meeting, Sister-to-Sister has been an integral part of SWS as we continue to add programming workshops. In January 2006, Sister-to-Sister became one of SWS’s Standing Committees. We have invited senior and junior scholars to discuss their experiences within the academy, focusing on issues of: race, ethnicity, and sexuality. Topics that have been discussed at our Winter and Summer meetings include:

- Class and Sexuality
- White privilege and working alliances among women of color
- Grad students
- Junior women & Senior women
- Tenure & Professional development

We continue this tradition and look forward to welcoming all SWSer’s who wish to join our ranks. Please send any suggestions for programming to Patricia Warren at pwarren@lsu.edu and marlese.durr@wright.edu

Co-Chairs of Sister-2-Sister

Marlese Durr and Patricia Warren
Job Opportunities

University of North Carolina Greensboro.

The Department of Sociology invites applications for a full-time tenure-track position at the rank of Assistant Professor. A major teaching responsibility will be statistics at both the undergraduate and MA levels. We seek a sociologist with both the desire and the ability to teach social statistics several times a year and whose substantive interests reflect a strong commitment to and familiarity with quantitative research. Specific areas of specialization are open. Candidates must hold or anticipate a Ph.D. in Sociology by August 1, 2009. UNC Greensboro is a growing research university with approximately 17,000 undergraduate and graduate students and has recently been awarded a Carnegie classification of a university with “high research activity.” It is located in a metropolitan area of 1.2 million in the Piedmont region of North Carolina between the Atlantic Ocean and the Appalachian mountains. The Department of Sociology offers the B.A. and M.A. degrees and currently has fourteen full-time tenure-track faculty. UNC Greensboro is especially proud of the diversity of its student body and we seek to attract an equally diverse applicant pool for this position, including women and members of minority groups. We are an EEO/AA employer with a strong commitment to increasing faculty diversity. To apply, send a letter of application, curriculum vitae, a writing sample, and at least three letters of recommendation to: Steven R. Cureton, Search Committee Chair, Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina Greensboro, P. O. Box 26170, Greensboro, NC 27402-6170. Initial review of applications will begin November 15, 2008 and continue until the position is filled.

The University of North Carolina Wilmington

Department of Sociology and Criminology invites applications for one full-time tenure track assistant professor position beginning August 2009. The department has 28 full-time faculty members, roughly 350 majors, and offers bachelor’s degrees in sociology, criminology & criminal justice, and a growing concentration in public sociology. We also offer a master’s degree in criminology and public sociology. We are seeking a sociologist whose areas of specialization are open. Preference may be given to candidates with expertise in intersections of gender, race, class, and sexuality. Secondary areas may include social movements, urban and/or community sociology. Candidates must have the Ph.D. in sociology in hand by time of appointment. Located on a beautiful 640-acre campus in an historic port city five miles from the Atlantic Ocean, UNCW is a growing comprehensive university committed to teaching, scholarship, and service. The university currently enrolls over 12,000 undergraduate and graduate students. For more information on the department, please see our website, http://www.uncw.edu/soccrj. Review of applications will begin January 20, 2009, and the position will remain open until filled. To apply, complete the online application process available on the web at http://consensus.uncw.edu. Microsoft Word or Adobe attachments are preferred. For more information, contact Dr. Diane Levy, Chair, Sociology Search Committee, Department of Sociology and Criminology, University of North Carolina Wilmington, 601 S. College Rd., Wilmington, NC 28403-5978, levyd@uncw.edu. Under North Carolina law, applications and related materials are confidential personnel documents and not subject to public release. UNCW is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. Minorities and women are particularly encouraged to apply.

State University of New York Fredonia.

The Criminal Justice Program in the Department of Sociology, Anthropology, Social Work and Criminal Justice at SUNY Fredonia invites applications for the position of Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice, tenure track, beginning fall 2009, contingent upon state funding. The successful candidate should have a PhD in criminal justice, sociology or other relevant field. It is anticipated that the successful candidate will be considered for Program Director. Candidate should be prepared to teach from among the following: Corrections, Criminology, Police Administration and Judicial Process. SUNY Fredonia is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. We actively seek and encourage applications from minorities, women and people with disabilities. Review of applications will commence on December 1, 2008 and continue until the position is filled. To apply, consult the specific guidelines for this position on the Human Resources page of the SUNY Fredonia website: https://careers.fredonia.edu/appliants/Center?quickFind=50585

University of Vermont.

The Department of Sociology at University of Vermont invites nominations or applications for the position of Professor of Sociology and The Bishop Robert Joyce Distinguished University Professor of Gerontology. This is an exciting academic opportunity for a distinguished scholar who seeks appointment (a) in a mid-sized, highly collegial department with a strong research profile and reputation for teaching excellence, (b) in a growing College of Arts and Sciences which plans to mount an interdepartmental doctoral degree in social policy to which successful candidate would be expected to contribute, (c) at a nationally acclaimed land-grant university with a strong commitment to liberal education and the stewardship of health and environment and with abundant opportunities for multidisciplinary collaboration, and (d) in one of America's most desirable places to live. The successful candidate will succeed Dr. Stephen Cutler, who has held the Jo Professorship and served the University of Vermont with vision, dedication, and distinction since 1984. Consistent with a number of current strategic academic initiatives at the University of Vermont, we seek a scholar with a Ph.D. in social work and with an established reputation for strong record of research and teaching in aging. The area(s) of policy application as well as secondary interests and methodological orientations are open, although a health policy focus or a quantitative methodological approach is desirable. The successful candidate will be expected to continue a substantial active program of research that will lead to publication in peer-reviewed scholarly outlets and to seek extramural funding to support that research. Contributions to the department's gerontology minor, concentration and certificate in gerontology are also expected. An essential university-wide role for the Joyce Professor is to provide leadership in facilitating and enhancing collaborative efforts in research, teaching, and partnerships with the aging work, and resources are available to support the successful candidate in these endeavors as well as for his or her own scholarly activities. The department is committed to increasing faculty diversity and welcomes nominations of or applications from women and underrepresented ethnic, racial, and cultural groups from people with disabilities. College of Arts and Sciences is equally committed to fostering and affirming
inclusive, multi-cultural, multi-ethnic environment for its students, staff and faculty. In the cover letter, applicants are requested to include a description of how they can contribute to the College’s goals in this area. The position will be available in Fall 2009. Review of applications will begin on November 1, 2008 and will continue until the position is filled. The application should include a cover letter discussing the reasons for interest in this position at this point in the candidate’s career and a curriculum vitae. Additional information such as reprints, evidence of teaching effectiveness, and letters of reference may be requested at a later date. Please do not have letters of reference sent at this time. Candidates may apply by mail or online. For on-line applications, go to www.uvmjobs.com. Once there, click on “Search Postings,” and then locate the position by scrolling to “Sociology” following “Department.” Alternatively, applications or nominations may be sent by mail to: Professor Dale J. Jaffe, Chair, Joyce Professorship Search Committee, Department of Sociology, University of Vermont, 31 South Prospect St., Burlington, VT 05405. The Search Committee Chair can be reached at 802-656-4276 or Dale.Jaffe@uvm.edu.

Wake Forest University Department of Sociology invites applications for a senior-level position to begin Fall 2009. Applicants must have a Ph.D. in sociology and have a demonstrated record of research, funded grants and teaching experience appropriate for tenured appointment at the rank of Associate or Full Professor. We seek a scholar in the areas of political sociology/social movements or health/medical sociology. Competitive applications will reflect a commitment to academic excellence, as well as strong interpersonal and administrative skills that will contribute to the leadership of a twelve member (full-time) department, including future consideration as department chair. To apply, please submit: (1) a letter of application that includes a description of current and projected research, teaching and leadership activities; (2) a curriculum vitae; (3) examples of recent published work; (4) evidence of excellence in teaching and (5) the names and contact information for three references. Please send your application materials to Joseph Soares, Chair, Recruitment Committee, Department of Sociology, P.O. Box 7808, Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, NC 27109. Review of applications will begin immediately and will continue until the position is filled. Wake Forest University welcomes and encourages diversity and seeks applications and nominations from women and minorities. It seeks to recruit and retain a diverse workforce to maintain the excellence of the University, and to offer students richly varied disciplines, perspectives, and ways of knowing and learning. Located in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, Wake Forest University is a private, coeducational institution with a student-faculty ratio of 10:1. Ranking among the top thirty national universities, it offers a vibrant intellectual community with a rich cultural life, an impressive array of facilities and an active athletics community. For facts about the University go to http://www.wfu.edu/visitors/quickfacts.html. For information about the Sociology Department go to http://www.wfu.edu/sociology/index.html. For facts about Winston-Salem, go to http://www.cityofws.org/DiscoverWinston-Salem/Articles/CityInformation.

ASA: Disability in Society

We are proud to announce a new Section-in-Formation of the ASA: Disability in Society. Scholars in this field are exploring many issues of concern to those studying sex and gender, including the politics of the body, the intersection of public and private issues, the importance of (and challenges to) identity politics, political and social barriers which limit people's rights and freedoms, the medicalization of femininity and masculinity, challenges to sex/gender binaries associated with intersexuality, and so on. This new Section-in-Formation is a great place to network, engage with other scholars, discuss recent events, and pursue avenues for grants, teaching, research and service. The Disability section is also pleased to be offering FREE membership to 40 graduate students who are current members of ASA who would like to join the section. We encourage potential members to contact the chairs of the membership committee:

Liat Ben Moshe: lbenmosh@maxwell.syr.edu or
Mark Sherry: markdsherry@yahoo.com
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SWS INTERESTS
SWS works on fostering feminism in sociology and society in several ways. Which of the following two or three are most interesting to you personally?

☐ Publishing feminist scholarship
☐ Fighting discrimination against feminists in the academy
☐ Supporting the careers of feminist sociologists
☐ Helping make feminist social change
☐ Providing resources for feminist teachers
☐ Building membership
☐ Giving scholarships and awards to outstanding feminists

AREAS OF SPECIALIZATION

(List 3 areas in order of importance: #1 #2 #3)

Politics and Social Change
H. 1. Collective Behavior/Social Movements
H. 2. Marxist Sociology
H. 3. Military Sociology
H. 4. Peace, War, World Conflict, and Conflict Resolution
H. 5. Political Economy
H. 6. Political Sociology
H. 7. Public Policy
H. 8. Social Change

Population and Ecology
I. 1. Biosociology
I. 2. Demography
I. 3. Human Ecology

Race and Ethnicity
J. 1. Asians/Asian-Americans
J. 2. Latina/o Sociology
J. 3. Migration/Immigration
J. 4. Racial and Ethnic Relations

Social Control, Law, Crime, and Deviance
K. 1. Criminal Justice
K. 2. Criminology/Delinquency
K. 3. Deviant Behavior/Social Disorganization

Law and Society
K. 4. Law and Society
K. 5. Penology/Corrections
K. 6. Social Control

Social Psychology and Interaction
L. 1. Emotions
L. 2. Small Groups
L. 3. Social Psychology
L. 4. Socialization

Application and Practice
A. 1. Applied Sociology/Evaluation Research
A. 2. Communication and Information Technologies
A. 3. Policy Analysis
A. 5. Sociological Practice
A. 6. Teaching and Learning in Sociology

Comparative and Historical Approaches
B. 1. Comparative Sociology/Historical Sociology
B. 2. Development

Family, Life Course, and Society
C. 1. Aging/Social Gerontology
C. 2. Animals and Society
C. 3. Children and Youth
C. 4. Family

Gender and Sexuality
D. 1. Sex and Gender
D. 2. Sexualities

Inequalities and Stratification
E. 1. Disabilities
E. 2. Education
E. 3. Race, Class and Gender
E. 4. Stratification/Mobility

Medicine and Health
F. 1. Alcohol and Drugs
F. 2. Medical Sociology
F. 3. Mental Health

Place and Environment
G. 1. Community
G. 2. Environmental Sociology
G. 3. Rural Sociology
G. 4. Urban Sociology

Sociology of Culture
M. 1. Art/Music
M. 2. Cultural Sociology
M. 3. Leisure/Sports/Recreation
M. 4. Mass Communication/Public Opinion
M. 5. Religion
M. 6. Visual Sociology

Theory, Knowledge, Science
N. 1. History of Sociology/Social Thought
N. 2. Knowledge
N. 3. Rational Choice
N. 4. Science and Technology
N. 5. Theory

Work, Economy and Organizations
O. 1. Economic Sociology
O. 2. Labor and Labor Movements
O. 3. Occupations/Professions
O. 4. Organizations, Formal and Complex
O. 5. Social Organization
O. 6. Work and Labor Markets

Qualitative Approaches
P. 1. Ethnography (Anthropology)
P. 2. Ethnomethodology/Conversational Analysis
P. 3. Language/Social Linguistics
P. 4. Qualitative Methodology

Quantitative Approaches
Q. 1. Mathematical Sociology
Q. 2. Quantitative Methodology
Q. 3. Social Networks
Q. 4. Statistics
Q. 5. Micro-computing
Local and Regional Chapters

ACTIVE STATUS
(Meet on a regular basis)
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA
Janice McCabe (jmccabe@mailer.fsu.edu)
LANSING, MICHIGAN
Lori Baralt (baraltlo@msu.edu)
Linda Gjokaj (gjokajli@msu.edu)
LAS VEGAS, NEVADA
(http://www.unlv.edu/faculty2/jkeene/SWS/)
Jennifer Keene (jkeene@unlv.nevada.edu)
NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK
Jackie Skiles (jsnye@yahoo.com)
NORTH CAROLINA
Southeastern: Leslie Hossfeld (HossfeldL@uncw.edu)
AKRON, OHIO
Kathy Feltey (felteyk@uakron.edu)
PIONEER VALLEY, WESTERN MASSACHUSETTS
Kat Jones (kjones@soc.umass.edu)
CHICAGO
Kimberly Fox (kfoxl@luc.edu.edu) (abrain2@uic.edu)
MINNESOTA
Teresa Toguchi Swartz (tswartz@umn.edu)
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
Alison Buck (arbuck@sa.ncsu.edu)

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA CHAPEL HILL
Mairead Moloney (maloney@email.unc.edu)
TUCSON
Cindy Cain (ccain@u.arizona.edu)
KENT STATE
(mjacobs2@kent.edu)

REGIONAL
MIDWEST (MSWS)
Sheri Hink (sjhink@gmail.com)
SOUTH (SWS-SOUTH)
Maria Febbo-Hunt (febbohun@meredith.edu)
WEST (SWS-WEST)
Clare Weber (cweber@csudh.edu)
EAST (SWS-EAST)
Laura Steck (lsteck@ycp.edu)
NORTH CENTRAL (SWS-NCSA)
Natalie Haber-Barker (nhaber@luc.edu)
Kathy Feltey (felteyk@uakron.edu)

INTERESTED IN FORMING CHAPTER
ALBANY/TRI-CITIES, NEW YORK
Sally Dear (sdear@binghamton.edu)
PHILADELPHIA AREA
Elizabeth Borland (borland@tmcj.edu)

Please send chapter updates to SHANNON DAVIS (sdaviso@gmu.edu)