PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE

Structural Reforms: SWS Moves into its Future

By Patricia Yancey Martin, President

Special thanks to the 300 SWSers who attended the 2012 Winter meetings. The workshops, plenaries, receptions, auction, banquet, dancing, sight-seeing, and early morning runs were a great treat for me and I hope for you (thanks to Sara Crawley for promoting St. Pete). Program Chair Heather Laube arranged an amazing program—17 workshops, five plenaries, 20 research roundtable sessions (75 presentations organized by Jesse Klein), 16 committee meetings, 10 meetings for interviewing Executive Officer candidates, two business meetings, two receptions, an awards luncheon, and a banquet that seated over 260 people. Whew! What this means is A LOT of very knowledgeable, experienced, skilled, and dynamic members led workshops, participated in plenaries, did the work of the organization, and had a really good time. We also had the pleasure of a number of invited guests who shared their insights and expertise.

President Pat Martin’s opening remarks challenged us to some self-reflection. Who do we say we are? Are we who we say we are? What do we do well? What can we improve on? We are Sociologists FOR Women in Society. Do our priorities and actions reflect that? These are things we need to consider as we think about the future of our organization. The second plenary was organized by Sharon Bird and Kathrin Zippel (who also worked extremely hard organizing workshops and sessions on topics related to NSF ADVANCE). Sharon, CoSandra McNeal, Patricia Roos, and Laura Kramer (continued on page 8)
Smorgasbord of Sessions in St. Pete

Human Rights and the Women’s Treaty: Why We Should Care, What We Can Do
by Susan Lee

At the SWS Winter Meeting in St. Petersburg, the Social Action and International Committees sponsored a session on Feb. 3 entitled “Human Rights and the Women’s Treaty: Why we should care, what we can do.” The panelists included Jeanne Flavin, Susan Lee, Trina Smith, and Barret Katuna, who discussed the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women or CEDAW (pronounced SEE-daw). This treaty is the lead international agreement protecting women’s human rights and has been ratified by virtually all the countries of the world with the exception of Sudan, Somalia, Iran … and the United States of America. The treaty guarantees a broad range of women’s rights including political, educational, economic, marriage, and family rights. It does not override a nation’s laws but it does set a standard for international norms concerning women and girls. Countries that ratify the treaty are expected to take steps to bring their constitution and laws into compliance with CEDAW.

President Jimmy Carter signed the treaty in 1980 on behalf of the U.S. but the Senate has never ratified it, a requirement under the Constitution for all treaties. The U.S. reluctance is due to concerns about family structure, abortion, women in combat roles, and same-sex marriage. While the treaty gives countries wide leeway to apply the treaty and does not assert a right to abortion or same-sex marriage, conservative voices in the U.S. have blocked ratification due to fears concerning these issues. President Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton back the treaty as well as Sen. John Kerry, chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that oversees treaties. However, there are not 67 votes in the Senate at the present time to ratify CEDAW.

The panelists urged SWS members to contact their Senators to ask for their commitment to CEDAW. Senate phone numbers are available at this address: http://www.senate.gov/general/resources/pdf/senators_phone_list.pdf. For more information on CEDAW, the panel passed out an information sheet available at this address: http://www.aclu.org/files/assets/CEDAW_factsheet_20100429.pdf. If you get information from your Senators about their position on CEDAW, please e-mail the listserv or Susan Lee at susanlee@bu.edu.

Feminist Issues and Strategies from Career Development Through Creative Retirement

Organizers: Esther N. Chow, American University; Marcia Texler Segal, Indiana University Southeast

Participants: Esther N. Chow (American University), Emily Fairchild (New College of Florida), Jeanne Flavin (Fordham University), Judith Lorber (Graduate Center and Brooklyn College, CUNY), Andrea Miller (Webster University), Marcia Texler Segal (Indiana University Southeast), and Margaret Vitullo (American Sociological Association).

Emily Fairchild [efairchild@ncf.edu] advised pre-tenure attendees to pay attention to those around you whose models you appreciate: soak up lessons from the people you respect (formal lessons, informal lesson, and via observations), and keep healthy distance from those you find toxic. She noted that it’s worth the time to articulate what you find important and what you want to accomplish. Not only can the process help clarify your thoughts, but, quite practically, you can consult the document as opportunities arise. Finally, she suggested as you move toward tenure, align your time with how you will be evaluated creating detailed semester plans and weekly work plans. She recommended checking this website http://www.facultydiversity.org/ for Kerry Ann Rockquemore’s detailed strategies for aligning your time and goals.

(continued on page 14)
Profile: President-Elect
Bandana Purkayastha

By Gayle Tuchman

Bandana Purkayastha, our new president, comes by her activism naturally—“genetically,” her family jokes. Bandana’s parents had met organizing against imperialism; her father had served several stints in jail for his anti-British activities, Bandana reports proudly.

Bandana’s story resembles that of her family. Like them, she has lived an international life, although the contexts are very different. Along with 3.5 million other Hindus and Sikhs (communal violence killed another million), Bandana’s parents moved from their ancestral homes in what is now Bangladesh to Kolkata, the capital of the Indian state of Bengal. As others had, they left behind their homes and possessions. Born in Kolkata and schooled there, Bandana and her husband moved to the United States in the post-1980s wave of Indian migration. Her two sisters remain in India, but close relatives are scattered across the United States, Europe and Africa. She visits family often, shaping her life as an international adventure. That internationalism and what Indians call “social service” and we might call “dedication to human rights” have also informed both her life and her sociology. Bandana received her bachelor’s degree from President College, one of India’s most elite colleges. (She received her doctorate in sociology from the UConn department, which she now serves as interim head.) Presidency was then part of the University of Calcutta and in 1977 Bandana was valedictorian of the whole shebang. Proud to have been educated at Presidency, the equivalent of Oxford or Harvard, Bandana shrugs off her remarkable academic status. (The university has roughly 100,000 students) “I was in geography,” she says and “geography has concrete answers.” Bandana attended Presidency on a highly competitive national merit scholarship. She studied geography, because of her political interest in environmentalism. (She was part of a civil society organizing for a humane, environmentally sustainable future.)

Though Bandana does not discuss her academic achievements, she is proud to announce that she is the second generation of her family to enter an inter-caste marriage, a relationship not uncommon in today’s India, but certainly rare in her parents’ day. Bandana is equally proud of her husband, Indra, and her daughter, Aheli. Indra is a senior executive in a robotics firm; an insightful fellow, he has a warm smile and a passion for soccer. Aheli received her master’s degree in international political theory from the University of Edinburgh, Scotland; earlier she received her bachelors degree from Bryn Mawr College where she served as elected president of the student government. Like her parents and grandparents, Aheli can organize anyone. Equally important, at Thanksgiving dinner, both Indra and Aheli clear and wash the dishes without being asked.

Though the list of awards that Bandana has received is lengthy (including University of Connecticut Women of Color Award for Excellence in Leadership, Achievement, and Service; State of Connecticut, General Assembly, Governor, and Lieutenant Governor’s Immigrant Day Citations for outstanding achievement, leadership and commitment to Connecticut; University of Connecticut Alumni Association Teaching Excellence Award; American Sociological Association, Asia and Asian American Section Teaching Award), she is proudest of the mentoring awards that she received from her own students.

Some of the praise for Bandana as mentor cites her academic contributions. Professor Shoba Hamal Gurung, who once served as a post-doctoral teaching fellow in our department and now teaches at Southern Utah University, lauds Professor Purkayastha’s mentoring of her graduate students and of young faculty, including herself. She tells how Professor Purkayastha’s “encouragement, motivation, and inspiration have been vital” to young faculty. Others tell of her compassion. The head of our women’s center praises how Bandana has quietly helped students experiencing domestic violence.

Our graduate students cite Bandana’s personal and academic encouragement. They call her “supportive” and “invaluable” to them and note that she has made it a practice to write an article with every one of her graduate advisees so that they get the hang of academic writing. With four students, she has written a book on Asian Americans and the experience of aging (forthcoming).

Several graduate students echo Miho Iwata’s comment on Bandana’s contributions to international students and students of color,

From the beginning of my career as a graduate student, she has been particularly attentive to the needs that I have as a woman of color… an international student, I do not have any family members in the U.S. I do not get to travel back home often, due to financial and time constraints. Dr. Purkayastha always asks me what I plan on doing for long breaks and holiday seasons, and invites (continued on next page)
me over to visit and/or stay at her house. At times when I felt overwhelmed by the stress and pressure of graduate school, she not only provided me advice and encouragement, but also invited me over to her house just to clear my mind and to relax. Her mentoring has affected me significantly; I know that I would not have been able to overcome many difficulties that I have faced in pursuing graduate studies without her understanding, friendship and kindness.

When she was Director of Graduate Studies, Bandana established support networks in part by making sure that no admitted graduate student was “one of a kind,” so that all students had someone with whom to discuss how intersectionality applied to their experience of graduate education.

Bandana’s own scholarship concentrates on gender inequality, racialization, human rights in the United States, and peace studies. She studies people whose achievements in their countries of origin did not cause them to view migration to the United States as forced by necessity, much less as an awesome privilege affording rights they had not previously enjoyed. These are people who could have continued to have good lives in their countries of origin. By studying middle-class, well-educated immigrant groups across the ethnic and racial spectrum, her work is redefining our understanding of how people construct racial identities and perceive each other in a racial context.

For instance, the book on religion that Bandana wrote with colleagues, Living Our Religions: South Asian Hindu and Muslim Women narrate their experiences (2009), redefines freedom of religion by addressing the structural arrangements that church-centered American practices presuppose. (My own grandparents would have said that one enjoys freedom of religion when people don’t kill you because of your beliefs.) That book also highlights how religion and racism have been conjoined, especially since 9/11, and how that linkage has misrepresented Hindu and Moslem women.

Some of my colleagues heap praise on Human Rights in Our Own Backyard: Injustice and Resistance in the U.S. (2011), edited with William Armaline and Davita Glasberg. It is, after all, one of the few sociological works that discusses human rights in the United States. (Too many people identify human rights as a problem that only crops up beyond our borders.) I am particularly fond of Bandana’s second book Negotiating Ethnicity: Second-generation South Asian Americans Traverse a Transnational World (2005), because it speaks to how the experience of immigration has changed since the wave that spanned the beginning of the twentieth century and it also incorporates observations about digital culture. However, all of Bandana Purkayastha’s writing makes clear that at a very young age she learned to value difference, to honor people in all of their diversity, and to effect social change so that we can all live in a just world. She writes about those important lessons and joyously passes them on to her students.
How Sociologists Can Create an Online Presence, Learn to Use Twitter, and Blog Their Way to a Bigger Part of the Global Discussion

By Theta Pavis, SWS Media Specialist

It may seem hard to keep up with the online world these days. Between carrying a smart phone and navigating the Internet, some scholars are overwhelmed at the prospect of adding a regular blog or social networking component to their already overflowing to-do lists. Presenters tackled this—and other tricky questions—at a recent panel on blogging and social networking held during the SWS Winter meeting in St. Petersburg.

Starting things off were Mindy Fried and Afshan Jafar, both SWS members with experience blogging. They pointed out that even if you are not ready to blog, reading blogs is important—and many will gladly welcome you as a guest writer.

Mindy Fried, an applied sociologist and Co-Principal of Arbor Consulting Partners (www.arborcp.com), has taught participatory evaluation at Tufts University, and social policy focusing on race and gender issues at MIT and other universities. Mindy has published three books, 


Born and raised in Pakistan, Afshan Jafar is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Connecticut College. Her research and teaching interests are globaliztion, transnational women’s movements, fundamentalist and nationalist movements, gender, and the body. Her first book, *Women’s NGOs in Pakistan,* uncovers the overwhelming challenges facing women’s NGOs. She is currently working on an edited volume, *The Body in a Global World.* She contributes regularly to the University of Venus blog at InsideHigherEd.com. Her blog posts have also appeared on The Guardian.co.uk.

Mindy and Afshan talked about how they got started blogging, how they deal with comments on their writing (both the negative and the positive), and other bloggers that they regularly read.

Theta Pavis, SWS Media Specialist, followed by giving a quick overview of social networking sites, such as Facebook and Twitter, and talked about how they played into the recent controversy over the Komen Foundation’s efforts to pull funding from Planned Parenthood (a decision Komen reversed after an intense outcry, much of which happened online). Theta, a freelance editor and journalist, said academics can publicize their research on networking platforms such as Twitter, and need to learn to make these tools part of their every day online experience.

Jessica Holden Sherwood, Executive Officer and Communications Director for SWS, wrapped things up with a look at how our organization has utilized Facebook, LinkedIn and Twitter to connect members, grow traffic to the SWS website and build an international dialogue at the same time. Sherwood, the author of *Wealth, Whiteness, and the Matrix of Privilege: The View from the Country Club,* also highlighted the many SWS members who regularly blog.

Attendees were asked to imagine what their blog would be called if they were to start one, and asked numerous questions. At least one participant started her blog that very night! Handouts from this well-attended session will be made available on the SWS website in the coming weeks.
Remembering April Brayfield

Thoughts compiled by Krista Brumley and Heather Laube

April Brayfield, Tulane Associate Professor of Sociology, died on December 13, 2011 following a long battle with cancer. She leaves behind a rich legacy of scholarship and mentorship of numerous students. In her own words, April’s “core identity” was as a teacher-scholar. April received her Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Maryland-College Park in 1990. She was a post-doctoral research associate at The Urban Institute in Washington, D.C. and began her career as an Assistant Professor at Tulane University in 1992. April was an accomplished scholar in her field. Her areas of specialization included gender, work-family nexus, sociology of childhood, and cross-national research.

April was deeply committed to her students and her passion to teaching and mentoring was immeasurable. It is no exaggeration to say that each and every student was important to April and that she worked hard to give each one the best education possible. She was honored for this dedication and commitment to students on numerous occasions. April was a long-time member of The Sociologists for Women in Society. Through her active engagement with this organization and as a feminist sociologist, April was instrumental in mentoring many students to become feminists and feminist sociologists.

I remember April above all in two specific settings. I think first of April at a bar in New Orleans during an SWS or SSS meeting (I can’t recall the date) making a point of introducing her students around to me and a few others, buying them drinks and enthusing about their work and about how they also contributed to mentoring other students and making the department a better place to be. As I chatted with them, I could not help thinking how much they were in that way simply emulating her and working on realizing an ideal she set and to which they aspired. Their admiration and affection was palpable, but it was also fully reciprocated.

And then I think of April in Budapest, with Sandor, on a summer night in her favorite neighborhood restaurant enthusing about the food, and her mother-in-law and the staff at the restaurant and their patience with her learning Hungarian. And across both settings, whether as a teacher or a student, enthusiasm was what I remember the most.

April’s joy in relationships was infused also with her pleasure in learning and her love for her family and students. Despite differences in status or knowledge, April seemed to see everyone she knew as a person who was enriching her life and thus deserving of gratitude.

I met April about the time she moved from the Urban Institute to Tulane. I loved her purple hair immediately; as we got to know each other better, I loved also April’s sharp-eyed but cheerful outlook on life, her deep regard for teaching and for students, and the way she revealed in life in New Orleans and with Sandor. The SSS meetings in New Orleans this year will be a much sadder and less lively place in April’s absence.

~Myra Marx Ferree

April brought a fun and off beat energy to every room. We seemed to run into each other as often at international conferences as SWS ones, and she always was as smart as she was fun to be around. The sociological community has suffered a real loss with her untimely passing.

~Barbara J. Risman

April was warm and generous, always.

We became friends in the mid 90s when I briefly lived in New Orleans. She (continued on page 17)
Remembering Arlene Kaplan Daniels, December 10, 1930 – January 29, 2012

Sociologists for Women in Society
First-Vice-President and Newsletter Editor, 1971-72; SWS President, 1974-75; Professor Emerita of Sociology and Women’s Studies, Northwestern University.

Arlene Kaplan Daniels earned her PhD in Sociology at the University of California-Berkeley in 1960 and was the founding Director of the Program on Women and a Professor of Sociology at Northwestern from 1975 to 1995. She published widely on the sociology of women, work and occupations. Arlene served as the President of the Society for the Study of Social Problems; as a Council member and Secretary of the American Sociological Association and as editor of the journal *Social Problems* as well as a founding mother and President of SWS. Along with her autobiographical chapter,* the remembrances below allow those who have had the good fortune of knowing Arlene, to know her even better, and those who did not to have at least glimpses of her life. They also provide one exemplary model of what an outstanding feminist sociologist is like.

Those who wish to, may make contributions in memory of Arlene:

- to the Esther Ngan-ling Chow and Mareyjoyce Green Scholarship, formerly known as the Women of Color Dissertation Scholarship, to which Arlene consistently gave: [http://www.socwomen.org/web/awards/chow-green.html](http://www.socwomen.org/web/awards/chow-green.html)
- to the Arlene Kaplan Daniels Fund of the Department of Sociology of Northwestern University that will provide a NU graduate student with funds for research work on gender: [http://www.sociology.northwestern.edu/](http://www.sociology.northwestern.edu/)


Arlene was one of those incredible women who, early on, had courage to say what was going on about women and helped the rest of us develop some of the same chutzpah! The year that I lived in Palo Alto, she and her husband Richard regularly welcomed me into their Belmont home with the most wonderful meals, wine, conversation, and laughter. I miss Arlene and Richard, and they were so kind in taking me and my young Swedish relatives who were visiting me out for a lovely dinner. I received a Christmas letter every year from Arlene — and I started to wonder this last Christmas about not hearing from her.

Thora Margareta Bertilsson (Margareta), Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Copenhagen

Arlene and I served on the ASA Council together when Irving Goffman was president. It’s scary to think how many years ago that was. We roomed together and she taught me, a neophyte, how to approach the Council experience. We did not maintain a relationship after that, but I thoroughly enjoyed our brief and intense contact. She was wise and funny, able to capture the essence of a situation in a pithy metaphor. I’m very sorry she is gone.

Edna M. Bonacich, Professor Emerita of Sociology and Ethnic Studies, University of California, Riverside

I first met Arlene as a graduate student in Santa Barbara in the 70’ies. I later spent a summer in San Francisco under the auspices of Arlene and her research team. When I was back in Berkeley for a summer or so in the 90’ies, I met with Arlene and Richard, and they were so kind in taking me and my young Swedish relatives who were visiting me out for a lovely dinner. I received a Christmas letter every year from Arlene — and I started to wonder this last Christmas about not hearing from her.

Thora Margareta Bertilsson (Margareta), Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Copenhagen

Arlene and I got to know each other when I was a professor at DePaul University in Chicago and she was at Northwestern. Together we helped to launch SWS in the Chicago area, which was lively!

Therese (Tessa) Baker-Degler, Professor Emerita of Sociology, California State University, San Marcos

It was with great sadness that I heard about Arlene’s death. Sad to say, I hadn’t seen her for at least a year. She was so generous to me when I was in Evanston.

(continued on page 18)
A pre-meeting workshop in St. Pete was held for current and incoming officers and chairs and, led by Jennifer Keene (University of Nevada Las Vegas), 30 SWSers discussed the charge, policies, and practices of their offices. Jennifer asked us to write (and we did) about our position and obligations, e.g., officer & committee charge, composition (number; how selected), duties, policies and procedures. The workshop taught us about our own and others’ obligations and revealed a need to undertake some reforms.

For these and other reasons, I view reform as urgent issue. Are we using our resources wisely? Are we inclusive and transparent? Do our actions improve the lives of women in society? Do we make the most of our journal, *Gender & Society*, fourth in citations among sociology journals, which lets us (via royalties) reimburse members for Winter-meeting attendance? G&S has produced an amazing corpus of scholarly work—“Doing Gender” paper by Candace West & Don Zimmerman, “Believing is Seeing” by Judith Lorber, “Hierarchies, Jobs and Bodies” by Joan Acker, “I’m Here But I’m There” by Pierette Hondaneu-Sotelo and Ernestine Avila, “To Veil or Not to Veil” by Jen’nan Read, “You Have to Show Strength” by Tamara Beauboeuf-Lafontant. Do we draw enough attention to articles like these and appreciate how they foster new lines of research, help with our teaching and research, and improve gender scholarship globally?

Our focus on ADVANCE at the St. Pete meeting (thanks to Sharon Bird and Kathrin Zippel) reflects our understanding that *institutions must change if the status of women and girls in society is to improve*. As many reports in this issue show, our attention to practical ways to improve academia was a key focus of the program. Thanks to all who contributed to that agenda.

In the *Network News* columns that I’m allowed (this issue plus three), I plan to address SWS structural reforms; SWS financial reforms; SWS cultural reforms; and SWS goals. In this first issue, the focus is structural reforms.

**Meeting Sites.** As you know, our Winter meetings are held in different cities each year. While this practice lets us visit new cities, it has drawbacks. For instance, we cannot get the best hotel deals. ASA and SSPP negotiate five and more years in advance to nail down rates that will only increase over time. We negotiate near the actual meeting dates—a year at most, and often only a few months. As a result, some hotels cannot accommodate us and those that can are in a privileged position relative to us. We are a ‘one-time’ affair, thus incentives to respond to our needs are minimal. Also, our procedures for selecting a hotel and negotiating with a hotel pose burdens for the President who, I assure you, has her hands full with the program. I had no clue about hotels. The snafu in 2012 regarding too few Hilton rooms can be blamed on me; I worried about meeting our commitment of “room nights” and never gave a thought to whether a tourist city at high season might prefer higher paying to convention-rate guests. Imagine my ignorance about ordering hotel food and drinks. Some of you complained (justifiably) about the vegan/vegetarian/gluten-free food options at the Hilton. Not knowing any better, I asked them to respond—which they believe they did—but I had little understanding of the options.

Some of our members have urged us to pick three US cities and rotate them, e.g., west coast, central, east coast. This is more or less what the Southern Sociological Society does on a 3-year cycle except it rotates between Atlanta, New Orleans and X with X varying (it was Jacksonville in 2011, Richmond three years earlier). As a for instance for three SWS cites, we could pick San Diego in one year, San Antonio in year two, St. Petersburg in year three and then start over. This would enable our new Executive Officer and Administrative Officer to bargain over hotel rates and privileges/perks early and it would make life easier for the President, SWS staff, and members who want to know “before the last minute” when and where the meeting will be. I repeat: The president’s hands are full with program challenges, even when assisted by a Heather Laube (new mother to Paxton Khai). It’s a lot of work, as it should be. Finally, another drawback is the failure to build institutional memory about hotels and meetings. When a new person bargains each year, there is no carryover from the previous year. All that I learned will not help Bandana Purkayastha who must start from scratch, as I did. Not everyone is aware of the learning curve a President faces but I assure you, it is major. Our members, in concert with Council, would have to select three cities if we choose that route. But it can be done and the arrangement would be fairer to the President and more effective for SWS—financially and relative to planning.

**Bylaws Revisions.** We have outgrown our bylaws. Twelve years ago, Myra Marx Ferree labored tirelessly to create the version we’ve used since and they’ve been invaluable. But life was simpler then, e.g., we had a single check book, while today we have multiple bank accounts, an investment adviser, contracts with individuals and organizations, and several employees. We need new bylaws to guide our officers and chairs regarding mission, goals, policies and practices. Two issues that illustrate this need: Who signs the hotel contract for the Winter meetings? (The bylaws say the president signs but the president cannot pay bills.) Who signs the Sage contract for *Gender & Society*? Our
current bylaws fail to say who signs and, to no one’s surprise, different categories of people have signed over time. The mission and composition of SWS committees are not specified in our bylaws; the EOB’s duties, which are extensive, are not detailed; a “regular member” is not defined (although a “student member” is) and the bylaws say we vote by mail ballot. And so on. The need for updating is great.

It is good news that SWS has a Strategic Planning Task Force, now revising bylaws, mission statement, long range goals and plans. Leslie Hossfeld chairs the Task Force and guides three subcommittees—chaired by Carrie Lee Smith (bylaws), Kecia Johnson (mission statement), and Cynthia Anderson (long range goals & plans). Task Force members stayed in St. Pete to work for an extra 1.5 days after our 2012 meeting, and when Leslie told them an 18-month commitment is required, they still agreed to serve. Please contact Leslie with your questions, ideas, and advice which she’ll pass along to others (hossfeldl@uncw.edu). (Our website lists all Task Force members.)

Revamped Administrative System. Given our current complexities, SWS Council voted this past year to adopt a new administrative structure. We are emulating the model used by the Society for the Study of Social Problems. This structure involves a part-time Executive Officer and a full-time Administrative Officer. The former is associated with an academic institution, which gives the Executive Officer credibility and resources. In contrast, the Administrative Officer works full-time to keep the organization’s books, hire and supervise part-time assistants, and perform most organizational tasks. The new system will require fewer external contracts, we hope, and allow the AO to have personal knowledge and control of our finances, supervised by the Executive Officer, SWS Treasurer, and EOB (or perhaps Finance Committee, see below). The EO and AO have extensive duties, as shown on our webpage (see job description and list of duties for each: www.socwomen.org).

As you know, we advertised the Executive Officer position prior to our Winter meetings and, with the help of many of you, interviewed three candidates. The person invited to accept the position is Julie Winterich (Guilford College) and, with the help and advice of Council, Kristen Myers and I are working on arrangements for her appointment. When we succeed, she will proceed (with Council’s review and approval) to recruit a full-time Administrative Officer who, we hope, will begin work soon. We thank Julie for being willing to do the EO job and we thank Donna King and Terri Spetalnick for their willingness to consider it.

We are venturing into uncharted waters with this restructuring plan. Not only must we move our records, supplies, and location from Rhode Island to North Carolina, we are changing organizational structures. Our EO and AO must learn our current systems and devise new systems, as needed. Please be patient as problems emerge and they/we work out the hows, whens, and whereabouts of change.

Revised Council Structure. At some point in our past, we created an Executive Office and Budget Committee (colloquially referred to as EOB) to consider financial requests and make recommendations about budgets and investments. Although the charge for this committee is not in our bylaws, it has played a major role in SWS financial dynamics. It membership is two-thirds identical to that of Council: 3 treasurers and 3 presidents on both and 3 Publications Committee members—G&S editor, chair, and co-chair—complete the list. EOB is chaired by the Treasurer who has a great deal of responsibility. The Treasurer must single-handedly supervise the Executive Officer, without input from others. Since we have few personnel policies, she has continuously to create them and ask others for advice. Many issues have gravitated to this committee, e.g., approval of a job description for a Media Specialist, appointment of a Search Committee for an Executive Officer, and more. The Treasurer has the responsibility to review our income and expenditures on a monthly basis and advise our investment firm. She proposes an annual budget and reports to Council and the membership. The annual income tax (990) report and visit to the executive office to review financial procedures fall into the Treasurer’s lap. If you use our bylaws to list duties of SWS officers, the list for Treasurer is far longer than anyone else’s, including the President’s. It’s too much. Treasurers, like our other officers, are volunteers. They have a “day job.” We need changes in this regard.

Based on discussions with others, I am proposing to the Bylaws Committee that our Executive Council be re-organized into three subcommittees, each with major duties. They are: Personnel, Finance, and Communication. SWS Council is equivalent to the Board of Directors of not-for-profit (and for-profit) organizations and such an arrangement is normative. Here are some thoughts about Executive Council subcommittees and their potential composition and duties.

Personnel. A Personnel Committee will (a) create job descriptions; (b) create policies for monitoring, evaluating, rewarding and terminating employees; (c) oversee recruitment of new employees (including recommending to EC approval for Search Committee members, procedures, deadlines); (d) and provide routine and annual supervision and evaluation of the SWS Executive Officer (and recommend to Council continuation...
(Meeting Reflection continued from page 1) shared insights from their experiences as social scientists working with ADVANCE projects. Barbara Risman and Patricia Warren organized “Mentoring Across Color Lines,” a plenary with an interactive format. With Shirley Hill, Patricia Roos, and Denise Sequra, they fielded questions about how feminist scholars from underrepresented groups might need different mentoring from those who are members of dominant groups. Tough questions were asked and considered. Stephanie Cootz, from the Council on Contemporary Families, graciously accepted our invitation to speak about “The Perils and Promises of Going Public,” and provided strategies and pitfalls of working with mass media. ASA President Erik Olin Wright provided a summary of his project on real utopias (the theme of the upcoming ASA meetings) during our final plenary, “Feminists Know What to Wish For.” Manisha Desai, Bandana Purkayastha, Linda Grant, and Rebecca Bach articulated their feminist visions of several real utopias.

In between these impressive plenaries we had many excellent workshops (some comments on those below), recognized our Undergraduate Social Action Award winners (wow), and committees and the membership at large did the business of the organization. We also had some fun—with an opening reception by the pool, hosted dinners, student reception, our banquet, and, of course Saturday afternoon free time (though some worked during this play time).

Our auction raised $5153.23 to benefit two local organizations, W. O. M. E. N., which funds abortions for poor women, and the Peacekeepers Program of Community Action Stops Abuse (CASA). This is quite an impressive amount for our relatively small group. Auctioneers Marybeth Stalp and Tracy Ore simply wouldn’t take no for an answer. In fact, they insisted the answer was, “How much more?” Thank you to everyone for your amazing generosity and be prepared to top this next year!

Thank you to everyone who made the 2012 Winter Meetings a success! Below you will find reflections volunteered by a number of conference attendees. If you were unable to be there I hope they provide a window into the meetings. If you were there I hope they conjure good memories. Enjoy.

(President’s Message continued from page 9) or termination of the EO agreement). I suggest that members of this Subcommittee be the President, President-elect, and Past-President, with the President having primary responsibility for supervising the Executive Officer.

Finance. A Finance Committee will (a) monitor SWS financial resources and activities; (b) propose and monitor SWS annual budget; (c) recommend policies and procedures to Council on financial matters; (d) assure that all SWS financial activities comply with applicable federal and state laws; (e) assist EO in securing an independent accounting firm to perform a financial and program audit at least once every five years (possibly more often). The committee membership will consist of Treasurer, Treasurer-Elect, and Past Treasurer, to be chaired by Treasurer who, with the Treasurer-elect, will visit (with President and President-Elect) the national office annually to review financial status of the organization. Perhaps the Chair of the Publications Committee should be on this subcommittee so issues that affect Gender & Society can be addressed directly.

Communication. A Communication Committee will: (a) create policies and procedures about all SWS communications with members and external entities; (b) review, approve and monitor agreements (including contracts) with entities charged with communicating on behalf of SWS (e.g., to members, Sage Publications regarding any G&S issues, membership list, web manager/designer, etc.); (c) will be responsible for Media Specialist position regarding contract—job description, effectiveness, continuation, and termination. Members will include Vice-President, Secretary, & Student Representative. The Chair of this subcommittee might be a non-Council member who has expertise in communication and media issues, for instance.

The above model came from talks with Bandana Purkayastha and Joya Misra in the pre-conference workshop. I hope it prompts us to understand the need to spell out policies, procedures, and practices that will help SWS operate effectively and efficiently. I hope to hold a session in Denver to discuss these and related issues. Please be part of it.

Closing. In closing, I am sad to announce the resignation of Treasurer Kay Valentine due to health considerations. Our Bylaws say the Deputy Treasurer becomes treasurer when this occurs but, in the present instance, our Treasurer-elect (Wanda Rushing) could not assume the office until her term begins next year. Council asked Kristen Myers to serve as Treasurer for one more year and she agreed. Since February, she has performed the Treasurer’s duties. Given the many tasks the Treasurer’s position requires, Kristen’s service is immensely helpful in a year of changing physical offices and administrative structures. Thank you, Kristen.

I look forward to hearing from you about any aspect of this comment and, indeed, invite any and all suggestions to help SWS move forward.
I recently got to participate in the Breakfast with Scholars program at the SWS Winter meetings. This was a great experience that offered a rare opportunity to sit and converse with students and faculty in particular areas in the field. I had the privilege of sharing a table with Myra Marx Ferree, and enjoyed a stimulating conversation about intersectionality in historic, global, and economic contexts. I find that as I get immersed in research, teaching, and the like, it can be rare to have an opportunity simply to sit and talk, share ideas, and discuss different perspectives with colleagues and students who share similar interests but are broadly dispersed. Conferences can provide a great place to remedy this, and the Breakfast for Scholars session was definitely exceptional in this regard.

-- Adia Harvey Wingfield, Faculty

What a great way to start the day. On the Saturday of the SWS winter meetings in St Petersburg I had the opportunity to participate in “Breakfast with Scholars.” The room was full of people ready to talk about such topics as Collective Behavior and Social Movements, Gender and Sex, Intersectionality, Transnational Concerns, Women of Color Feminist Research, and Work/Labor/Occupations.

I chose to have breakfast with the folks at the “Women of Color Feminist Research” table. Sharing the table were five other junior scholars who share my research interest working with people of color or who are researchers of color themselves. Two senior scholars, Denise Segura and Nikki Jones, joined us. As people began arriving at the table it was great to hear about all the different research projects and the anecdotal stories told by Denise and Nikki. I must say I was a bit nervous and anxious as I heard the other junior scholars present their interesting and timely research and wondered if the scholars would even find that my project was credible or even feasible. As I was listening to the other junior scholars present their research projects it was great to hear that even though there appeared to be difference, our research concerns were very similar. The main concern was how to work with a community who does or does not share your racial/ethnic identity? Denise and Nikki had great suggestions noting that we should expect challenges from the academy and the community. These challenges will suggest we are too close to the community or too distant from the community because of our racial/ethnic identity. Nikki and Denise pointed out the best thing to do is to acknowledge the challenges and confront them honestly. Great advice for any research project. When it was my turn to present my research I was bracing myself for the criticism, but was pleasantly surprised when Nikki and Denise had some encouraging words to say and had some valuable and constructive suggestions. I even received an offer to be introduced to a scholar at ASA this summer who is doing groundbreaking work in the community I am looking to work with as well. So not only great advice regarding all of our projects, but a great networking opportunity as well! Denise and Nikki made sure to hear everyone at the table and had constructive suggestions for all.

I am so glad I signed up to participate in the “Breakfast with Scholars.” Nikki, Denise, and all the women at the table presented great projects and had great advice and suggestions for being a Woman of Color who does research or being a researcher who is investigating People of Color. I hope “Breakfast with Scholars” becomes a regular feature at SWS meetings and one day I look forward to being able to return the favor and be one of the senior scholars at the table.

--Clare Walsh, grad student

(continued on next page)
“Critique Me”
I had the opportunity to participate in the Critique Me session at the Winter meetings, and the feedback I received on my C.V., Research Statement, and Teaching Portfolio was invaluable. More importantly, the generous folks who volunteered their time as mentors made the intimidating process of sitting face-to-face with someone as they review and critique your job materials something that was actually quite enjoyable and empowering! The SWSers I spoke with not only asked about my career goals and listened to my concerns about being on the job market as a queer lady with lots of LGBTQ things all over my C.V. and Research Statement and the like, but provided the support and encouragement I needed feel confident going forward in my search for a tenure-track faculty position. I hope SWS offers this workshop again at future meetings, and I encourage everyone: job seekers as well as those who have experience being on the job market or serving on search committees, to participate. I think in workshops like this everyone wins; like myself, I believe most job-seekers who attended benefitted in a myriad of ways from the experience, and mentors can (and should!) know that they are providing a great service to less experiences SWSers. Many thanks, again, to everyone who committed their time and effort to making this a success!

~ Leandra Smollin, grad student

Building a Gender Progressive Department
The workshop on gender progressive departments was great—the categorization of the different types of departments was particularly informative. It gave me the language to more concretely evaluate what a gender progressive department looks like and the “tools” to think about how to make change! It was also great to interact with others as we shared differences and similarities among our respective departments. This workshop once again reaffirmed how important SWS is for feminist sociologists!

~ Krista Brumley, Faculty

The Meetings in General
I attended the publishing workshop, which was so useful in regards to technical advice from current and past editors, but most importantly, it was a place where, as a graduate student, I found an atmosphere of solidarity and camaraderie. I walked out of that workshop hopeful and full of energy to continue the arduous work of publishing. I also attended the S2S (Sister-to-Sister) committee meeting, which was full of great working ideas for future workshops. The “Critique Me” workshop was useful to improve not only the quality of my CV, but because I felt so encouraged by the reviewer’s kind and supportive words. The Breakfast with Scholars was a great way to talk to expert scholars in my research area—international migration. I was able to meet other students with the same research interests, but most importantly, the advice and experiences from the scholars was very inspiring and informative. Finally, as the new Student Representative, the Student Concerns Committee was well attended and the students’ input was full of great ideas for upcoming activities and workshops.

~ Verónica Montes, grad student

Critique me! Mentor me! Between the Breakfast with Scholars, the publishing workshop, the “critique me” session, and Sister-to-Sister mentoring, graduate students got tangible, practical advice and guidance at the Winter Meetings.

Being a grad student during these years of economic crisis is difficult—Will I get a job at all? How many temporary positions will I take before landing something permanent? My brain often jumps the gun. Before that, I need to finish my dissertation, publish more, and navigate an incredibly competitive market.

I sat at the social movement table with Mary Bernstein and Tina Fetner during the inaugural Breakfast with Scholars. Informally discussing my work with like-minded students and two leading scholars in the field not only helped me pragmatically, it was also an ego boost: yes, I do belong here; yes, I am an emerging scholar. The overly packed publishing workshop offered simple advice for a part of our jobs that, especially for new scholars adjusting to the nuances of journal submission, is quite daunting. The “critique me” session was set up speed-dating style, allowing each of us one-on-one time with different mentors who offered suggestions on how to strengthen our job market materials. I left feeling much more confident and pleased than any actual speed dating experience. The support and energy of the St. Pete Winter Meetings was invaluable for me!

~ Crystal A. Jackson, grad student

In case you were like me and always wondering what the heck Sociologists for Women in Society winter conference is like I would say: AWESOME.

This was the friendliest conference ever! There is heavy emphasis on mentoring, building connections between junior and senior scholars and basically building a community that is a respite for many feminist sociologists irrespective of their research area in or out of the academy.

It is hard to pin down one aspect of the conference that made it successful for me: connecting with old friends, hosted dinners that provided a chance to meet other faculty and students, a perfect Hand match, honest conversations about identity, financial support to attend or the many other things the
winter conference offers that others do not.

I really did come away with the sense that “This year’s new friend is next year’s old friend” (a description New College faculty member Emily Fairchild gave of the conference as we stood in a hallway chatting with some new old friends.)

~ Zakiya Luna, Postdoctoral Fellow

I really enjoyed the meetings overall but I especially enjoyed the Breakfast with Scholars and the Critique Me session. I sat with Denise Segura and Nikki Jones at the BWS, and the conversation was honest and inspiring! I definitely suggest that we have that session every year and continue to poll students on what they would like to discuss. One question Nikki asked us that we didn’t get to answer but I would really like to at another meeting is, “How do you manage your spirit when conducting this research?” That could definitely be a roundtable: “Managing Your Spirit While Conducting Feminist Research” (or something along those lines).

I also benefited a great deal from the “Critique Me” session. I had my CV looked over by Tina Fetner and Afshan Jafar. They both gave really great feedback on how to re-structure my CV depending on the type of school I apply for. I’ll be going on the job market in August so this was profoundly helpful!

I also had a great time the student reception!! It’s really awesome to see so many folks in the same position as me (i.e. grad students). It was particularly nice to get to know fellow Chow Greene recipients and of course, Dr. Esther Chow herself! This was actually my favorite meeting.

~ Chandra Waring, grad student

The St.Pete’s meeting was my first SWS winter meeting, and it was unlike any other professional conference I have attended—in a great way! As a graduate student, I felt the usual stiff boundaries at conferences between faculty and students were slackened, and because of this I received so much professional advice which will carry me through this last phase of graduate school and into my professional career—not to mention the wonderful people behind the words of wisdom. The workshops I went to were incredibly useful and well-attended, particularly ‘Critique Me’ and ‘Publishing.’ I am so grateful for the experience, and now I understand what faculty mean when they say SWS is like a feminist booster shot that keeps your spirits high throughout the year—I can’t wait for the next meeting!

~ Julie C. Keller, grad student

In the past, I had some negative involvement with SWS that left me with the perception that it was a white-dominated, classed, elitist, and exclusionary organization. Despite well-meaning colleagues encouraging me to participate over the years, I shied away from the winter meetings and any formal SWS connections, perhaps to my own professional detriment. However, a sabbatical and the availability of unexpected funds provided the impetus for me to attend the 2012 SWS Meetings in St. Petersburg, Florida.

My experience at the 2012 SWS meetings went a long way towards smashing these perceptions. How? First, Stephanie Nawyn did an excellent job of matching me with Shirley Hill (former SWS president) and Meghan Conley (SWS Southern Sociological Society representative). Staying together at the Hotel Indigo, we walked to and from the Hilton, shared stories, exchanged teaching ideas, and attended the banquet together. Second, SWS President-Elect Pat Martin’s opening talk was welcoming and transparent in conveying SWS’s strengths and limitations, which I appreciated. I felt that Pat was initiating a conversation among us rather than talking to us.

Third, I enjoyed all of the formal sessions I attended, especially “Mentoring Across Color Lines” and “Feminist Issues and Strategies for Career Development & Creative Retirement.” Though I am sure much work remains to be done, SWS appears to have become more inclusive! Finally, I was heartened to see resources available to newcomers such as the research roundtable presentations, sign-up sheets for hosted dinners, and the Breakfast With Scholars.

As a result of the 2012 SWS meetings, I have joined this organization, plan on attending the 2013 winter meetings, and would like to volunteer in a small capacity. Thank you to everyone who helped make this meeting such a success!

~ Catherine Fobes, Faculty

Did you say YOGA?

I had the honor of leading the second annual SWS yoga class at this year’s winter meetings. No sticky mats. No mood lighting. No incense. Just forty people taking our seats on a somewhat smelly hotel conference room floor to remember that we academics are not just “heads on a stick.” We shared a resonant OM. Looked inward. Moved in concert with our breath. Remembered our humanity. It was truly beautiful. My deepest gratitude to all of you who practiced yoga with me on that special day.

Namaste,
Gayle Sulik, independent scholar
Andrea Miller [Andreamiller31@webster.edu] pointed out that according to the AAUP between 60-80% of professors are adjuncts or contingent faculty without a tenure-track contract. At her own university, 80% of professors are adjuncts like herself. She also noted that at universities where adjunct or contingent faculty members already teach most new tenure-track positions are not given to those adjunct or contract professors. “Familiarity breed Contempt” is how she described this. As Eliana Osborn said in her piece on from the Feb. 3, 2012 edition of The Chronicle of Higher Education: “It’s likely they’ll get both [when new positions open] the great adjunct will stay, and they’ll have a brand-new faculty member from outside as well.” She encouraged non-tenure-track faculty members to find ways to be professionally active in research, publication and professional service even where these are not institutionally rewarded.

Jeanne Marie Flavin [jflavin@fordham.edu] noted that with the privilege of tenure and promotion comes responsibility, i.e., to assume leadership roles in our departments, universities, professions; to mentor and support junior colleagues and share with them what we have learned; to say the hard things and where necessary, to step into controversy and defend important principles. Drawing on her personal experiences she urged people not to wait until they experienced a major health problem or some other traumatic event to figure out what is personally important. She pointed out that life is too short to waste time on soul-sucking committees to nowhere. Even so, she continued, we can’t do it all. So do less, do it late, do it to a lower standard and as much as possible, do it with love and a sense of levity.

Margaret Weigers Vitullo [vitullo@asnet.org] challenged the narrow, singular career path we are socialized to believe is the only definition of success. She shared her own unusual and divergent career path, from outside of academia, to inside, and back outside and contrasted this with the usual definition of success: faculty job, publish books and high status journal articles, tenure, get promoted to full. She concluded with an excerpt from Mary Catherine Bateson’s alternative view of “composing a life” that ends: “Goals too clearly defined, can become blinders…Increasingly, we will recognize the value of life times of continual redefinition.”

Judith Lorber [Jlorber@rcn.com] offered advice for new retirees: First, organize your finances. Second, have at least one project ready to be worked on or completed, with ideas for new projects ready to start. Third, think about short-term visiting international professorships as a way to combine travel with professional work. It’s a wonderful way to expand international networks, travel, and provide your expertise in new settings. The Fulbright Scholar Program is a good place to start: http://www.cies.org/us_scholars/us_awards/. Use your current connections to make contacts with places you would like to go. In most cases, she noted, you need to work with the host institution to develop a project and work your way through the necessary applications.

Esther Ngan-ling Chow [echow@american.edu] focused on the fact that there is indeed life beyond retirement. She urged taking ample time to prepare for retirement, taking a holistic approach to health and well-being and a forward-looking perspective with a short break for revitalization. She urged social involvement and continuing involvement in professional life including SWS. Finally she suggested finding a new project. To that end she showed slides of The True Light Foundation’s Project Hope where she has participated in opening schools and awarding scholarships to students in two provinces in China.

Marcia Texler Segal [msegal@ius.edu] closed the session focusing on the shift from faculty member to administrator. She noted that this opened opportunities for grant-financed administrative consulting at institutions in Africa and Central Asia, opportunities to learn about aspects of the university well beyond her discipline and faculty status, and the luxury of clerical assistance that facilitated writing and editing. However, administrative responsibilities proved a barrier to conducting empirical research. She urged those who are considering this route as a career path to think about it early as the ladder to a campus chancellorship or university presidency requires several steps.

Advice From the Field: How to Write Grants and Obtain Funding for Your Research

The workshop started with a brief review of myths that impede successful grants application, and a short list of key points for success, presented by Bernice Pescosolido (PowerPoint available on the SWS website). Mindy Fried discussed the role of evaluator in the preparation of proposals, including consulting during the conceptualization and writing stage of the overall proposal, and ensuring that the research questions and the measures included in the evaluation demonstrate an understanding of the intent of the proposed program’s outcomes. Gayle Sulik described some funding sources at NEH that are often overlooked by sociologists. (Her handout can be found on the SWS website.) Anne Lincoln reflected on her experiences as an early career applicant and recipient of NSF funding, and the challenges and opportunities of collaboration particularly across disciplines. Laura Kramer spoke about the work role of NSF program officers and (continued on next page)
implications for applicants for funding. There was an energetic discussion, with Q and A and contributions from the attendees following the presentations.

– Laura Kramer, Mindy Fried, Bernice Pescosolido, Gayle Sulik, and Anne Lincoln (panelists)

Critical Advice
By Afshan Jafar

I was one of the faculty who volunteered at the “Critique Me!” session for current graduate students this year. Faculty from all kinds of institutions and backgrounds volunteered to offer advice on each person’s CV, personal statement and whatever other materials they may have brought with them. Sara Crawley, the organizer of the session, very accurately described the format as similar to “speed dating.” The “experts” sat at different tables and every twenty minutes students moved around from one table to another to get advice. We briefly explained our background/expertise (such as working at a small liberal arts college, part of an academic couple, international scholar) so that students could identify who matched their interests the most.

Even though I had volunteered to serve as an “expert”, I was a bit unsure. How much advice could I have to offer? I’m only in my fourth-year as a tenure-track faculty after all. I thought so many things I would have to say would be . . . obvious. Turns out, I’ve forgotten what it was like to be a graduate student at a research university. My most interesting exchange was with a graduate student who sat down at my table and started her introduction with something along the lines of “I know you’re at a small liberal arts college, and I don’t want to teach at one, but I still wanted to talk to you . . .” She went on to tell me how much she absolutely loves teaching (which is the reason she decided to get a PhD) but also wants to do research, so the only option for her would be an R1 institution.

So I asked her: If you love teaching so much, how come you don’t want to consider a small college? Turns out that somewhere along the way, she had picked up the idea that small liberal arts colleges, for instance, just make you teach and teach and never leave any time for research. Not only that, she was led to believe that research isn’t rewarded or expected at small liberal arts colleges.

Once I cleared up these misconceptions and told her about what life is like at a small liberal arts college like mine, she seemed thrilled. Maybe even relieved. She then told me how a liberal arts option is never really discussed and how people treat her love of teaching as a naïve preoccupation, one that she’ll outgrow once she’s in the real world.

So, my participation in this session had an unintended consequence. It made me realize that if we want graduate students to succeed (that is, be happy in their choices and careers), we need to consider their interests, passions and strengths and advise them accordingly. Graduate programs need to acknowledge that not every one of their students will be happy in a large research institution. And more importantly perhaps, they need to develop opportunities, like the “Critique Me!” session, for their own graduate students to be exposed to a variety of views and experiences that go beyond the R1 experience. Only then can graduate students really begin to think about what path is best suited for them.

Tales from Feminist Administrators: Navigating Leadership Pathways in the Academy
By Janet Hankin

Panelist were: Janet Hankin, Shirley Las-ka, Barbara Risman, Patricia Roos, Mary Virnoche, and Amy Warton. They had a variety of experiences as administrators at various levels including: departments, centers, colleges, and universities. The panelists concluded that leadership matters and feminist administrators can transform the academy.

How to deal with bullies was a major focus of the discussion. For information on bullying, see the link to

(Continued from previous page)

the article “Faculty Experiences with Bullying in Higher Education: Causes, Consequences, and Management,” Lorraine Keasly and Joel H. Neuman Administrative Theory & Praxis, March 2010, Vol. 32, No. 1, pp. 48–70 which is posted on the SWS website. Bullies harass, negatively affect work, offend, and disrupt faculty governance. The behavior is repeated over time and escalates. Strategies to deal with bullying include: pushing back, setting ground rules for behavior in department meetings, co-opting people, creating alliances, seeking support from deans and provosts, and writing formal letters requesting the bully to cease and desist. Sometimes the only way to address bullying is to leave the university.

The workshop also discussed techniques to improve department morale and build rapport including: conducting retreats, bringing food to meetings, having an open door policy, addressing concerns of junior faculty who feel powerless, taking faculty to coffee and meals, walking the halls to see if people are unhappy, meeting individually with each faculty member annually, creating an inclusive environment and addressing inequalities. It is useful to develop departmental strategies, for example, mentoring programs that can change the institution.

When you consider an administrative post, be careful about salary negotiations. Often you get an attachment to your salary that disappears after you return to the faculty. Negotiate having salary increases placed in your base salary so you are not worse off when you return to a regular faculty position. Usually one moves from 9 month to 12 month position, and returning to the faculty means you lose 25% of your income. If you are not a full professor when you become an administrator, take care not to jeopardize your changes for promotion and tenure.

Figure out who you will serve, who will help you, and who will not help you.

Women’s and Gender Studies and Feminist Transformation of the Academy
By Anastasia Prokos

Organized by Anastasia Prokos, Solange Simoes, and Crystal Jackson
Featuring Solange Simoes, Gloria Jones-Johnson, and Manisha Desai

This workshop focused on current issues facing Women’s and Gender Studies (WGS) programs and departments, and how SWS can facilitate intellectual exchange about the role of Women’s Studies in the academy. Panelists discussed a range of issues, including historical transformations of the academic context, the institutionalization of WGS in the academy, how current budget crises are affecting WGS programs and departments, as well as tensions within women’s studies and between women’s studies and academic institutions. Many SWSers work in multiple capacities within our home institutions and beyond, including appointments in a variety of social justice oriented programs. The conversation that emerged out of the workshop included a host of questions about how to adapt our institutions to reflect the insights of contemporary feminist theory, how to engage with today’s students, and how to continue to act as a force for feminist change within our institutions. We hope to continue these conversations at SWS and NWSA as well as reach out to broader audiences.

(Session Smorgasbord continued from page 15)
introduced me to the cool coffee shops uptown and the local’s world of Mardi Gras. We were strangers, but she sensed my disconnection in a new place and she reached out to me.

April kindly mentored me during the revise and resubmit of my first ever article for publication. I still hear her wise voice when I work on R&Rs.

I loved her laugh and her joie de vivre. She was a rare model of a serious scholar who made time for play.

My heart is heavy with losing her. Damn.

She would have been a kick-ass old broad.

~Chris Bobel

I met April at an SWS Winter meeting many years ago. I don’t remember the city, but I remember Beth Rushing leaning over and saying, “That is April Brayfield.” I had read her work so I knew the name, but what struck me about her that day was the glow she radiated as she moved into and across the room. In the years since then, April and I had many Winter meeting conversations about our lives, work, New Orleans (my family lives there) and SWS. She will live on in the students she has mentored, the colleagues she encouraged, and the family and friends she loved. I think I’ll dye my hair for Mardi Gras this year, order a King cake, and pass April on to our SWS graduate students, “There was an SWS Professor at Tulane…”

~Kathryn Feltey

Unpretentious, committed to principles, and irreverent: April was a breath of fresh air and I’ll miss her.

~Irene Padavic

When my daughter, Sasha, was looking at colleges and considering Tulane, I only knew April from the SWS listserv. But I wrote her a note, asking her to tell me a little about the university’s “culture”. April wrote me back right away with a comprehensive and informative analysis - a true sociologist! - based on her experience teaching at the university for many years. When Sasha enrolled at Tulane the following year, April and I finally met in person and became fast friends. As anyone who knew April knows, she was warm, sharp, engaging, insightful and fun-loving.

As Sasha continued her studies, April became a kind of shadow advisor for her. In fact, I believe that April’s advice to Sasha about how to navigate the sociology department was instrumental in guiding her to becoming a Sociology major. Sasha was in April’s research analysis class this fall semester when April passed away. I know that for Sasha it was very hard to lose April, as she had gotten very close to her, as had many other students. Sasha kept me updated on April’s health, and I’m glad to say, told me just in time when she was really failing, so that I could write April a final note before she passed away. Sasha also had a final office visit with April before she died. April may have known that it would be soon, because she was extremely open with Sasha about her health, and also very supportive about Sasha’s work. No unfinished business. I miss April, and have enormous respect for how she lived her life up until the very end.

~Mindy Fried

Many friends know that April had a crafts group – knitting – that was very important to her. Well I learned about it in an interesting way. I encountered her and the other “crafters” busily working away and listening avidly in the Jazz Tent at the New Orleans Jazz and Heritage Festival. Back left corner of the tented area, folding chair section. I encountered the group about four years ago and was immediately welcomed by April to sit (and very shortly as I brought my knitting) to knit with the group. An unlikely group in the ‘hip’ setting of the jazz tent. I enjoyed the likely inaccurate assessment that we didn’t know our music. Strangely, modern jazz is at risk to being diminished at the Festival so we prepared letters for a Jazz and Heritage Foundation Board member to help plead the case and we each recommended sophisticated performers in our letters. “Who would have thought?” A classic April assertive activity: knitting women waxing sophisticatedly about jazz musicians and asking/demanding that the fest respect jazz. It will be a difficult moment as I enter the tent the last week in April not to see April there. Definitely I will be bringing my knitting.

~Shirley Laska
those marvelous hats, the exuberant lovely picture in my mind. as embraced the child of a friend. What a help another budding feminist as well bracelet, which she treasured. Arlene ing my then teenage daughter an ERA ages of her, perhaps 38 years ago, giv

Dawn Day, SWS Treasurer, 1972-1975

Arlene Daniels was an inspirational, cou rageous, and kind colleague. As one of the founders of SWS, Arlene set an ex cellent model for me and inspired me to be a feminist. I have a fond memory of her. She will be missed.

Esther Chow, Professor Emerita of Sociology, American University

I was very sorry to hear of Arlene’s death. She was a wonderful woman who did so much for so many. A scholarship fund is a very fitting memorial.

Dawn Day, SWS Treasurer, 1972-1975

I wrote Arlene last summer after receiv ing her letter and learning of Richard’s death. At that time I was filled with im ages of her, perhaps 38 years ago, giving my then teenage daughter an ERA bracelet, which she treasured. Arlene helped another budding feminist as well as embraced the child of a friend. What a lovely picture in my mind.

And then there was Arlene in those marvelous hats, the exuberant personality and voice, and the wonder ful hugs and real presence. She enjoyed her friends, as we all enjoyed her. Beth and I have wonderful memories, coupled with a sense of loss.

Steven Deutsch, Professor Emeritus of Sociology, University of Oregon

I remember vividly the first time I met Arlene (in 1977, I guess). I had gone up to Northwestern as a prospective grad student; I was an earnest young feminist who had never taken a sociology course, and Arlene was directing the Program on Women in its early days. Arlene told me about all her activities and then said, “I’m just running along at top speed, having a wonderful time, and you’re welcome to run along with me.” So that’s what I did, and we did have fun doing our work together—reading, discussing, organizing, and of course cooking and eating with great gusto.

When I talk about her as my advi sor, I tend to emphasize Arlene’s enth usiasm and warmth and encouragement— and the networking (she introduced me, and promoted my work, so generously, to so many wonderful feminist sociologists who’ve been models and comrades over the years!). But she was also exacting—almost stern, though that’s not quite the right word—about the work itself. When you gave her something, it had to be right, it had to be interesting, and it had to be very well written! She made that very clear and then, when you did get it right, she was absolutely thrilled and let you know that. She also had an ability to turn students’ work around very quickly, and the work came back not only with substantive comments but also with her superb copy-editing. Now that I’m commenting myself on students’ writing, I’m truly in awe of how she did it, especially since I now know that she was providing editorial feedback as well to a large network of colleagues.

Arlene’s conceptualization of “invisible work” and her writings on the topic were foundational to my scholarship and continue to underpin most of what I get interested in. She articulated a key insight that continues to inform a great deal of feminist and other scholarship, both explicitly and implicitly. I also learned profound lessons from Arlene about scholarship and collegiality; she taught me by example about the importance of building and sustaining scholarly networks and organizations, and about the social and emotional dimensions of our intellectual work. Despite the differences in our personal styles, I’ve tried to enact in my own more reserved ways at least some of Arlene’s fierce resistance to exclusion and dedication to continual expansion of our scholarly communities.

Marjorie Devault, Professor of Sociology and Maxwell Professor of Teaching Excellence, Syracuse University

I am one of the many whose lives and careers Arlene changed forever. Arlene and her hats will live on in our hearts. And, in her honor, I promise never to split another infinitive!

Timothy Diamond

I was Arlene’s last Ph.D. My life is better because of her being my advisor, and I am feeling this loss. Arlene was tough on me, but VERY good to me. I enjoyed our dinners out and our evenings out to Music of the Baroque in Evanston.

Mark Ellis, Associate Professor of Sociology, William Paterson University of New Jersey

Arlene was the “grande dame” of sociology—she was elegant, fearless, and unfailingly kind, especially to junior scholars. Her rapier wit would skewer the
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How very sad indeed. It was founding mothers like Arlene who have made it possible for women like me to follow and join the journey to change the academy. Her legacy is indelible.

Davita Silfen Glasberg,
Professor of Sociology,
CLAS Associate Dean of Social Sciences and Undergraduate Education,
University of Connecticut

Outwardly Arlene was high-spirited, assured, directing. I remember Arlene standing near me as I chaired my first SWS mid-year meeting having succeeded her as its president, poking me in the back to get me to cut off the endless talkers. And she gave me grief afterward for not moving the agenda along faster. She also directed me to Richard-as-CEO where in his Redwood City office he tutored me, as she predicted, on the industry I was researching.

Underneath—she could be contemplative, vulnerable. I remember dinner with her when I enjoyed her quiet (yes, quiet) musings about how important sociology and being a sociologist were to her life, how these gave her community and self-worth. Yet another Arlene—after reading my sharp critique of a draft commentary she wrote for a book Rachel (Kahn-Hut) and she were editing, she called to announce that she had vowed never to talk to me again, but she laughed, would I read her revisions.

How sad for me that visits to the Bay Area will no longer include her company—a superb dinner (menu selections by Arlene) at a restaurant (Arlene-selected, where the staff greets her by name). What a pair—she and Richard—serious about their work while taking joy in food and music and art and travel.

Nona Y. Glazer,
SWS President, 1976-88,
Professor Emerita of Sociology and Women Studies,
Portland State University

Most remember Arlene from her glory years, when she held powerful positions as a full professor at Northwestern, and held leadership positions as President of SWS, editor of Social Problems, President of the SSSP, and Secretary of the ASA. In all those positions, she used her clout to open doors for other women, including women of color. It is important for us to remember also that Arlene persevered through some 15 years when she did not have a stable academic position, relying mostly on grants to support her research. She fought the good fight in her own career and in those of scores of women in sociology. I was among those fortunate enough to have her on our sides as we struggled to survive in academia. She, as many have observed, was larger than life—outspoken, funny, and sometimes outrageous—using humor to deflate sexist pomposity and to rally the troops. Arlene was one of my heroes, and I will miss her.

Evi - Evelyn Nakano Glenn,
SWS, First Vice President and Newsletter Editor, 1975-76,
Professor, Ethnic Studies and Gender & Women’s Studies,
Director, Center for Race and Gender,
University of California Berkeley

It was 58 years ago this January that I got to grad school at UCB with Arlene already there. We stayed friends and supporters all these years. I looked forward to my many visits from the East Coast to the Bay area staying with Arlene and Richard in Belmont and finally in the apartment in Oakland when Richard
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began to fail. I was saddened but prepared for Richard’s passing. I guess it was hard to anticipate Arlene’s leaving – she was such a force of nature.

Fred Goldner,
Professor Emeritus of Sociology,
Queens College and CUNY Graduate School,
City University of New York

I did not know Arlene well, though I agree with others that her professional influence continues to be immense. What I remember is her incredible generosity when I contacted her prior to teaching my first undergraduate course in qualitative methods. At the time, there were only a handful of such courses being taught in Soc. departments. Not only did Arlene share with me her syllabus and other teaching materials, but she rounded up syllabi from colleagues around the country whom she knew had taught similar courses.

Linda Grant, 
Professor of Sociology, 
University of Georgia, Athens

Arlene and Richard Daniels were second parents to me. Many of you have heard my name over the years. I’ve known Arlene and Richard since I was four years old. Arlene lived with my family while attending graduate school. Later they acted as my legal guardians when I was fifteen and sixteen and my family was living in Europe. Even though I was a typical eye-rolling teenager, it was at this time that they imbued in me my lifelong love of opera. We have stayed very close over the years, and my daughter Sara became their darling granddaughter.

Arlene passed away in her sleep on January 29 at the Berkshire, the assisted living facility where she spent her last ten months. She had lost her husband Richard in April of 2011. Despite the years they lived apart while Arlene was at Northwestern, their marriage was an extremely close one, and Arlene felt his loss tremendously. Even though Arlene’s short term memory was seriously impaired, she was still able to take pleasure in the weekly outings we made to the symphony, ballet, and opera, right up to a week before she died. Although she had a few chronic health issues, none of them caused her pain, nor did she feel ill. She was just very tired, and in the last few weeks had visibly slowed down, sleeping most of the day. I visited with her the weekend that she died. On Sunday she had a visit from a good friend, but slept through most of it, and passed away an hour after he left.

Susan Hadley

Arlene was very special friend and colleague. I got to know her when she was the President of SSSP and I was on a committee. Our friendship lasted for many years. She was a gifted scholar who had insights about everything. She was also a wonderful friend who always responded very thoughtfully to her friends and students. I found her to be a role model for standing up and fighting for what is right. I will miss her.

Elizabeth Higginbotham,
Professor of Sociology and Criminal Justice, 
University of Delaware

Arlene was one of my staunch supporters after I was unfairly denied tenure at my previous university. She wrote letters for me and provided emotional support as did Barrie and other SWSers.

Strangely enough, not even ONE of the senior women in my department had supported me for tenure. (Some apologized later as I became more successful.) I had been voted down by just one vote in the department, and so my case could not go forward.

With Arlene’s and others’ help, I was then able to get a job at the University of New Mexico. However, I could never have gotten that job without many artful letters explaining why any department should hire me after another one had fired me!

The Arlene story I like best came to me second hand. Apparently Arlene was at a regional meeting attended by one of the best-known senior women in the department. As the story goes, Arlene marched right up to that woman (those who knew Arlene can just see her doing that), and demanded in her very loudest husky voice, “I WANT TO KNOW WHAT HAPPENED TO JANE HOOD’S TENURE!”

Thank you, Arlene.

My next most favorite story is the hat story. SWS had a fall meeting one year (I think at New York’s Fashion Institute) at which we had what might have been our first auction. Senior members auctioned off some very funny things including craft products that some of our members had made during their housewife years in the 1950s. However, a large number of Arlene’s old hats were by far the hottest-selling items. For the rest of the meeting, one could identify many SWSers by their second-hand colorful broad-brimmed Daniels hats. I loved Arlene and will miss her.

Mary is so right in her description of Arlene as bold and courageous. I will add compassionate and generous. Arlene also made major contributions to the study of work and occupations.

Jane C. Hood, 
Professor of Sociology, 
University of New Mexico

A light just went out. There was no one who had anything like her intuitive acuity in handling the ups and downs of spoken English along with a huge dollop of compassion for those less lucky than she. Arlene was a witty optimist. What more could one ask?
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I think of Arlene often when I feel the invisibility age brings in the social world. When I commented at the age of 46, that I was beginning to feel invisible, she responded: “It’s great for doing field work.” I have told that story to so many people, but never sent her a thank you note for it, and the comfort the truth of it brings.

Laura Kramer,
SWS Treasurer, 2010,
Professor Emerita of Sociology,
Montclair State University, New Jersey

Arlene Kaplan Daniels was my UC Berkeley cohort, a long-time friend, and a highly valued collaborator and editorial assistant on the Festschrift in honor of Professor Tamotsu Shibutani. Arlene would probably agree with me that the Special Session of the Pacific Sociological Association on March 23, 1996 in Seattle, when we presented to T. Shibutani the Festschrift, *Individuality and Social Control: Essays in Honor of Tamotsu Shibutani* (published 1996) was one of the most memorable occasions in our lives. More than once she said to me that the session was the antithesis or direct opposite of “anomie.” I shall miss Arlene’s company and counsel very much.

Kian M. Kwan,
Professor Emeritus of Sociology,
California State University, Northridge

I knew Arlene well, both professionally and personally and I shall miss her a lot—just knowing she was there lifted my spirits and hopes. We worked together on many feminist issues, in our profession, over the years and also developed a strong friendship. We sat on committees together, went on excursions to investigate denials of tenure and other unacceptable and UN-professional behaviors by our so-called colleagues. We visited each other, and spent time together, over many years, at my home and hers.

Rachel Kahn-Hut,
Professor Emerita of Sociology,
San Francisco State University

Dear Arlene, I appreciated you greatly, as a friend, a colleague, a fighter and will miss you greatly. I loved you. You were a pal.

Barbara Laslett,
Professor Emerita of Sociology,
University of Minnesota

Arlene was truly a sister feminist for me. She was so intertwined with the early days of SWS and so much THERE—as a person, an activist, a feminist, a professional, that I can’t disentangle her from my memories of those days when there weren’t 12 out of 18 women governing ASA (next year) but none at all, and we were sitting in at all-male restaurants at the meetings, demonstrating in the halls during presidential addresses, hammering out the details of getting child care...

And there was Arlene in a big hat leading the fights.

Judith Lorber,
Professor Emerita of Sociology and Women’s Studies,
The Graduate Center and Brooklyn College of the City University of New York

Arlene was very dear to me, a welcoming colleague at Northwestern, even though I wasn’t in her department and was only there a few short years. We kept in touch. We went to the opera together. I loved her wackiness and wit and dedication to women in the labor movement.

I will really miss her. I am planning to come to the Bay Area for a week in late May, and she was on my short list of people to spend time with. I live in northern Minnesota now and don’t get out there often. I’ll keep Arlene in my heart, and really miss her Christmas letters!

Ann Roell Markusen,
Professor Emerita of Urban and Regional Planning and Public Policy,
University of Minnesota
Arlene’s Christmas cards were always a joy for me and made me feel close to her and part of her life. We learned of Arlene’s death just before the recent Winter Meetings of Sociologists for Women in Society and we remembered her at every step of the way. At our banquet, we did the “Arlene thing” of using a floppy hat to have everyone give money, which we gave to a feminist organization, or this year, to two. It was touching and great fun! The hat was a wild pink color so we felt Arlene was at work on more levels than one.

I also want to tell a story from the 1976 SWS “midyear” meeting in Washington D. C. It was my first winter meeting; I knew hardly anyone. Arlene was SWS president. As SWS old-timers know, all we did back then for 3 days was SWS-business (well, we did eat and visit too). My friend at the meeting was Gladys Handy and she was no more familiar with SWS-types than I was. Still, we both stayed and tried to take part for three days. Just before the meeting ended, I went up to Arlene (whom I did not really know except by reputation) to ask if it were all right (with her/with SWS?) if we started an SWS group in the south. As if she were the queen knighting a loyal subject, she held out her arm, patted me on the head, and said “Yes, Dear.” And so, I was charged with the duty, I was official. That was January. In April, in Miami, Florida, we started SWS-South and, today, it is going strong. SWS-South raises money every year for the ASA minority fellowship and, besides, just like SWS nationally, we have great fun. It was my impression over all the years after that the reason Arlene “liked” me and paid attention to me was that encounter. (Of course, I could be wrong.) But it meant a great deal to me, as she did. Plus her love of laughter and fun was contagious. She was a joy to be around.

Many have already attested to Arlene’s vibrant feminism and unstintingly generous support of women scholars. We will long value these legacies which continue to inspire us. A review of her highly productive publication record shows that her feminism also informed her substantial contributions to sociological understanding of work, occupation and careers, e.g. women in trade unions published with Alice Cook and Val Lowin (Temple, 1984; Cornell, 1992) and women and work with Rachel Kahn-Hut and Richard Colvard (Oxford, 1982). She widened sociological conceptions of work with her insights of women’s work as invisible (Social Problems, 1987). In that vein her 1988 analysis of women volunteers in civic organizations (Invisible Careers, Chicago, 1988) remains a classic which also broke ground in studying elites. She was a superb qualitative researcher who insightfully wrote about self/self and self/other relations long before reflexivity became an important feminist and qualitative issue (Qualitative Sociology, 1983). We will all miss her.

Like so many other people, Arlene Kaplan Daniels was the reason I became a sociologist…as an undergrad at Northwestern she took me under her wing, or rather, under one of those wide brim hats. She was really one of our founders. Barbara Risman, SWS President, 2003, Professor of Sociology, University of Illinois, Chicago

Although Arlene was not at the last two ASA meetings, I’m still grappling with the thought that she will not be at future ones. She ALWAYS contributed so much spirit, joy and good sense! I remember first meeting Arlene in September 1969 at the Women’s Sociology Caucus that the organizers held in the basement of Glide Memorial Church because the ASA wouldn’t let us meet at the San Francisco Hilton, its hotel. Like me, Arlene was in the audience. Then an assistant professor at S.F. State, Arlene, who was to become a friend of many of us, later recalled, “I became intensely involved in the outpouring of emotion by the speakers, who talked about their difficulties in finishing their studies and finding careers against
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the odds of institutionalized and explicit sexism. … Suddenly, I recognized the larger pattern in all the slights, snubs, omissions, and patronizing acts that I had shrugged off as my paranoia or my just desserts. … I resolved to help younger women, to protect them against the systematic frustration and neglect that I had experienced” (“When We Were All Boys Together,” 1994, p. 36).

Indeed, Arlene lived her resolve of helping younger women. Following the Spring 1971 SWS meeting at Yale, Arlene visited Jessie Bernard in Washington, D.C. Kindred souls, the first thing they decided to do with their day together was to invite Dawn Day and myself, who’d both missed the meeting due to teaching and other responsibilities we couldn’t ignore as untenured women assistant professors, to lunch. While both bubbled with excitement about the meeting, Arlene kept exclaiming, “They were all such bright, powerful women!” With Arlene and Jessie’s encouragement, Dawn and I organized the first meetings of DC-SWS.

Over the next several years when we could all still fit around a single large table at dinners SWS held during the ASA meetings, Arlene was always there contributing laughter, good humor and leadership. Over the next decades, Arlene maintained her caring for SWS and so many of us whom she supported. At the 2009 ASA meeting when I was giving a paper on “The 1969 Women’s Sociology Caucus, SWS and the ASA”, it seemed just like old times to look out and see Arlene, sitting in the third row along with Rachel Kahn-Hut and others, smiling and enthusiastically nodding her head with her big wide-brimmed hat bobbing spiritedly back and forth. While we will miss Arlene, her contributions to the building of SWS and to the de-gendering of Social Problems, the SSSP and the ASA, and the results of her support of the careers of so many feminist sociologists as well as our individual and collective memories of Arlene will long be with us.

Pam - Pamela Ann Roby, SWS President, 1978-80, Professor Emerita of Sociology and Women’s Studies, University of California, Santa Cruz

Arlene was an enormous influence on my life, as a teacher, mentor, colleague and friend. When I was an undergraduate, she opened the world of sociology to me in a way no one else had done. She sent me off to graduate school, but was forever coaching and prodding and encouraging me in ways large and small. She always had time to read a draft, talk through an idea, and generate great enthusiasm for writing. I will always cherish my years as her research assistant when I learned more about doing research than from any class. As I moved from sociology to public health, I tried to take with me the sociological imagination and enthusiasm Arlene had cultivated. I also tried to give my own students and “apprentices” the energy, enthusiasm and encouragement that she so generously gave to me and to many others. I will always remember Arlene for her infectious smile, her enormous energy and generosity, and for the ways she so enjoyed the little pleasures of life.

Sheryl Burt Ruzek, Professor Emerita of Public Health, Temple University

I met Arlene in the early 50’s in Berkeley. I was a grad student in Physics at the time. When I told her I wanted to change to the social sciences or psychology, she persuaded me to come to the tennis court on Saturday morning to meet her idol, Tom Shibutani. So for many a Saturday, I played tennis with Tom and his wife Tomi, and Wally and Elaine McDonald. When we weren’t playing, we were talking a mile a minute.

I found the talk of great interest, since I was hearing about nothing but gadgets in the small talk of physics people. Soon I changed departments to Sociology. It was Arlene who recruited me into the field, and she also helped me change my physics habits so I could get through the sociology program. Thank you, Arlene!

Tom - Thomas J. Scheff, Professor Emeritus of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara

The three things I remember most about Arlene are: She used to introduce me as “Art Stinchcombe, we were boys together in graduate school in Berkeley — that was the only alternative in those days.” Near Christmas one year she commented, “He was one of ours that made it among the Goyim.” And when I was cooking fresh spaghetti for the first time when she was there to eat with us, I didn’t know you had to wash it first, and Arlene grabbed the colander, washed the pasta, and started it boiling, saving my thin claim on being a good housewife.

Arthur Stinchcombe, Professor Emeritus, Department of Sociology, Northwestern University

In her later years, Arlene taught some classes at UC Berkeley, where I was a grad student. She was a warm, light-hearted, and supportive feminist presence there, who inspired undergrads and took the time to mentor grad students like myself. I will always be grateful for the helping hand she extended my way and the feisty role model she offered us.

Millie Thayer, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Each person is one of a kind, but Arlene Daniels, especially so, with her larger-than-life, zestful personality.
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She was sometimes brassy and amusing, and always warm and responsive, with enormous kindness and generosity. She took principled actions, e.g., walking on the picket lines at San Francisco State, and being fired from her job. And she mustered determined optimism even in the face of adversity. Arlene mentored many, many younger people (including me), and she was an exceptionally loyal and generous friend.

Arlene's acts of generosity multiplied: when we shared hotel rooms at conferences, she always left a generous tip by her bedside table with a note: “Thank you for making up my room, Arlene.” I began doing the same, as does one of my friends, Jean Lave, whom I told about this thoughtful gesture; Jean told me she signs her notes, “Arlene.” Arlene Daniels had a hearty laugh and a generous spirit. She loved opera, good food, her friends, doing the right thing, and both cooking and traveling with her husband—“my Richard”—as on every trip they squeezed in more operas, museums, and fine restaurants than one would have thought possible. She was quick to praise and intolerant of pretensions, especially those that justified inequalities, whether in universities and their departments or in the everyday world. Arlene was eloquent. Her writing sparkled. She also knew how to listen.

Arlene edited my work for over ten years. I think of Arlene every time I see the word “etc.” (“Etc.” means “I can’t think of another example,” she said), encounter the adverbs “importantly” and “interestingly” (Arlene said those words mean, “I think this matters, but I really can’t explain precisely how”), and every time I boil an egg. Arlene also taught cooking techniques, if you were fortunate enough to be in the kitchen as she and Richard prepared a meal. Arlene’s most valuable lessons, though, were to enjoy life and to stand up for what you believe. She was happy to stand up for all of us.

Gaye Tuchman, SWS Vice President, 1976-77, Professor Emerita of Sociology, University of Connecticut

The Knapsack Institute: Transforming Teaching and Learning, June 6-9, 2012
http://www.uccs.edu/~knapsack/

The Knapsack Institute: An interactive, collaborative Institute that supports curriculum building from an intersectional, privilege and oppression theoretical framework; emphasizes strategies and tools for fostering inclusive and welcoming educational environments; provides professional growth and development, including CEUs & academic credit; provides mentoring and leadership development; provides hands-on activities, tools and practices that can be replicated; provides strategies for dealing with resistance; provides suggestions for creating institutional change in your organization; provides resources and networking to support on-going change; is facilitated by an interdisciplinary faculty team and informed by the latest research. Workshops focus on LGBTI: Examining Our own Assumptions and practices; Understanding Microaggressions in the classroom; Responding in Difficult situations; Teaching Intersectionality Through Film, and many more.

Evaluation Highlights: for the fourth consecutive year, on a scale of 1-10, with 10 being fully agree, participants rated the KI a 10 in the following key areas: This Institute was very useful and valuable to me; I would recommend this Institute to colleagues; speakers were knowledgeable and engaging.

The Knapsack Institute is a program of The Matrix Center for the Advancement of Social Equity and Inclusion, the home of the national, award-winning White Privilege Conference.
Details and application at: http://www.uccs.edu/~knapsack/
STATISTICS AND BASIC DATA

The United States incarcerates people at a higher rate than any other nation in the world [29]. Although the overall U.S. prison population declined in 2010 for the first time since 1972 as a result of a decrease in prison admissions, at yearend 2010, more than 1.6 million people were incarcerated in state or federal prisons [14]. If we add people imprisoned in local jails to these numbers, over 2.2 million people—or approximately 1 in every 104 adults—are incarcerated in prisons or jails [11].

More men than women are imprisoned, with incarceration rates for men and women at 938 and 67 per 100,000 male and female residents [14]. However, women's incarceration rates have increased faster than those of men since 1977: the women's prison population grew by 832% between 1977 and 2007, whereas the men's prison population grew 416% during that period [30, 32]. There are over 200,000 women in U.S. prisons; women comprise about 7% of the prison population [14, 32]. More than half a million women and girls are imprisoned around the world, with the U.S. holding about one-third of this population [29].

Who are the women behind bars?

- Imprisoned women are disproportionately racial and ethnic minorities. At yearend 2010, Black women (133 per 100,000 Black female residents) had an imprisonment rate almost three times higher than that of white women (47 per 100,000); Latinas rate of imprisonment fell between that of Black women and white women (77 per 100,000 Latina residents) [14].
- Increasing numbers of prisoners are migrant women, particularly from Central and South America [8].
- Approximately 42% of women in state prisons have not graduated high school [31].
- Between 57 and 75% of imprisoned women experienced physical, psychological, and/or sexual violence before prison, which is higher than the 43% of non-imprisoned women who report violence [23]. Some studies suggest that the percentage of imprisoned women who experienced violence is higher than 75% [26].
- Seventy-three percent of women in state prison (and 55% of men), have been diagnosed with a mental health problem [16].
- Seventy-four percent of women prisoners report that they regularly used drugs prior to their incarceration [20].
- Many incarcerated women have serious physical health problems, including hepatitis, diabetes, and HIV infection.
- Sixty-two percent of women in state prisons are mothers to children under 18 years of age [12].
- Non-heterosexual and gender non-conforming women are more likely to receive lengthier sentences than heterosexual, or gender conforming, women, and once in the system are subject to heterosexism and homophobia [19].
- As of December 2011, there were 58 women on death row, which is 1.8% of the total death row population [5].

REASONS FOR WOMEN’S INCARCERATION

Why are so many women behind bars, and why has the women’s incarceration rate increased so much faster than that of men? Despite the fact that media images have framed imprisoned women as violent and out of control [17], women’s high incarceration rates are not a result of rising crimes rates or a “more violent offender” [4].

- At yearend 2010, about one-third of imprisoned women were sentenced for violent crimes. About 56% of imprisoned women were sentenced for drug or property crimes [14].
- Drug offenses are the largest source of growth for the women’s prison population. About one-third of women (and one-fifth of men), serve time for drug offenses as compared to 1 in 10 imprisoned women in 1979 [10].
- Mandatory minimum sentences and sentencing guidelines emerged largely from the war on drugs in the 1980s. These measures require judges to hand down lengthy sentences based on the amount of the drug and presence of a weapon, without taking into consideration extenuating circumstances, prior records, context of the crime, abuse that could have led to addiction, or the low-level role that the woman may have played. Although women tend to play minor roles in drug crimes (such as petty sales), women drug offenders are likelier to be arrested, convicted, and incarcerated than they were prior to the war on drugs. Mandatory sentencing and sentencing enhancements eliminated judicial
considerations of women’s role as primary caretakers of children, so women are removed from their families even if they played a very minor role in the crime.

- Many women became involved in drugs because of economic need or physical coercion by male partners [6].
- Mandatory minimum sentences and sentencing guidelines have been found to disproportionately target Black women [22].
- Other “get tough on crime” measures like Three Strikes have helped to increase the rates of women’s imprisonment. In states like California, the third strike need not be a violent felony to get a woman 25 years to life in prison.
- A smaller number of women are incarcerated for killing their abusers in self-defense. Although detailed statistics on this type of crime are unavailable, estimates suggest that between 2,000 and 4,000 women are imprisoned for killing their abusers [28].
- Laws such as the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (IRCA) and the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act (IIRAIRA) have served to criminalize migrant women. IRCA extended the war on drugs to the border, and IIRAIRA reclassified some minor offenses as aggravated felonies. These laws have helped to sweep migrant women into the war on drugs [6, 8] and have resulted in the separation of migrant women from their children; in some cases, women have been deported after their sentence, and their children are sometimes put into foster care [8].

NEGLECT AND VIOLENCE DURING THE PRISON EXPERIENCE

- Once in prison, women’s lives continue to be marred by neglect and violence.
- Women have high rates of drug dependency upon imprisonment, yet drug programs are often unavailable [21].
- Educational opportunities would improve women’s ability to transition back into society upon release, yet women’s prisons have fewer educational and vocational facilities as compared to men’s prisons [21]. When courses are available, they are in areas that are underpaid and traditionally relegated to women, such as beautician classes [27].
- Incarcerated women are subjected to routine searches, harassment, and sexual assault by staff.
  - The Prisoner Rape Elimination Act (PREA) was passed in 2003, which sets national standards to prevent sexual assault and rape in U.S. prisons, but rape by correctional officers still occurs [15].
  - The National Inmate Survey found that 2.1% of women prisoners reported sexual activity with correctional staff, and 4.7% reported experiencing sexual victimization from another prisoner [1]. About 82% of imprisoned women who experienced sexual victimization reported that they were pressured or coerced by staff to engage in sexual activity [1].
  - Sexual violence is also emotional; women prisoners are also assaulted by staff’s use of denigrating language.
- Physical and mental healthcare is extremely poor in prisons.
  - Medical care is substandard in men’s institutions, but compared to men, women entering prisons have higher rates of infective diseases, respiratory and digestive system issues, genitourinary disorders, and skin and musculoskeletal diseases that often go untreated [27].
  - Gynecological care is considered a specialty service and problems often go untreated [10].
  - Women have suffered from—and some have died—of asthma, cancer, and other ailments because they were either refused medical services or received substandard care [9].
  - Women have received unlawful procedures. For example, the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation allowed 116 women to be sterilized through post-partum tubal ligations between 2006 and 2010; this violated federal law, which says prisoners cannot give informed consent during pregnancies, and state law, which does not permit California to pay for the sterilization of prisoners [10].
  - Pregnant women frequently labor and give birth in shackles, and receive little or no prenatal or postnatal care. The infant mortality rate among female prisoners is higher than the population at large.
  - Many women are placed on multiple psychotropic drugs at high doses with little counseling [18]. Some are also housed in security housing units or administrative segregation units, where they are confined from 22-24 hours without mental health care.
THE EFFECTS OF INCARCERATION ON CHILDREN, FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES
The U.S. emphasis on imprisonment has had disastrous consequences for women prisoners, their families, children, and communities.

• Over 60% of children live more than 100 miles away from their mother’s place of confinement. This makes visits for children and other family members very challenging, and makes intensive mothering impossible [2].
• The burden of childcare often falls on extended family, including grandparents (53%) or other relatives (26%) [2].
• When imprisoned women are unable to place children with family, those children are placed in foster care. Children of incarcerated mothers make up 7 to 13% of the foster care system [2].
• Under the Adoption and Safe Families Act (ASFA) of 1997, agencies are required to move to “permanency planning”—including termination of parental rights—when children are in foster care for 15 of the previous 22 months [2].
• Children of mothers in state prisons are likelier to be placed in the foster care system than children of incarcerated fathers (9.6% versus 1.8%), because women were the primary caretakers of the children [2].
• Prisoners cannot contribute to their families in terms of finances, time, or presence in their households [3]. They also cannot contribute positively to their communities.
• In the vast majority of states, prisoners cannot vote. In states like Florida, felons are banned from voting for life, affecting local, state, and even national election outcomes.
• Prisoners are counted in the census according to the location of the prison. They therefore raise populations for counties that house prisons. In communities where high numbers of people have been displaced, however, funding for institutions such as schools and hospitals decreases with the decrease in population.

TRANSSEXUAL, TRANSGENDER, GENDER NON-CONFORMING, AND GENDER VARIANT PRISONERS
• Transgender and transsexual people are generally assigned to facilities based on the gender listed on their birth certificate.
• Trans women are therefore housed in men’s institutions and are subjected to sexual harassment, assaults, and rape [7, 24].
• Although little is known about trans immigrants who are held in detention, one report indicates that transgender and gender variant undocumented individuals are deported at higher rates than other undocumented immigrants [7].
• Solitary confinement has been used as the primary way to protect transsexual women from violence in male institutions.
• For those who were on hormone therapy prior to prison, once in prison that therapy is frequently denied [7].
• A Philadelphia-based study showed that compared to the general prison population, transgender and gender variant prisoners spend more time in prison because they are denied parole due to factors such as inability to secure housing or jobs [7].
• Many transgender and gender variant prisoners are locked up for financial offenses, such as prostitution [7].

PRISON PROGRAMS: EDUCATION AND THE ARTS
Prisoners may obtain their G.E.D. and college education at some institutions—and also have access to programs like Alcoholics Anonymous—but other innovative education and arts programs have sprung up around the country. For example, the Prisoner Creative Arts Project (PCAP; http://www.lsa.umich.edu/english/pcap/) operates in women’s prisons in Michigan, and produces art created by incarcerated women. The innovative “Inside-Out Prison Exchange Program” (http://www.insideoutcenter.org/home.html) connects universities and prisons around the country by allowing undergraduate students to take a course with prisoners; both populations exchange information and read the same materials for a reciprocal learning experience. Writing workshops can also be found in women’s prisons, with an emphasis on individual growth and social analysis [24]. These programs are largely volunteer-run.

COMMUNITY RESPONSES TO WOMEN’S INCARCERATION
Many grassroots and nonprofit organizations are working to support women in prison and decrease rates of women’s incarceration. They run the gamut from reformists seeking to fix the system already in place to abolitionists seeking to dismantle the prison system, altogether in favor of community alternatives to incarceration. The following groups engage in prisoner support and/or abolition work:
• Incite! Women of Color Against Violence: http://www.incite-national.org/
  Supports anti-violence strategies and prison abolition
• Critical Resistance: http://www.criticalresistance.org/
  Supports prison abolition
• The Action Committee for Women in Prison: http://www.acwip.net/
  Engages in prisoner support work, including letter campaigns and help with resources
• The California Coalition for Women Prisoners: http://www.womenprisoners.org/
  Engages in prisoner support work, including parole support, help with resources, and is committed to de-carceration
  Addresses the effects of criminal justice policies on women and their families.
  Provides support for transgender and gender variant prisoners.
• Transformative Justice Law Project of Illinois: http://www.tjlp.org/
  Provides services for LGBT and gender non-conforming prisoners and is committed to prison abolition.
• Women's Prison Association (WPA): http://www.wpaonline.org/
  Provides re-entry services, residential and family services, and support while in prison

ADDITIONAL TEACHING AND COMMUNITY RESOURCES
• Sin By Silence, a film about women who kill their abusers: http://www.sinbysilence.com/
• Razor Wire Women, A Blog About Women, Prison, the Arts, and Activism: http://razorwirewomen.wordpress.com/
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SWS is Daliesque

by Martha Thompson
Professor Emeritus, Sociology and Women’s Studies, Northeastern Illinois University
Visiting Professor, Sociology, University of Illinois Chicago

I attended the 2012 SWS Winter meeting in St. Petersburg and stayed an extra day to visit the Dali Museum. Prior to visiting the Museum, I knew little about Dali and his work, other than some notion of surrealism, melting watches, and his mustache. During my visit to the Museum, I was captivated by the titles of his paintings as well as the scientific and artistic principles underlying his work. I visited the Museum immediately after the Winter meeting and, consequently, these two seemingly separate experiences have melded together for me. By playing off some of Dali’s absurdly titled paintings, I hope to convey why SWS is Daliesque.

Dali: “Eggs on the Plate Without the Plate”
SWS: Meeting in the Hotel Without the Hotel
Dali’s “Eggs” painting portrays his bliss when in the womb. Even though the meeting was held in an impersonal hotel, the atmosphere was open and welcoming for first timers to “old-timers” like myself who haven’t attended many meetings. Several structures were in place to create a safe place where people could meet and new ideas and relationships were birthed and celebrated: the SWS Hand Match, SWS sponsored lunch, and hosted dinners.

Prior to the meetings, through the SWS Hand Match program, old timers and first time attendees were matched. Yun Cho, a first-year graduate student at University of Wisconsin Madison, and I met each other through the Hand Match program. We emailed each other before the meeting and met up throughout the meeting. Yun says: “I benefitted from the SWS Hand Match as a first-timer at the SWS meeting.”

The SWS sponsored-lunch meant attendees did not have to look for a lunch spot nor eat alone. The round tables were large enough that I was able to sit at a table where others were already sitting and not feel like I was intruding. I was soon joined by Alaina Mathers, an undergraduate at Florida State University. I enjoyed meeting her and hearing about her ethnographic study of straight allies in a PFLAG chapter and her plans to attend graduate school.

The hosted dinner was another opportunity to nurture new relationships and ideas. An SWS member chose a restaurant and others signed up. Diane Kholos Wysocki, University of Nebraska at Kearney, hosted dinner and conversation for six at 400 Beach Street Seafood and Tap House.

(continued on back cover)

Another Hand Program success at the winter meetings, thanks to our senior volunteers!

On behalf of the Membership Committee, the Hand coordinators, and “junior” matches, we thank the “senior” matches for volunteering for the Hand program! The Hand Match co-coordinators, Miriam Sessions and Patti Giuffre, made over thirty “Hand Matches” for the winter meetings. We would like to acknowledge Hand program participants below.

The Hand program is named after the late Jeanne Hand, a sociology Ph.D. candidate from Tulane University and active SWS member. It connects newer SWS members to more established members to have coffee or a meal during meetings. If you find professional meetings to be intimidating experiences filled with unfamiliar faces, the Hand Program can make meetings more welcoming.

“Juniors”
Lauren Bell
Jennifer Brailsford
Chris Fowler
Melissa Gesbeck Howell
Justine Gunderson
Gloria Jones-Johnson
Kristin Kelly
Annette Nierobisz
Celene Reynolds
Alex Raphael

Nicole Rosen
Shannon Sabo
LaTonya Trotter
Zakiya Luna
Amber Deane

“Seniors”
Jade Aguilar
Chardie Baird
Sarah Jane Brubaker
Diane Everett
Liz Grauerholz
Michelle Jacobs
Anne Lincoln
Amanda Gengler
Vrushali Patil
Catherine Solomon
Andi Stepnick
Mary Virnoche
Margaret Vitullo
Irene Padavic
Barbara Risman
People’s…

MEDIA

Leta Hong Fincher’s research appeared in the New York Times and Salon.com in March.

Anne E. Lincoln’s research appeared in USA Today in March.

http://content.usatoday.com/communities/sciencefair/post/2012/03/women-scientists-shafted-on-research-prizes-matilda-effect/#.T2CzxhyLP58

Lisa Wade was the subject of a “Fifteen Questions With…” column in the Harvard Crimson in March.

HONORS

Shelia Cotten, Nikki Jones, Lisa Wade, Sara Goldrick-Rab, Louise Roth, and Gwen Sharp are among the SWSers on the WorldWideLearn.com list of “50 Sociology Professors You Should Be Following on Twitter.”

Julie Shayne, University of Washington-Bothell, will have her book They Used to Call Us Witches: Chilean Exiles, Culture, and Feminism (Lexington 2009) added to the holdings at the Museo de la Memoria y Los Derechos Humanos (Museum of Memory and Human Rights) in Santiago, Chile. https://rowman.com/ISBN/0739118501

Rebecca Bach has won the Southern Sociological Society’s Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award. This award not only recognizes outstanding classroom teaching, but is intended to honor individuals whose contributions go beyond their institutions to benefit the discipline as a whole.

Laura Kramer will participate, March 19-20 in Stuttgart, in the final conference of the European Commission supported project GENDERA: Gender Debate in the European Research Area. She will speak about the NSF ADVANCE Institutional Transformation program as part of a panel on “Maximising Innovation Potential Through Diversity in Research Organisation.” http://www.gendera.eu/

Heather Sullivan-Catlin (SUNY Potsdam) is 2012 President of the New York York State Sociological Association (NYSSA). See the ad in this issue about the 2012 NYSSA annual meeting.

JOBS & MOVES

Sarah Fenstermaker is the new Director of the Institute for Research on Women and Gender at the University of Michigan.

Katja M. Guenther is promoted to associate professor of sociology with tenure at the University of California, Riverside.

Kimberly Kay Hoang will be an assistant professor of sociology this Fall at Boston College.

Ophra Leyser-Whalen will be an assistant professor this Fall in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Texas El Paso.

The entire text is available for free online. Flat World Knowledge publishes open textbooks that go through the same peer review and editorial processes that traditional publishers use.

Varieties of Feminism: German Gender Politics in Global Perspective, 2012 by Myra Marx Ferree.

http://www.sup.org/book.cgi?id=12121

Varieties of Feminism investigates the development of German feminism by contrasting it with women’s movements that arise in countries, like the United States, committed to liberalism. With both conservative Christian and social democratic principles framing the feminist discourses and movement goals, which in turn shape public policy gains, Germany provides a tantalizing case study of gender politics done differently. The German feminist trajectory reflects new political opportunities created first by national reunification and later, by European Union integration, as well as by historically established assumptions about social justice, family values, and state responsibility for the common good. Tracing the opportunities, constraints, and conflicts generated by using class struggle as the framework for gender mobilization—juxtaposing this with the liberal tradition where gender and race are more typically framed as similar—Ferree reveals how German feminists developed strategies and (continued on next page)
movement priorities quite different from those in the United States.

http://www.amazon.com/Feminist-Measures-Research-Catherine-Harnois/dp/1412988357/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1331731096&sr=1-1

How can multiracial feminism inform social science survey research? What would it mean, in practical terms, to bring an “intersectional” approach to survey design and statistical analysis? How might such an approach change our understanding of the social world? **Feminist Measures in Survey Research** offers a new approach for bridging feminist theory and quantitative social science research. Catherine E. Harnois demonstrates how a multiracial feminist perspective can inform virtually every aspect of the research process, from survey design and statistical modeling to the frameworks used to interpret the results. Harnois argues for an interdisciplinary approach to social research, rooted in multiracial feminist theorizing. Such an approach, she suggests, enables a critical reexamination of the assumptions embedded in everyday research practices. It also provides a new and important framework for critiquing and producing quality survey research.

**The Social Dynamics of Family Violence**, 2012 by Angela Hattery and Earl Smith. 

This compelling new text explores family violence throughout the life course, with special attention to the social character and institutional causes of family violence. From child abuse and neglect to intimate partner violence and elder abuse, Hattery and Smith ask students to consider how social inequality, especially gender inequality, contributes to tensions and explosive tendencies in family settings. Students learn about individual preventive measures and are also invited to question the justice of our current social structure, with implications for social policy and reorganization. Hattery and Smith pepper the text with evocative case studies from their own research and illuminating stories published in mainstream media. Unique coverage of same-sex couples and multicultural couples, as well as of theory and methods, make this text an essential element of any course considering the sociology of family violence.

http://www.oup.com/us/catalog/general/subject/Sociology/SexGender/?view=usa&ci=9780199861989

The women’s movement and feminism has been responsible for profound changes in American society, from greater access to education and jobs to increased choices in health and parenting. Its ideas and goals have largely become a part of everyday beliefs and norms. At the same time, obituaries of the women’s movement appear regularly in the news and the current movement is criticized for being apolitical or ineffectual. In this sense, feminism today can be said to be at once “nowhere,” no longer visible, and “everywhere,” diffused into the culture.

Through an extended case study of three communities, Jo Reger explores this paradox with a systematic and empirically-based look at the contemporary women’s movement. She investigates some of the most debated topics about and between feminists in the 21st century, including the relationship of contemporary and second-wave generation feminists, the influence of identity politics on gender and sexuality, and the stubborn legacies of racism and classism. Where, with all these changes, is feminism today? The answers, she finds, are myriad and specific to each community. It is precisely the variations and convergences of feminist activism within particular communities, Reger reveals, that define the women’s movement today.

http://www.routledge.com/books/details/9780415593977/

The book engages with contemporary scholarship on citizenship and welfare, including feminist works that take seriously the production of gendered subjects. Analyzing the effects of family policies—a site often overlooked in studies of states—the book reveals the complex processes that go into the making of both state and society, as well as the consequences of a polity that balances neoliberal policies with a decidedly “moral” take on national development.

Using the case of Singapore, the book examines the production of a set of institutionalized relationships and ethical meanings that link citizens to each other and to the state. The Singapore government has put in place a number of policies to encourage marriage and boost fertility that has attracted much attention, and are often taken as evidence that the Singapore state is a social engineer. The book argues that these policies have largely failed to reverse demographic trends, and reveals that the effects of the policies are far more interesting and significant. As Singaporeans negotiate various rules and regulations, they form a set of ties to each other and to the state. These institutionalized relationships and shared meanings—referred to as neoliberal morality—render particular ideals about family and “the economy” natural.
St Pete Beneficiaries Say Thanks

Our auction in St. Pete benefited two local nonprofits. Here are their messages to SWS.

Community Action Stops Abuse

“Dear SWS:
Thank you for inviting Elyssa Broussard, CASA Peacemakers Program Coordinator, and me to your delightful banquet. It is good to know that even with the serious topics of the day, we know how to have fun!

We are very grateful for your support of CASA’s Peacemakers prevention program. It is sometimes hard to convince funders with scarce resources to think ahead of dramatic immediate needs to fund prevention programs that will create a new generation of Peacemakers. Success in creating this new generation will mean that in the future we may be able to say we have had a hand in reducing domestic violence because we have created the social change that needs to occur in our communities. We know that domestic violence at its root affects us all and is often the reason why we have drug and alcohol addictions, teen pregnancies, teen crime and incarceration.

It takes a whole community to stop domestic violence. By helping to fund CASA’s Peacemakers, you are part of the community that will create the social change we have been waiting for.

Thanks to all of you for caring enough to support Community Action Stops Abuse (CASA)!

Sincerely,
Linda A. Osmundson, Executive Director
www.casa-stpete.org
CASA
P.O. Box 414
St. Petersburg, FL 33731”

Women’s Organization for Medical Emergency Needs

“The Board of W.O.M.E.N. and the women and girls who benefit thank the Sociologists for Women in Society for their most generous donation and for honoring our organization. It gives each of us the strength to fight even harder for reproductive freedom and justice.

W.O.M.E.N., Women’s Organization For Medical Emergency Needs, began and still is a grassroots 501(c)3 nonprofit organization founded in 1990. Our mission then, as it is today, is to raise funds for low income women and girls who choose to terminate their pregnancies but who cannot afford to do so. We believe it is a simple matter of justice that all women are able to access reproductive freedom regardless of financial status.

We are online at http://fund abortionnow.org/funds/women; on Facebook by connecting with W.O.M.E.N. (period needed between letters) under non-profit organizations. Our email is womenforchoice73@yahoo.com and our twitter contact is womenforchoice. Our address for any correspondence or donations is P.O. Box 272565; Tampa, FL 33688.

Over the years we have helped thousands of women and girls for reasons as varied as the women themselves: abusive situations, incest and rape survivors, women who were terminally ill, substance abuse, no support system, too young, too many children, and too many families struggling in a poor economy.

Given today’s political environment, your honor and donation is so very, very meaningful. Through the clinics we work with your donation will help approximately fifteen women ease the financial burden. We thank you from the bottom of our hearts for this reaffirmation of the work we do.”
Routledge International Handbook of Race, Class and Gender invites chapter proposals for original essays that chronicle the history, impact, growth, and consequences of race, gender, and class studies from a multidisciplinary approach. Scholars in a variety of disciplines, including anthropology, health history, legal studies, political science, public health, social policy, sociology, and women’s and feminist studies, are encouraged to submit a proposal. The editor encourages theoretical or applied original works that provide conceptualizations and substantive overviews of the intersection of race, class, and gender; major contributions to the field; race, class, gender, nation and migration; race, class, gender, and sexualities; and contemporary trends in the intersection of race, class, and gender, including an exploration of how race, class and gender create social change globally. Submissions must be original works of 4500-5000 words, including references. Submissions should adhere to ASA Style. Deadline: September 1, 2012. Contact Shirley A. Jackson at jacksons1@southernct.edu.

Picture This Scene…

A ballroom overlooking the water, in St. Petersburg, FL. Much of our good work at the 2012 winter SWS meeting is complete. It is time to relax and enjoy ourselves at the Saturday night banquet.

Tracy Ore and Marybeth Stalp serve as the MCs for the banquet. Constantly trying to channel Carla Howery (the ultimate MC), Ore and Stalp attempt to balance the fun of the banquet (YAY for each of us and our individual accomplishments for the year!) with the need to “walk the talk” and convince their feminist colleagues to donate money to two local and very deserving organizations.

We had assistance in an Oracle—the magic 8 ball—when Stalp asked it, “Will we raise $5000 tonight?” the magic 8 ball affirmed it. The task was set—but, how to achieve it? How can Ore and Stalp convince their colleagues to part with $5000 for a worthy cause?

Ore and Stalp further channeled our most recently lost SWS members—April Brayfield, a known crafter, and Arlene Kaplan Daniels. To honor April, members brought especially innovative and crafty items for auction, including the ever popular “glam bands” handmade by Kristen Myers. To honor Arlene, we “passed the hat” as she was known to do. This, plus the channeling of Carla (taunting SWS members to cough up some dough), we did it. WE DID IT!

Thanks to all for making our jobs as MCs so enjoyable! :) And, thanks to Pat Martin for organizing a great meeting!

~Marybeth Stalp and Tracy Ore
Progress Report: Strategic Planning Taskforce

by Leslie Hossfeld, Taskforce Chair

The SWS Strategic Planning Taskforce came together for the first time in St. Petersburg in February. This is a working taskforce charged with addressing the mission statement, bylaws and long range planning for the organization.

There are 11 Taskforce members: Cynthia Anderson, Hara Bastas, Marlese Durr, Myra Marx Ferree, Mindy Fried, Kecia Johnson, Judith Lorber, Julia McQuillan, Barbara Risman, Zandria Robinson and Carrie Smith. Three working subcommittees focus on three critical areas: Review of the Mission Statement (Kecia Johnson Subcommittee Chair); Examination of Bylaws (Carrie Smith Subcommittee Chair); Long Range Planning (Cynthia Anderson Subcommittee Chair). Each subcommittee reports to the entire Taskforce members with recommendations that will be discussed by the entire Taskforce body. Once agreement has been made, the Taskforce makes recommendations to Council. Council will then discuss and make recommendations to the entire membership who will vote on the recommendations.

Over the course of the St. Petersburg conference, SWS members were encouraged to reach out to Taskforce members and to leave suggestions and provide feedback (through a suggestion box made available at registration) on concerns and key issues of the membership. SWS members are encouraged to continue providing feedback and suggestions to the Taskforce as we move through this process; membership input and participation in this process is vital to the success of this taskforce and our organization. Please email Leslie Hossfeld, Taskforce Chair at HossfeldL@uncw.edu if you have any questions, comments or concerns as we move ahead.

Below are Subcommittee Chair reports describing work conducted in St. Petersburg. Please feel free to contact subcommittee chairs at any time with questions, comments, and suggestions.

Bylaws Subcommittee: Report by Subcommittee Chair, Carrie Smith

The Bylaws Subcommittee has gone over the existing bylaws and updated it to reflect current practices. The Subcommittee has also compiled a list of current and past officers, as well as officers from other sociological associations, to interview. Interviews are currently taking place and we expect to have all interviews completed by the end of April/beginning of May. In interviewing officers, we solicit their feedback on organizational processes and structures and what they think worked well. In the next several months ahead, we plan to complete our interviews and compile a list of suggestions and feedback on organizational processes and structures related to the bylaws. We will also be sharing this information with the other Subcommittees. Our hope is that during the summer meeting in Denver, we can begin the process of drafting a new set of bylaws based on the data we have collected. Bylaws Subcommittee members are: Carrie Smith (Chair), Julia McQuillan and Barbara Risman.

Mission Statement Subcommittee: Report by Kecia Johnson, Subcommittee Chair

The goal of the Mission Statement Subcommittee is to develop a mission statement which reflects the current focus of SWS. Based upon member comments provided during the Summer (August 2011) and Winter (February 2012) meetings, our task is to write a mission statement that specifies the purpose of the organization and incorporates member suggestions. We have planned for the mission statement webpage to include an interactive feature that allows readers to select key words contained within the mission statement. These key words will be linked to other pages of the SWS website where more information on the respective topic of interest can be found. In the coming weeks, please look for the SWS Tagline Contest that will be posted to the list serve. To participate in the contest, members must submit a one sentence “catch phrase” they feel best describes the mission of SWS. We look forward to receiving your submissions. Mission Statement Subcommittee members: Kecia Johnson, chair, Judith Lorber, Hara Bastas.

Long Range Planning Subcommittee: Report: Cindy Anderson, Subcommittee Chair

The Long Range Planning Subcommittee held its kickoff in St. Petersburg on February 5. Members include Mindy Fried, Myra Marx Ferree, and Cindy Anderson. Our subcommittee is charged with “visioning” the future of SWS. We discussed key issues such the challenges and rewards of being a feminist organization, what brings people to SWS, what SWS offers people, how SWS takes care of its self, and more. We agreed on the need to involve the membership in the collective process of visioning. We welcome your suggestions, advice, complaints, and encouragement. Everyone is welcome to contact Cindy Anderson, Subcommittee chair, at andersc2@ohio.edu. Look for big things from us!
(Dali’sque continued from page 31)

Dali: “Gala Contemplating the Mediterranean Sea which at Twenty Meters Becomes the Portrait of Abraham Lincoln”

*SWS Contemplates Women in Society which at Any Meter Becomes the Portrait of Society*

When standing close to this painting, one sees Gala (Dali’s spouse) gazing at the Mediterranean Sea. Standing 20 meters back from the painting, an observer sees Abraham Lincoln’s head. The idea that things look different close up than they do far away or that one’s standpoint affects what one sees is an integral principle of feminist sociology and could be experienced everywhere at the Winter meeting, for instance:

- The plenary panel on “ADVANCE” addressed the participation and advancement of individual women in academic science and engineering careers and institutional transformation.
- In the workshop on “Feminist Issues and Strategies from Career Development Through Creative Retirement,” women reflected on their careers from different vantage points.
- The plenary panel “Mentoring Across Color Lines” examined the individual rewards and costs of mentoring across color lines and institutional supports and barriers.

**Dali: The Hallucinogenic Toreador**

*SWS: The Mind-Expanding Activist*

Another of Dali’s double image paintings, the Hallucinogenic Toreador contains repeated images of Venus de Milo inside a bullring with the face of a toreador hidden within. For me, the embedded bullfighter is transformed into feminist activism which is at the heart of Sociologists for Women in Society. Throughout the meeting, participants and presenters addressed what feminist sociology means for women in society and how to convey our message for maximum impact. For instance,

- The panel “Human Rights and the Women’s Treaty: Why We Should Care, What We Can Do”
- The panel “How Sociologists Can Create an Online Presence, Learn to Use Twitter, and Blog Their Way to a Bigger Part of the Global Discussion”
- The plenary by Stephanie Coontz, Council on Contemporary Families, “The Perils and Promise of Going Public”

From a safe haven for generating visionary ideas and actions to the principles of complex realities and illusions to a blend of scientific thinking and feminist paradigms, SWS is Daliesque.