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A NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

In this issue of Social Problems Forum, we have the second installment of a new feature to provide analysis and debate on various social problems. “Convergences and Divergences: Points of View on Social Problems” presents four essays that summarize and analyze facts, issues, policies, and opinions regarding a current social problem. The problem examined in this issue is poverty and inequality. My thanks go to Keith Kilty, who coordinated this feature and co-authored an essay. Many thanks also go to the other authors of the essays in this feature: Alfred Louis Joseph, Lisa Raiz, Elizabeth A. Segal, Dominico Parisi, Stephen Michael Grice, and Michael Taquino. I would be happy to consider suggestions for topics and volunteers for coordinators and essay authors for our new feature.

We are also fortunate to have reviews of two books and one film. Lora Lempert reviews Leslie McCall’s Complex Inequalities; Stella Capek reviews Sylvia Noble Tesh’s Uncertain Hazards; and Lisa Anne Zilney reviews the film A Sentence of Their Own. My thanks to the reviewers for their fine contributions.

I continue to welcome contributions from you in the form of essays, reviews or letters to the editor.

Stephen R. Couch, Editor
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Article VI. Section 10. Membership Committee
That Article VI, Section 10, be amended to read as follows: The Membership Committee shall consist of a Chairperson, a Chairperson-elect, and nine members selected from five regional areas... The Chair-elect and regional Committee members shall be appointed by the President-Elect in consultation with the Committee on Committees and appointed by the Board of Directors to serve three year terms, with three new members being appointed each year...

Rationale: Broaden recruitment activities and range of contacts.

Article VI. Section 1. Special Problems Divisions
Add this sentence to end of second paragraph: “Division Chairpersons are expected to provide an annual report of the activities of their divisions, via electronic correspondence or other means, to the Executive Office.”

Rationale: Adds a bylaws statement to formalize existing practice and to insure communication.

Article VI. Section 5. Budget, Finance, and Audit Committee
Delete reference to “Investment Advisor.”

Rationale: Committee members have assumed this responsibility
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FROM THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE
TOM HOOD

"JUSTICE AND THE SOCIAL IMAGINATION: Theory, Research, Teaching, Practice and Action." This appealing theme has produced 98 sessions for the Atlanta meetings, August 15-17, 2003. Our President Nancy Jurik will address us on the topic, "Imagining Justice: Challenging the Privatization of Public Life." In addition to a wealth of interesting sessions our members will have an opportunity to perform songs and poetry on Friday evening. Later that evening you’ll be able to attend the 3rd Annual AIDS fundraiser with music by Afroblue. We’ll also have an auction on Friday evening; all of the proceeds of these events go to Jerusalem House. This organization provides homes and supportive services for people living with AIDS who would otherwise be homeless in Atlanta. More details on these activities appear on page 4 of the preliminary program which should be in your hands now and is available on the web site –http://www.sssp1.org. (The web site has been updated. Please let us know if you like the new look and can navigate through all of the information available.)

CONGRATULATIONS to our new officers and elected committee members whose names appear elsewhere in this issue. We are extremely grateful to all of the individuals who allowed their names to be put before our membership. As usual, the nominating committee, composed of the Council of Special Problems Division Chairs, did a great job in selecting candidates. Please thank those that you know whose names were on the ballot. Please support all those who were elected when they ask you to do something to support the work of SSSP. A special thanks goes to each member who took the time to vote in the election.

Elsewhere in this issue you’ll find the authors and titles of the 2002 C. Wright Mills Award finalists. This list of seven books provides a range of contributions from young scholars to established ones. We hope you’ll come to the banquet to learn who receives the award. All of these books will be on special display in the book exhibit at the annual meeting.

This year in Atlanta we’ll be remembering the recent deaths of two past presidents who were stalwarts in their careers as sociologists and in their lives as citizen-scholars. Beth B. Hess and Helena Znaniecki Lopata will be remembered for their vibrant personalities and many contributions as both scholars and as citizens.

Have you considered becoming a Life Member of the Society? The Budget, Finance and Audit Committee has calculated that Life Memberships are a money saving option for those people who plan to be members of the society for more than ten years. This is a way to show your commitment to the purposes of the organization by making an investment. As I write this column we have just finished preparing for the planning meeting of the Budget, Finance and Audit Committee. If you have not yet renewed your membership for 2003, please do so since this is the last newsletter you will receive, unless you renew. Each year we gain many new members, we’d like to encourage you to continue your membership.

This is the busy time of year at the Executive Office. We are delighted to have had the help of Nancy Brannon, our strong Graduate Assistant. Nancy will begin the second year of her doctoral program at the University of Tennessee and we will continue to profit from her assistance through next year. She is preparing for comprehensives in September so be sure to give her good study and writing tips. Michele Koontz continues to serve in her capacities as Administrative Officer and Meeting Manager. As always we are delighted with her excellent attention to detail and her faithful service to the members of the Society. Be sure to say hello and thank Michele at the annual meeting. She continues to keep the Society running smoothly.

Tom Hood, Executive Officer

Call for Papers
Special Section of SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Going Public: Scholarship in Pursuit of Social Justice

Social Problems is soliciting manuscripts for a special section of a forthcoming issue devoted to "taking scholarship into the public realm." Papers for this symposium should deal with the challenges, problems, and politics of entering social scientific research and commentary into public debates. The focus is on the activity of bringing social science to bear on critical issues of social justice. Submissions may be either 1) empirically grounded observations of the practice of public scholarship that have theoretical, practical, political, or policy implications, or 2) theoretical or polemical commentaries concerning public scholarship that have clear foundations in, or implications for, empirical research. Papers should be 10-20 manuscript pages (3,000-6,000 words). All submissions will be subject to peer review, using standards appropriate to the topic and forum. Submissions will be considered until September 1, 2003, or until the section is filled.

Send manuscripts to Social Problems, Social & Cultural Sciences, Lahlumiere Hall 340, Marquette University, 526 N. 14th St., P.O. Box 1881, Milwaukee, WI 53201-1881.
Helena Beatrice Znaniecki Lopata

We all lost a good friend and colleague when Helena Lopata passed away on February 12, 2003. She was a lively and invigorating presence at the many conferences and gatherings she attended over the course of her long and distinguished career and will be remembered as a woman who was always interested in others’ work and ideas, as well as a person who actually practiced the support network processes she also wrote about. For many of us she was a personal friend who will be deeply missed.

Helena struggled with issues most of us are spared, and her enormous success as a scholar and a person can be measured against those struggles. She was a teenage immigrant who fled with her family from the Nazi invasion of Poland, the daughter of an internationally renowned sociologist, a suburban housewife with a Chicago PhD. She was driven by a profound desire to achieve although at first was unsure of the proper routes to take. She was filled with both self-doubt and courage, the various configurations of which she showed in different ways at different times and places. While the self-doubt plagued her, less so I think in her later years, her courage won the day and Helena established herself firmly as a leading American sociologist in her own right.

Helena received her undergraduate degrees from the University of Illinois in 1946 and her PhD in Sociology from the University of Chicago in 1954. Her first academic appointment came in 1965 at Roosevelt University. In 1969 she was appointed Professor of Sociology at Loyola University of Chicago, where she achieved the prestigious position of Senior Professor in 1997. She published over a dozen books and 100 articles on many topics pertaining to gender, aging and adulthood, ethnicity, family, the intelligencia, and generically, social roles and support systems. She was central to the governance and organization of many scholarly societies, serving, for instance, as Presidents of the Midwest Sociological Society, Sociologists for Women in Society, Society for the Study of Social Problems, Midwest Council for Social Research on Aging, and the Illinois Sociological Society. She held numerous offices ranging from committee memberships to vice-presidencies to Presidencies in two dozen professional societies and organizations ranging from the local to international. In recognition of her scholarly and civic contributions, she was the recipient of both the Mead and Feminist Mentoring Awards from the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction, the Distinguished Scholar Award from Society for the Study of Social Problems, the Meiczyszlaw Haiman Award from the Polish American Historical Association, and the Bronislaw Malinowski Award from the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America. She received an Honorary Doctorate of Sciences from the University of Guelph.

Those are some of the highlights of Helena’s remarkably productive professional and public life. She accomplished this during her fifty year marriage to Richard Lopata, with whom she reared two children, Teddy and Stef, who blessed them with several grandchildren. I recall well the delight Helena took in those grandchildren during the ceremonies marking her retirement from Loyola some years ago. But in many ways, Helena preferred to keep her private life private. In the early 1980s, I published a short essay on Helena’s life history, and while she was pleased and approved of it, she said that I got “too close.” So I will not get too close here, except to say that a treasure Helena was for so many of us. The meaning of her loss is experienced in our memories, which for me go back nearly 35 years, and for others far longer. For myself, her many graduates and undergraduate students, and all the many scholars in numerous countries who have benefited from her scholarly contributions, she will remain an enduring part of the sociological landscape. We all really liked Helena a lot and we miss her.

David Maines, Oakland University

Beth B. Hess

Tragically, Beth B. Hess died at her home in Mt. Hope, New Jersey, on April 17, of a brain tumor. Beth was an accomplished feminist sociologist and gerontologist whose leadership, scholarship, service, and mentoring will be remembered by many.

Beth Bowman Hess was born in Buffalo, N.Y. She graduated from Radcliffe College with a B.A. in Government in 1950 and received her Ph.D. in Sociology from Rutgers University in 1971. She was Professor of Sociology at the County College of Morris from 1969 to 1997. While she had no illusions about the status of this position in the elitist hierarchy of academia, she valued her students and the opportunities to combine her teaching with her family life.


It was always Beth’s style to enlist co-authors and co-editors into her many writing projects, and to work with her was to learn more about sociology and more about effective writing. Beth had no patience with obfuscation and pretension, whether in person or in prose. For her, good writing was a political act: it raised consciousness, made connections between issues, and illuminated
the relation between individual life stories and public policies. She was a pioneer in integrating gender into the analysis of aging, and her introductory sociology textbook broke new ground in bringing race, gender, and class out of the ghetto of separate chapters into the overall analysis of all dimensions of society.


The list of honors does not begin to capture the full scope of her contributions to many sociological organizations. She labored in the unsung vineyards of associational maintenance for decades, taking on the Executive Office role at the Eastern Sociological Society in a time of crisis and steering it through, putting her home and her good judgment into the service of Sociologists for Women in Society to plan the launching of Gender & Society and selecting its first editor, and helping many organizations to face their fiscal and structural issues more constructively.

Beth also served as editor and member of the editorial boards of Society/Transaction, Research on Aging, Contemporary Sociology, Gerontology Review, Teaching Sociology, American Sociologist, and Gender & Society. But her editing and reviewing was never limited to such gate-keeping roles. She gave generously of her time and red pencil to help both junior and senior colleagues to sharpen their arguments and get their dissertations and papers finished promptly and with style. At annual meetings of all the many associations to which she belonged, Beth reached out to graduate students and junior faculty and encouraged them to send their drafts to review. Her rewrites were not only tighter and more elegant, but she challenged all the weak spots of an argument. She believed that sociology had something worth saying to the world and cared deeply about getting it said effectively, no matter whose name was on the manuscript in the end. The saying that a person could accomplish great things if one did not care who got the credit was her motto (along with the realistic warning to junior scholars that the reward for service is more service).

Beth's research and writing reflected a broad-based and humanistic perspective, with an emphasis on contemporary social problems. As she presented her work, we sociologists and thousands of undergraduates who have used her books in their courses have been led to see that these social problems are not those of the elderly, women, and wives, but of the social order that marginalized, exploited, and diminished them. She was a feminist who was committed to thinking about gender as a social construction, a relationship of power, and a structural factor with massive material consequences, and she was a humanist who celebrated the effective agency and life-long potential for change in every individual.

Beth's husband, Richard Hess, died on December 25, 1986. She is survived by her mother, Yetta Bowman, her son, Larry, her daughter and son-in-law, Emily and Gary Robinson, and three grandchildren.

We had the privilege of working with Beth and we will miss deeply her insights, energy, friendship, cooperation, and support.

Myra Marx Ferree, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Susan Farrell, Kingsborough Community College, City University of New York; Judith Lorber, Brooklyn College and Graduate School, City University of New York (Emerita); Elizabeth Markson, Boston University; Peter Stein, William Paterson University

In addition to being a great scholar, teacher, and professional leader, Beth Hess was one of the kindest and most generous mentors I have known. She treated everyone with full respect, regardless of their professional status. I could offer multiple examples, but will stick to my first encounter with Beth. As a very young graduate student out on my first foray into the ASA Meetings maze, Beth rescued me from loneliness and anonymity. She approached a few of us lost-looking students at the SWS "Meeting and Greeting" Room, and with no agenda other than enthusiasm, proceeded to "adopt" us for the course of the meetings. She showed interest in our work, introduced us to well-known scholars and other students alike, and steered us to the receptions with the best free food. Not only that, she remembered me with a huge smile the next year, and the next. She taught me that feminist sociologists share access and privilege, as well as research agendas.

Beth also taught me that it was possible to dedicate oneself to a predominantly teaching institution and still stay professionally vibrant. And, I would add, to "have a life" and still keep laughing. Merton may have coined the term "role model," but Beth Hess embodied it. The best tribute to her is to carry it on.

Dr. Karen Hossfeld, Chairperson, Sociology Department, San Francisco State University
2003 CALL FOR RESOLUTIONS FROM THE MEMBERSHIP

Should the SSSP express a position on affirmative action? If so, what should it be?
Did SSSP members favor the actions of the State of Illinois with regard to the death penalty?
As an association of scholar-activists, is the SSSP capable of speaking to pressing social problems?

SSSP resolutions constitute an important opportunity for our scholar-activist membership to publicly declare their sentiments, thereby creating a channel for greater visibility and more direct influence upon a variety of "publics," i.e., fellow activists, scholars, students, decision-makers, social action groups, voters, and others. Recent President Bob Perrucci has called upon the association to work in a more dedicated fashion in ensuring that we are making the greatest possible impact upon the larger public. While previous resolutions were heard and made a social impact, consideration is continually being given to improving the resolution-making process. For example, working in tandem with the press can maximize our impact as scholar activists. At our annual meetings, a more participatory sequence in the construction and refinement of resolutions can encourage greater political discussion among members. To encourage this forward motion, a few changes have been made for 2003 in the resolution-making and adoption process.

SSSP Division Chairs were recently asked to solicit resolutions that deal with substantive issues relevant to their Division focus. Since SSSP Divisions form the core of the Society's specialized focus upon specific social problems areas, they constitute a key resource for increasing the SSSP's public impact and should serve as the primary source for generating meaningful and action-oriented resolutions. When circulating among special division members, proposed resolutions can serve as useful discussion points for SSSP members, helping to increase and enhance communication and activities during the long period between annual meetings. Resolutions that are submitted to Division Chairs should contain a concise position statement concerning a social problem of urgent concern to the Division. In most cases, the resolution should include some sort of call for viable action on the part of the SSSP. This typically has involved a letter from the Board directed to some public entity, expressing concern, support, or protest. Feel free, however, to propose other forms of appropriate action.

It is the SSSP Vice-President's responsibility to serve as the facilitator for resolutions being sponsored from the Divisions as well as from individual Society members, making them available to the membership at the annual business meeting. This year in Atlanta, the resolutions process will be organized in a manner which promotes wider discussion prior to formal consideration at the 2003 Business Meeting:

- On the first day of the meetings, an open forum of discussion will be held which is designed to encourage a political discussion of concerned members. This year, each proposed resolution should be presented for membership discussion by the sponsoring Division's Chairperson (or designated representative) and adequate time for discussion will be properly allotted to each. To facilitate this process, all proposed resolutions should be made available to the SSSP vice-president well in advance of the meetings such that the membership can be provided a print copy with their registration packet.

- Modifications and revisions will be considered during the open discussion forum that will meet in place of the annual meeting of the Resolutions Committee. All Division Chairs should plan to participate in this session or designate a proxy from their division if unable to attend. It is essential that someone be present who can speak to the substance of the proposed resolution.

- During the 2003 Annual Business meeting, the resolutions will be presented (including any modifications or revisions) by the Vice-President as a package for approval for action by the attending membership. The membership will vote on proposed resolutions which were discussed and revised on the first day of the meeting. Experience shows that the Annual Business meeting fails to provide sufficient time for a detailed discussion of resolutions. If objections from the floor are raised to any specific resolution at this year's Business meeting, that resolution can, by majority vote of those present, be singled out from the package, and voted on separately. Those present can either support the resolution for approval as proposed or decide to table the resolution for further discussion at the subsequent year's annual meeting.

- This year, we will attempt to make approved resolutions immediately available to the press. In addition, all approved resolutions will be submitted for publication in the Fall issue of Social Problems Forum: The SSSP Newsletter.

Members who wish to propose resolutions for consideration of the SSSP should submit them to a Division Chairperson (see http://it.utk.edu/sssp/ for current contact information) or directly to the SSSP Vice-President at rdelob@dom.edu. Together, these new measures form a working strategy for enhancing the resolution-making process. Our commitment to pursuing social justice through scholarship calls upon us to work in a more dedicated fashion to ensure that we are making the greatest possible impact upon the larger public. Encouraging membership-sponsored resolutions is one important way to make our collective voice heard! We look forward to receiving your proposed resolutions.

Richard A. Dello Buono, SSSP Vice-President 2002-2003
SUGGESTIONS FOR THE SUBMISSION OF PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS:

Here are some suggestions that may help enhance resolutions submitted for consideration by the Society:

- **Local awareness**: A resolution which addresses an issue of urgent concern for the city or region where the annual meeting is taking place is highly desirable. Thus, a more general or globally-oriented resolution can be strengthened if it makes the extra effort to cite any local aspect or manifestation of the problem which can help dovetail with the larger concern. Clearly, matters of local concern are more likely to be of interest to the local media.

- **Urgency**: Resolutions that embody some urgent or timely matter involving some current manifestation of a larger social problem are highly desirable. This can relate, for example, to pending legislation, policies and programs, a recently released report, and so on. Resolutions that address urgent matters are much more likely to be picked up by the press.

- **Action-oriented**: All resolutions should attempt to incorporate a call for action, be it on the part of the SSSP Board, or for concerned individuals. If action is requested on the part of the SSSP, it should be as specific as possible, e.g., to whom should a letter be directed, etc. In the past, other proposed actions have included calls for boycotts, participation in public demonstrations, collecting donations, and so on.

- **Resource pointer**: A resolution which is accompanied by a specific resource or resource list is extremely useful for those who wish to learn more about the issue at hand. The resource supplement can be a specific document or scholarly paper, website(s), or some other useful repository of information. This can be very helpful in increasing the impact of the resolution by assisting teachers, students, the press and others who wish to have further background information in engaging the issue for their own specific purposes.

ATTENTION: MEETING PARTICIPANTS, STUDENTS, AND NEW MEMBERS:

Never been to a SSSP meeting before? No worries! Last year at the meetings, we offered a mentoring program for new members and graduate students and it was met with much success. I am sure you know the scenario: sometimes you’ll meet someone at the meetings and wind up learning the ropes from them, but sometimes this can be awkward and difficult. Tempting as that awkwardness is, why not just get that out of the way and sign up for a meeting mentor? This person will help you find your way and introduce you to people they know. You won’t be attached to them all weekend, they will just serve as a connector for the meetings. They are your very own “in” to the meetings!

If you are a meeting veteran, would you be willing to help a graduate student or new faculty member out at the meetings as a mentor? Remember those awkward days when you were trying to meet people? Sure, we all go to the meetings to catch up with old friends and chat and work. This will just add a fresh perspective to some of those conversations, having a lunch with someone new, and showing off all your spectacular contacts and friends. Whether you are a faculty member or a grad student, you always have something to offer to someone new!

Whether you are an old hand or a newcomer (however you want to define that), please email your contact information (name, affiliation, address, email, and interest areas) before July 1 to either Erin Robinson (ecer1@acsu.buffalo.edu) or Michele Koontz (mkoontz3@utk.edu). Please indicate whether you’re a newcomer or a returning SSSP member. See you in Atlanta!

Lora Bex Lempert,
University of Michigan - Dearborn

Identity-based theories and politics have long celebrated strength, community, and intellectual advance for people of color, non-heterosexuals, and others, but, as Kimberle’ Crenshaw (1995:357) has argued, “The problem with identity politics is not that it fails to transcend difference, as some critics charge, but rather the opposite – that it frequently conflates or ignores intra group differences...Feminist efforts to politicize experiences of women and antiracist efforts to politicize experiences of people of color have frequently proceeded as though the issues and experiences they each detail occur on mutually exclusive terrains.” Instead of bifurcated models, Crenshaw (1995:358) offered the concept of “intersectionality” to denote the various ways in which race and gender interact to shape the multiple dimensions of black women’s experiences. Through use and adaptation the concept has evolved to reflect the multiple social locations we each inhabit and the consequent individual, interactive, and cumulative effects of each location on life fortunes and opportunities. Despite the theoretical richness of intersectionality, with its complex potential to complicate current understandings of processes of racial, class, and gender stratification, intersectionality has not really been quarried by either quantitative or qualitative researchers, until Leslie McCall.

McCall’s significant contribution is in identifying the distinct patterns of inequality associated with specific economic conditions in regional labor markets, that is, with the social outcomes of different economic environments and scenarios. She names these socioeconomic patterns “configurations of inequality,” and identifies the ways that race, class, and gender intersect in various permutations depending on the underlying conditions in local economies. McCall then uses configurations of inequality to frame the considerable degree of contextual variation across regional labor markets.

She conceptualizes inequality as an outcome of both economic restructuring and gender and racial divisions of labor and she provides a systematic macroanalysis that identifies both similarities and differences in types of inequality. Her spatial examination of inequality is based on a macro quantitative analysis of over 500 regional labor markets as well as on case studies of particular markets, i.e., industrial Detroit, postindustrial Dallas, high technology St. Louis, and immigrant rich Miami. The spatial unevenness of inequality and its mostly nonrandom appearance serve as the pivotal frame for her analytic questions: What are the causes of inequality? Do gender, class, and racial inequality follow similar or radically different patterns? Are the underlying causes of economic inequality the same for gender, race, and class? (Other forms of inequality are not considered.)

As a unifying concept, configurations of inequality, defines economic conditions associated with unique combinations of gender, race, and class inequality as they are reflected in wage inequalities. McCall argues persuasively that the same economic conditions do not necessarily lead to the same consequences for all forms of inequality, and therefore each form of inequality must be understood on its own and in relation to other forms. For example, she contends throughout that “gender cannot be understood simplistically as an uncontentious, independent category of individual and group identity -- gender relations are embedded in racial and class relations, just as much as racial and class relations are mediated by gender” (p.13). Gender and race and class must be read contextually in relation to larger structures of inequality.

Organized in seven chapters the text begins with an analysis of the underlying premises about the causes and structure of wage inequality. In the Introduction McCall presents her theoretical arguments, methodology, and rationale for research decisions. Chapter 2 particularizes configurations of inequality in four ideal type case studies: Dallas, Detroit, Miami, and St. Louis. The complex, complicated trajectories and outcomes for Dallas and Detroit are the subject
of in-depth comparison in Chapter 3. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 each discuss a particular dimension of inequality. Chapter 4 focuses on the impact of economic restructuring on occupational gender segregation and the gender wage gap; Chapter 5 on the gender wage gap for college and non-college educated women; and Chapter 6 on college/non-college wage gap for men and women. The concluding chapter reviews the history and politics of economic inequality and argues for broad redistributive economic policies to alter the underlying structure of the economy. All chapters have accessible charts, graphs, and tables with extensive explanatory narratives in text for the statistically unsophisticated.

A particular strength of the text is the challenge to the conventional link between occupational gender segregation and the gender wage gap. McCall demonstrates that the trajectories and causes of the two are not the same in different regions across the U.S. She documents several routes to gender wage inequality by establishing that conditions that foster equality for some groups of women can also disadvantage others thus moving the discourse beyond comparisons of male/female wage inequities to intra-gender inequalities, e.g., gender inequalities by class and class inequalities among women. Because economic inequality among women has always been "eclipsed" by the greater concern for inequality among men and gender wage inequality, McCall addresses this empirical gap in her case studies. For example, Detroit -- an industrial city with high unemployment and strong wage-setting institutions -- and Dallas -- a city with low unemployment, sustained service growth, and concentrated postindustrial employment -- are discussed as polar opposite mirror reflections of one another. Both gender wage inequality and female wage inequality are above the national average in Detroit and above the levels in Dallas. "This is mainly because Detroit's brand of unionism was never egalitarian and encompassing enough to lift the wages of non-college-educated women workers. Gender therefore turns out to be the primary marker of inequality in the Detroit economy, whereas class becomes the primary marker in the Dallas economy" (p.65). The level of male inequality in Detroit is substantially below that of Dallas or of the nation as a whole.

The average gender wage gap, the most commonly used measure of women's economic status, is frequently recognized as a fair indicator of the status of all women, not just the average woman (p.120). McCall disputes this contention and claims that the overwhelming focus on the gender wage gap is inadequate and frequently misleading. Economic restructuring varies in implications for the gender wage gap between men and women in different social classes, is unevenly distributed among different groups of workers, and masks low levels of difference in some groups and high levels in other. Further, class inequalities are increasing among women, as stratification among women is becoming an increasingly important aspect of women's economic status. As more women are being supervised by women, the relations of authority in the workplace are becoming a central feature of many women's work experience. Since anti-gender discrimination policies tend to focus on gender equity in access to jobs, rather than on wages and conditions at the bottom of the economic ladder, they may be a more effective remediation strategy for highly educated women than for women at the lower end of the labor market continuum. Such advantage may well lead to wage polarization among/between women. In depressed local economies with lower wages for both men and women, gender based remediation strategies -- comparable worth and/or affirmative action -- might be ineffective. McCall argues that a more cogent policy solution would be to shore up the bottom half of the wage structure for both men and women.

Complex Inequality offers a nuanced and expanded discussion of the politics of inequality. My only critique of the text is also paradoxically one of its strengths, that is, the text focuses too centrally on gender inequality. Although gender is intersected with race and class, neither race nor class is centered in the analysis. Race and class intersect with gender, but gender doesn't intersect race or class at the same level of attention. This results in a subtly detailed consideration of gender economic inequality, but a less Complex Inequality with regard to race and class.

References

Stella M. Čapek
Hendrix College

Uncertain Hazards by Sylvia Noble Tesh raises an important and provocative question: what should we do when democracy and science clash? More specifically, whom should we believe when local residents are convinced that their health problems have an environmental cause while the studies of experts can find little or no support for this claim? Sidestepping the dilemma of agreeing with one or the other, Tesh suggests what she calls a third position: that “science and democracy are in the same camp.” Since science is socially constructed, it is influenced by cultural change, including an environmental movement whose key ideas are slowly reshaping the ideas and practices of science. Tesh claims that although environmentalist ideas are relatively new in modern societies, “as they come to be taken for granted, science will change, and is changing, to reflect them.” This is a book, then, that explores how social movements influence societies, draws attention to new interpretive frames that are created and diffused by the U.S. environmental movement, and offers an optimistic reading of the constructed nature of science.

Tesh’s book rests on a qualitative research base, including interviews with environmental activists from three different groups: “mainstream groups” (such as the Sierra Club who have traditionally been concerned with protecting natural resources), grassroots groups (local groups of citizens who mobilize to fight environmental health hazards), and the more recent phenomenon of “grassroots support groups” (groups such as the Southwest Network for Economic and Environmental Justice, or the Center for Health and Environmental Justice, who exist in order to provide resources to grassroots groups). She makes it clear that she is also interested in a broad range of social actors who may not be aligned with the environmental movement or social movement organizations, but who have played an important role in making the ideas of the environmental movement available to the public. These may include the scientist doing paradigm-challenging work on endocrine disruptors, the journalist reporting on environmental issues, the government official or congressional staffer who creates visibility for environmental problems and solutions, and the person who recycles in her or his local community. Such activities help to “fortify the principles of the environmental movement,” and play a significant role in social change. Tesh is critical of social movement theories that focus excessively on social movement organizations and neglect broader cultural processes of change.

The author’s argument is clearly presented in each of her chapters. The book opens with case studies of three communities where activism resulted in seeming scientific validation of the illness-toxicity connection: Guilford, Connecticut; Alsea, Oregon, and Love Canal. These cases involved, respectively, power lines and electromagnetic fields, herbicides sprayed by the Forest Service, and the now infamous landfill at Love Canal. Yet, Tesh points out, the scientific studies of places like these do not offer unequivocal answers. She goes on to ask why scientific studies so often do not support grassroots groups’ claims regarding health effects. Her chapter on environmental health research looks in detail at the risk assessment model used by toxicologists and its various shortcomings. Tesh concludes that although scientific “tools” such as risk assessment are presently flawed, they can be rendered more sensitive and used in new ways as a result of the influence of environmentalists’ ideas on science. The third chapter explores these “new ideas about nature” that the author dates back to the 1960s environmental movement: an ecological principle that cautions against human interference with the balance of nature, an ethical principle that argues for the rights of nature, and a political principle that advocates value change and institutional protections for nature. Tesh bases much of the premise of her book on the argument that this new environmental “frame” and its acceptance by the general public is altering the practice of science in a more democratic direction, including the ability to “more easily be able to correlate a community’s exposure to pollution with health problems.”

For this reader, Chapter Four on “environmentalist science” is one of the most interesting in the book. Here the author presumes evidence for changing practices in science that are more consistent with an environmentalist frame. These include the broadening of the risk assessment model beyond a focus on cancer, the emerging scientific interest in identifying “especially sensitive populations” such as children and racial minorities, the “use of biomarker research to expand the definition of disease beyond clinical illness,” and the emergence of an argument for lowering validity standards so that more studies could attain statistical significance. Activists suffering health impacts in contaminated communities have long argued that existing models of scientific investigation are “inconclusive by design.” The above-mentioned changes alter the design of the studies and invite a reassessment of some standard notions of scientific proof. Tesh suggests that “the lack of corroboration of grassroots activists’ claims may be an artifact of the slow incorporation of environmentalism into science rather than a statement about the actual effect of pollution on health.”
The remaining chapters include some interesting discussions of the literature on risk perception and communication, as well as identity politics and the place of “experiential knowledge” in social movements and scientific inquiry. Tesh attributes a great deal of influence to environmentalist ideas that have, she claims, become commonsense knowledge—so much so that she argues that “what activists take to be their experiential knowledge about environmental toxins does not come directly from their personal experience but is filtered through the teachings of the environmental movement.” This is a particularly interesting point in regard to the democratization of science; the author’s book appears, on one hand, to validate the experience of ordinary citizens, but on the other to dismiss its substance, which she sees as unconsciously shaped by the frames of the environmental movement. This leads to a certain kind of tension in the book. One wonders about the implications of this position for interpreting various indigenous knowledges, for example, particularly those that embraced ecological principles long before the “environmentalist” values that Tesh dates to the 1960s.

From a critical point of view, one could also say that Tesh’s book, while offering compelling evidence of change taking place in the practice of science, slides over questions of power and institutional resistance which, when taken into account, make the process appear far less benign and certain. Work such as Brian Martin’s (1999) investigation of the “suppression of dissent in science” is relevant here. Similarly, the role of citizen mobilization and direct action appears to be underplayed, as Tesh focuses rather on the power of the ideas themselves. One might also ask whether it is enough to “retool” a risk assessment model that may not be set up to handle some of the most difficult questions regarding toxicity, including synergistic variables and time scales that make studies difficult. This being said, Tesh’s book raises provocative questions and offers intriguing evidence about relationships between social movements and scientific proof. It certainly merits the attention of those who would like to better understand this relationship.
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“A Sentence of Their Own” a Film by Edgar A. Baren

A Film by Edgar A. Baren

Lisa Anne Zilney
University of Tennessee

In a film recognized as the CINE Golden Eagle Award Winner of 2001, as well as the National Council on Crime and Delinquency PASS Award Winner of 2001, Edgar A. Baren explores the social and emotional lives of a family after Alan Raymond, father and husband, is sentenced to seven years in prison. Sentenced to a New Hampshire prison in 1996, Alan leaves behind in Georgia a wife Becky, and sons Donnie and Josh. This film examines the day-to-day experiences of this family and their yearly trip to visit Alan in prison.

The film explores briefly the union of Alan and Becky, which grew when Alan helped her escape an abusive relationship with a man who fathered one of her children. When Alan commits a felony (offense unknown) and is sentenced to prison, Becky decides to remain in the relationship until his release in seven years. She makes a commitment to include Alan in the family from a distance and makes efforts to keep him abreast of happenings with the children, at school and at home. Though the family once enjoyed a middle class existence with a home and comfortable lifestyle, Becky and the children are forced into poverty without any avenue of social support during Alan’s prison time. The film chronicles this hardships this family endures when Becky must support the children on her own.

Screening this film for review, I began this project believing I would find a film that I could add to my course curriculum to help undergraduate students understand the negative ramifications of a prison sentence on an American family. A film that would elucidate the institutional constraints on a family left to fend for themselves after the head of household was removed from the emotional and financial support structure of the family. What I found instead was a film that did an excellent job exploring the feelings of this family specifically and their individual responses to the husband and father being sent to prison. This work examined from the mother’s perspective, the impact of an absent father on the emotional and intellectual well-being of two children.

While I found the film to be an interesting social psychological examination of the Raymond family, I would not recommend showing this film to an introductory course in either sociology or criminology if your goal is to demonstrate the impact of incarceration culturally. Teaching in the Bible Belt, this film may serve to reinforce the conservative, victim-blaming attitudes of many undergraduate students. Becky is a mother who is shown with half a dozen domestic ani-
mals, consuming Starbucks beverages, and chain smoking, while informing her children there are no towels with which to dry oneself after a shower and only potatoes for dinner. I believe the Raymonds would be perceived by many students as unsympathetic, resulting in blaming the mother for the situation as she chose to remain with her husband throughout this ordeal.

There is no doubt that the mass incarceration of men in the U.S. negatively impacts families, leaving many women to single-handedly raise children with few, if any, networks of social support. Furthermore, there is much truth in Becky’s statement that the men make homes for themselves in prison, while the families waiting on the outside have difficulty constructing a home with the phantom presence of a husband and/or father. This film would be an excellent addition to a social psychology class or a child welfare class, in which one could explore potential issues of concern in families abandoned by networks of aid. Both the Raymond children have issues that would spur discussion, including illiteracy, mental psychosis and anger management. For a general sociology or criminology class, however, I fear this film would serve to add fuel to the victim-blaming fire as the myriad of institutional constraints affecting the families of those in prison are not thoroughly explored.

Note: “A Sentence of Their Own” is available only from the American Correctional Association for a cost of $125.

---

**CALL FOR PAPERS**

**Solutions that Work**

We invite submissions for an upcoming conference on homelessness, "Solutions that Work," September 25-26, 2003 at the Omni William Penn Hotel in Pittsburgh. The conference is sponsored by Bethlehem Haven of Pittsburgh, Inc., an agency providing services for homeless women for more than twenty years. Speakers for the conference include Andrew Cuomo & Cushing Dolbeare. Cuomo is "a spellbinding orator and rising political star...one of the most effective advocates to come out of government in many years" (kepleralassociates.com); Dolbeare is the founder of the National Low Income Housing Coalition (NLIHC). Conference information and an online copy of the Call for Papers are available at http://www.bethlehemhaven.org/solutions_that_work.html.

**Criminal Justice**

Seeking papers to be included in a volume of work on women victims of violence published by Prentice Hall for the Women's Issues in Criminal Justice Series. Papers should focus on the treatment of women victims in the media and/or in the criminal justice system. Of particular interest are papers dealing with female victims and the police, courts, and/or correctional systems, the presentation of female victims in the media, global female victimization, minority women as victims, women in non-traditional occupations as victims, and vicarious victims (mothers, daughters, etc. of victims of violence). A summer deadline is preferred. Please contact Cynthia L. Line, Department of Law & Justice Studies, Rowan University, 201 Mullica Hill Rd., Glassboro, NJ 08028, 856-256-4500, line@rowan.edu.

**Entrepreneurship**

Call for papers: Volume 14 of the JAI Press series on Research in the Sociology of Work will focus on entrepreneurship. Papers on all aspects of entrepreneurship research are appropriate for this volume including the factors that lead people to become entrepreneurs, the implications of entrepreneurship for individuals and families, and the effects of entrepreneurial activity on organizations and economies. Research from sociology, economics, business, and related disciplines is welcome. I encourage empirical papers (both quantitative and qualitative), conceptual work, theoretical papers, comparative studies, synthesis of previous literature, and policy-relevant work. Two copies of completed manuscripts should be submitted by April 15, 2004 to: Lisa A. Keister, Editor, Department of Sociology, 300 Bricker Hall, 190 North Oval Mall, the Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, 43210. Email: Keister.7@osu.edu.

**Consequences of Institutions and Culture**

Annual Meeting of the Georgia Political Science Association, November 14-15, 2003 at the Callaway Inn at Callaway Gardens Pine Mountain, Georgia, USA. The theme: Consequences of Institutions and Cultures. All other topics will be considered. The meeting is interdisciplinary and is open to all interested persons from all academic fields worldwide. For information about submitting proposals, registration and lodging go to our web site at http://web2.mgc.edu/gpsa or contact Harold Cline at hcline@mgc.edu
Convergences and Divergences: Points of View on Social Problems

POVERTY AND INEQUALITY
Keith M. Kilty, Coordinator
Ohio State University

The Impact of Poverty on the School Experience

Alfred Louis Joseph, PhD
Miami University (Ohio)

In a rational world, we could reasonably expect a wealthy society to pay special attention to the needs of its most disadvantaged citizens as they try to navigate their way out of their predicament. Generally, that is not what we find when we examine contemporary American society. If assistance is not going to be offered, we should at least make sure that obstacles are not placed in the path of those with the least access to resources. Again, this is precisely what we find in all spheres of American life. The people in need of resources the most, get the least. And conversely, the more advantages people have, the easier they will find it to access resources. This skewed arrangement is most apparent in the nation’s schools. There are policies and practices in place, from the way schools are funded to how poor children are taught and treated in schools that warp the educational experiences of poor school children across this nation (Anyon, 1995; Kozol, 1991). Johnson (2002) clearly makes the connection between wealth and opportunity,

“Because school funding is based on local property taxes, there is a direct relationship between the size of parents’ bank balances and the quality of their children’s education; as a consequence, the children who most need generous school resources have least access to them” (p. 221).

The literature is replete with studies that document substantially different educational experiences for impoverished children, particularly children of color, compared to white-middle class children (McLaren, 1988; Brantlinger, 1993; Anyon, 1995; Anyon, 1997). These different school experiences create problems for children not only in the school setting but long after they reach adulthood.

Schools should be a place where children, regardless of their socio-economic status, find support and encouragement as they grow, learn and gain confidence in their abilities. Sadly, all too often this is not true for children living in poverty. The controversial practice of tracking, the segregation of students by curriculum, has been identified by many critics as the primary reason that poor children do not receive equal treatment in schools (Oakess, 1985). Frazier (1999) states that “the practice of tracking involves grouping grade school children based on perceived academic ability. All too often, the practice ends up placing poor and minority children in less-challenging classes and white students in more advanced courses” (p. 2). Some supporters of the practice claim that tracking actually benefits all students by making instruction easier and more effective (Chunn, 1987). Others claim that the practice will aid low achieving students in developing a more positive attitude about themselves and education (Chunn, 1987). In fact, there is a great deal of evidence that seems to contradict these claims. Many studies find that the exact opposite is often the case (McLaren, 1988, Oakes, 1992, Gamoran and Weinstein, 1998). Joseph and Broussard (2001) surveyed over 1300 school social workers nationally in an attempt to understand how school social workers viewed tracking and its impact on students. Over 54% of those surveyed thought that minority students seemed to be placed disproportionately in the non-academic tracks. Over 63% thought that lower income students were disproportionately placed in the lower tracks. Perhaps one of the most disturbing findings was that 76% of those surveyed thought that teachers tended to have more positive beliefs about students in the higher tracks, while 65% felt that academic counselors and advisors also seemed to favor the students in the higher tracks over the students in the lower track. It is important to remember that the tracks have always been highly racialized (McLaren, 1988; Oakes, 1992).

Given this reality, it should come as no surprise that many of these students feel alienated from the educational process and see dropping out of school as a viable option. According to a report released by the National Center for Educational Statistics (2000), young people living in families with incomes in the lowest quintile were six times more likely than their counterparts in the top 20% to drop out of high school. Fully 10% of students from this lowest income group dropped out of school versus only 1.6% from the top 20%.

This act by young alienated students can have grave consequences for their future lives. In her book titled Getting By on the Minimum: The Lives of Working-Class Women, Johnson (2002) gives voice to many of these neglected students who were keenly aware that their treatment did not mirror that received by their wealthier counterparts. One woman states the following when asked about her experience with school counselors,

“They were only for the ones who had super high scores and that’s all they really cared about then. Sometimes it’s like that now too...I asked and really didn’t get good enough answers. I don’t think that the advice that I was given about colleges or careers was worth anything. There was nothing that you could actually hold on to – nothing you could do anything with – no direction given” (p. 207).

A vicious circle that is hard to escape is in motion here. Many poor children come from homes where the adults had similar
experiences in the schools. They dropped out and now, if they can find work, are trapped in low-paying jobs that will not allow them to "purchase" the type of educational resources that could help their children attain the type of education needed to break the cycle.

The national newspaper USA Today, citing data from the United States Census Bureau, points out that a college graduate with a bachelor’s degree can expect to earn nearly one million more dollars over a lifetime than someone with only a high-school diploma. Another study done by the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture shows that the chances of earning $47,000 per year dramatically increases for all racial groups with a college degree. Without completing high-school, the chances of earning that amount drop to below 1%. Though earning power is certainly important, it is not the only thing influenced by schooling. Furr (1993) and Chapman (2003) showed that school success can be related to mental health issues, self-esteem, attaining further education, timing of births, attitudes towards gender roles, divorce, etc...

Clearly much is at stake here, the quality and perhaps even the quantity of life can be influenced by forces beyond the control of poor students and their parents. The great appeal of the public school was its promise to transform society into a better place for all. What we have now more closely resembles a society with strong aristocratic leanings, where wealth and privilege are passed down from one generation to the next. Let me close by offering a quote from the late scholar Stephen Jay Gould:

"We pass through this world but once. Few tragedies can be more extensive than the stunting of life, few injustices deeper than the denial of an opportunity to strive or even to hope, by a limit imposed from without, but falsely justified as lying within" (from The Mismeasure of Man, 1981).

References


Health Care Poverty

Lisa Raiz
Ohio State University

Discussion of health care in the United States directs attention to two distinct but related issues: 1). poverty and health care and: 2). poverty of health care. Poverty and health care examines the relationship between income and health insurance. Poverty of health care addresses the lack of universal health insurance in the United States as well as the existence of underinsurance. Consideration of the inadequacies of health care coverage invites examination of the relationship between poverty, health insurance and the quality of health care services in the United States.

As with many social constructs, definition and measurement impact "the numbers." According to the United States Census Bureau, 41.2 million individuals (14.6% of the population) had no health insurance coverage in 2001 (Mills, 2002). The definition of "uninsured" used by the Census Bureau requires that individuals are without health insurance coverage during the entire year of interest. A study by Families USA (2003) utilized a different measure of "uninsured" by including individuals who experienced a lack of health care coverage during part of the 2001-2002 (24 month) period. This measure reflects a very different picture. Approximately 74.7 million individuals under the age of 65 (30.1%) were uninsured for all or part of 2001 and 2002 (Families USA). Nearly two-thirds of these individuals were uninsured for six months or more. Individuals without health insurance for six through eleven months would not have met the criteria for inclusion in the Census Bureau’s “uninsured” category and, thus, not been represented.

Income level or another indicator of socioeconomic status has frequently been shown to be associated with the likelihood of having health insurance. Data from Kaiser (2003) and Families USA (2003) presented in Table 1 depicts the positive relationship between income level and likelihood of having health insurance. Individuals at or just above the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) have the greatest likelihood of being uninsured. Despite this relationship, 16.5% of people with incomes at or above 400% of FPL (60,008) had no insurance during all or part of 2001-2002 (Families USA).
Table 1: People under age 65 without health insurance by income level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family income relative to poverty threshold (2001; 2002 FPL for family of 3)</th>
<th>Kaiser Percent of Income Group Uninsured (during all of 2001)</th>
<th>Families USA Percent of Income Group Uninsured (during all or part of 2001-2002)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≤ 100% (14,128; 15,020)</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-199% (28,255; 30,039)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299% (42,383; 45,059)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-399% (56,511; 60,079)</td>
<td>6% (300+FPL)</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400%+ (56,512; 60,008)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and Uninsured, January, 2003
Families USA, 2003

Employment, which since the 1940s has been the primary method for providing health care in the U. S., has historically been associated with a greater likelihood of having health insurance (Moniz & Gorin, 2003). However, 82% of individuals without health insurance in 2001 were in families in which a member was employed, 70% engaged in fulltime work (Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and Uninsured, 2003). Reasons identified for lack of health insurance despite employment include: no health insurance available through employer; inability of employee to pay their share of the health insurance premium; and temporary job loss (Families USA, 2003). Challenges to maintaining coverage, despite COBRA include: not all employers are required to participate in COBRA; not all employees and family members meet criteria for COBRA participation; pre-existing condition exclusions; and the cost to employees for participation in COBRA may be prohibitive (Retsinas, 1998).

Findings that employment increases the likelihood of having health insurance, do not apply to the working poor. Poor, unemployed individuals were more likely to have health insurance than poor individuals employed part time who, in turn, were more likely to have health care coverage than poor individuals working fulltime (Mills, 2002, p. 8). Less than 50% of poor individuals working fulltime reported having health insurance in 2001 (Mills).

The relationship between race/ethnicity and the health care system has been examined extensively. Table 2 indicates that although white, non-Hispanic individuals comprised the largest category of individuals without health insurance, Hispanic and African Americans were disproportionately represented among the uninsured (Families USA, 2003). An examination of insurance status by income level and race/ethnicity revealed that Hispanics had the highest percentage of uninsurance throughout all income levels, followed by African Americans and whites (Holahan & Pohl, 2002). Forty-five percent of Hispanics with incomes less than 200% FPL were uninsured compared with 29.2% and 27.8% of African Americans and whites, respectively (Holahan & Pohl). Although rates of uninsurance declined with income, even at 400% or greater of FPL, Hispanics had twice the percentage of uninsured than whites (10.5% and 5.1%, respectively). Nativity has also impacted health care coverage for individuals in the United States. Over one-third of all foreign born individuals were without health insurance in 2001 and over one-half (55.1%) of poor foreign born individuals had no health care coverage (Mills, 2002). Finally, lack of English fluency has been found to be associated with reduced use of health care among Hispanic patients (Fiscella, Franks, Doescher & Saver, 2002).

Table 2: Individuals under age 65 without health insurance, by race and Hispanic origin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race and Hispanic Origin</th>
<th>Percent of Race/Ethnic Group Uninsured</th>
<th>As Percent of All Uninsured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Families USA, 2003
Access to and quality of care has also been shown to be lower for racial and ethnic minorities including, but not limited to, the treatment of cardiac disease, asthma, breast cancer, HIV and nursing home care (Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2000; Fiscella, Franks, Gold & Clancy, 2000). Although not a direct measure of quality of care, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) found minimal progress during the past ten years in eliminating disparities based on race/ethnicity in health status indicators (Keppel, Peary & Wagener, 2002).

Another population of individuals with potentially limited access to health insurance is same-sex partners. Recent findings released by the U.S. Census Bureau reported that 10% of the 60 million unmarried partner households from which data was collected in 2000 consisted of same-sex couples (Simmons & O’Connell, 2003). The current lack of opportunity to marry or obtain legally recognized civil unions denies them access to a myriad of benefits available to opposite-sex couples, including health insurance.

The consequences of uninsurance have been well documented. Forty-one percent of adults under age 65 without health insurance in 2002 reported delaying seeking medical treatment and over one-fourth reported not getting needed medical care or not obtaining needed medications, 28% and 26% respectively (Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and Uninsured, 2003). This compared with 20%, 6% and 11%, respectively, for individuals with insurance (Kaiser). Additionally, uninsured individuals experienced a decreased likelihood of having a usual source of care and obtaining preventive care as well as an increased likelihood of death in the hospital and receipt of less and lower quality care while hospitalized compared to individuals with health insurance (Families USA, 2003).

The presence of health care coverage does not assure that health care will be received, particularly for individuals with lower incomes. Underinsurance occurs when health insurance is insufficient to cover all needed health care services and includes insurance deductibles, copayments and out-of-pocket expenses (Moniz & Gorin, 2003). A 1996 study found that 12.5% of households surveyed with individuals under age 65 spent more than 10% of their income on health insurance premiums not covered by employers and out-of-pocket health related expenses; 80% of these families has health insurance (Shearer, 1998). Families with incomes under the FPL averaged 16% of their income on premium payments and out-of-pocket expenses (Shearer). Less use of health care services by those with a lower socioeconomic status has been documented, even if they were insured (Fiscella et al., 2000). One-fourth of insured adults under age 65 with incomes under 20,000 reported difficulty getting medical care, not visiting a physician when they experienced a medical problem and not filling a prescription due to financial concerns (Donelan, DesRoches & Schoen, 2000). Additionally, insured individuals with incomes under 20,000 were three times more likely than insured individuals with incomes 60,000 or greater to forego obtaining needed care or skip completing recommended tests or treatment (Donelan).

Health care poverty is ubiquitous. Working hard does not provide protection from uninsurance or the consequences of underinsurance. Even a higher income does not guarantee health care coverage or the ability to manage the costs of health care. Groups that have historically experienced discrimination due to race/ethnicity or sexual orientation remain vulnerable in the health care arena. The lack of universal access to health care in the United States continues to be an issue begging for attention.
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# Social Problems Inventory Reduction Sale

Members Only — Save 64% per issue!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th># AVAILABLE</th>
<th>PRICE PER ISSUE</th>
<th># ORDERED</th>
<th>$ TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V18:1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V18:2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
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</tr>
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<td>3</td>
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</tr>
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<td>11</td>
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<td>4</td>
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</tr>
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<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V19:2</td>
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</tr>
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<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V25:2</td>
<td>5</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V25:3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V25:4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V25:5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V26:1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V26:2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V26:3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V26:4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V26:5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V27:1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V27:2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V27:3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V27:4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V27:5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ordering Deadline: August 30, 2003
# Social Problems Inventory Reduction Sale

Members Only — Save 64% per issue!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th># AVAILABLE</th>
<th>PRICE PER ISSUE</th>
<th># ORDERED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V28:1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V28:2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V28:3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V28:4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V28:5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V29:1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V29:2</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V29:3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V29:4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V29:5</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V30:1</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V30:2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V30:3</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V30:4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V30:5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V31:1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V31:2</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V31:3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V31:4</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V31:5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V32:1</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V32:2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V32:3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V32:4</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V32:5</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V33:1</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V33:2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V33:3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V33:4</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V33:5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V33:6</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V34:1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V34:2</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V34:3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V34:4</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V34:5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V35:1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V35:2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V35:3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V35:4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ordering Deadline: August 30, 2003
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Members Only — Save 64% per issue!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th># AVAILABLE</th>
<th>PRICE PER ISSUE</th>
<th># ORDERED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V35:5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V36:1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V36:2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V36:3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V36:4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V36:5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V37:1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V37:2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V37:3</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V37:4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V38:1</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V38:2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V38:3</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V38:4</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V39:1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V39:2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V39:4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V40:1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V40:2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V40:3</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V40:4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V41:1</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V41:2</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V41:3</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V41:4</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V42:1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V42:2</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V42:3</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V42:4</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V43:1</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V43:2</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V43:3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V43:4</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V44:1</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V44:2</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V44:3</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V44:4</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V45:1</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V45:2</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V45:4</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ordering Deadline: August 30, 2003
## Social Problems Inventory Reduction Sale

Members Only — Save 64% per issue!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUE</th>
<th># AVAILABLE</th>
<th>PRICE PER ISSUE</th>
<th># ORDERED</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V46:2</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V46:3</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V47:2</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V47:3</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V47:4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V48:2</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V48:3</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V48:4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V49:2</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL PROBLEMS V49:3</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Shipping & Handling:**

- **Within North America:** $2.50 for 1st copy
- $.50 for each additional copy up to 4 ($2.50 - $4.00)
  - 5 to 10 copies = $6.50
  - 11 to 20 copies = $12.00
  - 21 to 50 copies = $25.00
  - 51 to 100 = $40.00
- More than 100 copies call 510.643.7154 for estimate.

- **Outside North America:** $2.50 for 1st copy
  - $2.00 for each additional copy

**Billing Address:**

- Name: ____________________________
- Address: _________________________
- City/State: _________________
- Zip/Postcode: ________________
- Country: _____________________

**Payment Information:**

To pay via check, please make check payable to UC Regents/Social Problems.

- Credit Card Payments □ Visa □ Mastercard
- Account Number: ____________________________
- Expiration date (month/year): __________________
- Name, as it appears on card: __________________
- Telephone number: _________________________

**To order, please complete this form and mail to:**

Sheryle Hodapp, Customer Service Manager
University of California Press
2000 Center Street, Suite 303
Berkeley, CA 94704-1223
Phone: (510) 643-0953; Fax (510) 642-9917
Email: sheryle.hodapp@uexpress.edu
Beliefs about the Poor and Poverty, Political Rhetoric, and Welfare Reform

Elizabeth A. Segal
Arizona State University
and
Keith M. Kilty
Ohio State University

In his first run for the presidency, William Clinton made a campaign promise to “end welfare as we know it.” While Clinton may have made “welfare reform” a cornerstone of his campaign, he was certainly not alone in calling for change. Other public officials had been clamoring for changes in the public welfare system for over two decades. All of this outcry reflected a common set of attitudes and beliefs of those in positions of authority about public assistance and the poor. The power of their language to shape and inform policy is significant in our society, and those who hold power use this language to mold and rationalize public policies.

This research critically examines the speeches given on the floor of the House of Representatives prior to the final vote on the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act on July 31, 1996. While numerous Congressional sessions and hearings covered welfare reform, the discussions on that day pertained to the actual legislation that became law. It is important to recognize that these speeches represent what policy-makers are prepared to state publicly, not merely their private beliefs, attitudes, and ideologies. Therefore, examining these speeches using a critical discourse approach demonstrates the power of language to set norms, maintain the status quo, and oppress already marginalized groups.

The methodology used in this analysis was Critical Discourse Analysis, and a complete description of and rationale for this method may be found in Segal and Kilty (2003).

Why Welfare Reform

Unfortunately, even when poverty and the poor are acknowledged by those in power, their public sentiments often depict the poor themselves as the main cause of their condition (Kilty & Segal, 1996). Throughout the history of this country, the poor have been identified in terms of “deserving” or “undeserving” of assistance (Gordon, 1994; Katz, 1989). The impetus for welfare reform in the early 1990s was nothing new. Opponents of federal efforts to provide public assistance for poor women and children were numerous from the first passage of the program originally titled Aid to Dependent Children in 1935.

Many argue that the rationale for dismantling Aid to Families with Dependent Children was far different than the commonly depicted concern with dependency.

Virtually all the ills afflicting American society are being attributed to single-mother families. Out-of-wedlock births have been blamed for the “breakdown of the family,” as well as for the crime rate, drug and alcohol addiction, poverty, illiteracy, homelessness, poor school performance, and the rending of the social fabric. The labeling of some citizens as “dependent” — that is, dependent on social welfare programs rather than on spouses, parents, or other family members, or on other, more acceptable federal programs — has been used indiscriminately to discredit an entire group of women and children without regard to their character or their specific work and family history (Sidel, 1996, p. 491).

The reasoning for welfare reform was that, if single-mothers could be put to work, then these problems would be solved. Although decades of research had failed to demonstrate any link between women’s marital or childbearing status and the use of public assistance, the belief in that link became the impetus and rationale for changing the law (Abramovitz, 1996).

Statements on the Floor of the House of Representatives

On July 31, 1996, 44 members of the House of Representatives took the floor to speak on pending welfare reform legislation (Congressional Record, 1996). The composition of those who spoke was not reflective of the total House membership. Of those 44 who chose to speak that day, 68% were males (n=30) and 32% were females (n=14) compared to the overall membership of 89% male and 11% female (see Table 1). The speakers tended to be against the bill more than the overall membership, with 36% of the speakers voting against the measure versus 23% of the overall membership (see Table 2). Women speakers voted similarly to women members in general, while 30% (n=9) of the male speakers were opposed to the legislation compared to 21% (n=80) of all the men in the House (see Table 3). For the House as a whole, 30% (14 out of 46) of the female members spoke that day while only 8% (30 out of 388) of the males took to the floor. In summary, those who chose to speak tended to represent opposition to the bill, were more likely to be Democrats, and were more likely to be women.

Speakers stressed three major areas in their speeches. They referred to the problem of welfare, the goal of changing the current system, and their assessments of the legislation before them. These three emergent themes dominated the debate. Complete results can be found in Segal and Kilty (2003)

Implications

Some points were clear from the words speakers chose to use. Self-sufficiency and personal responsibility were mentioned frequently, reinforcing the purpose of the PRWORA, as clearly stated in its title. Other implications were noticeable in the absence
lack of concern for eradicating poverty. There was no mention of substance abuse, and one complaint about ignoring domestic violence attests to the lack of understanding or acceptance of larger social issues that correlate with poverty.

Gender was missing from the debate. Those who favored the legislation rarely identified adult recipients as women, although the vast majority of adult recipients are female. Terms used to identify those receiving public assistance were general, such as “welfare beneficiaries” or “welfare recipients” and as a family unit such as “disadvantaged families” or “welfare families.” General references were made to “our Nation’s low-income citizens.” In comparison, identification of adult recipients as women and mothers did occur among the speeches of those in opposition. “What if a mother on welfare cannot find a job?” was followed by concern about child care, typically the responsibility of women. Another complained that “this bill does nothing to train mothers for work.” For those who supported this legislation, the fact that the roles of women such as child-rearing and birth and limitations for economic achievement based on gender are very real aspects of life for poor women went unmentioned. This silence means either lack of knowledge, or that those who fail to speak of gender do not accept it as part of the problem. Also, while almost 90% of the members of the House were male, 96% of the adult recipients of AFDC were female (Administration for Children and Families, 1995). That almost 80% of the men in the House voted to support the legislation compared to 54% of the women, further demonstrates the gender imbalance. This unwillingness to speak of gender is true not only of politicians. The same ostensibly neutral (and therefore “objective”) language used to identify welfare recipients is common in social science evaluations of welfare reform programs (Nelson, 2002).

Where gender does become an issue is in terms of the beliefs about deviant behavior. This legislation is clear that out-of-wedlock childbirth, lack of marriage, and personal responsibility are the problems. Low wages, corporate down-sizing, globalization, lack of education and training, difficulty in being a single-parent, inadequate child care, insufficient benefits, were not articulated concerns. While this may not be surprising, it is revealing. The words used by those in authority positions contribute greatly to the public consciousness. When elected officials in power neglect to acknowledge the true conditions of those who are disempowered and marginalized, then the power imbalance remains. By ignoring the gender reality for poor women, those in the majority, the supporters, reinforce the status quo that prevents women from gaining access to economic resources. This is precisely the evidence of the power of discourse to shape society.

Race and ethnicity are never mentioned. By completely ignoring the fact that a disproportionate number of the recipients of AFDC are people of color silences the role of race and ethnicity in the context of poverty. The assumption that personal responsibility is the key allows policy-makers to ignore the realities that racism can and does impede employability and access to opportunity. This silence conveys the message that those in power do not consider race or ethnicity relevant, and therefore neither should the rest of society.

Class is another silence. Contextually it is noteworthy that members of Congress received an annual base pay of $141,300 in 2000 compared to the median household income that year of $42,148 (DeNavas-Walt, Cleveland, & Roemer, 2001). Many members of Congress have income from other sources, and left very lucrative professions from which they amassed savings and investments. Most likely few, if any, experienced poverty while raising children, by definition the condition of every family receiving AFDC. In fact, most members of Congress have household incomes that place them in the top 5% of the U.S. population. In fact, many come from wealthy backgrounds, independent of annual income. A recent analysis of newly elected members to Congress from the 2002 elections found that nearly half were millionaires, many of whom will likely face conflicts of interest in their votes on legislation pending in the current Congress (Salant, 2002).

Our analysis indicates that much that is important to those who live in poverty and those who work with people living in poverty was never addressed in the debate on “welfare reform.” Rather, those in power were intent on maintaining the status quo. The glaring discrepancies in race, gender, and class between those crafting welfare policy and those subject to that policy must be illuminated. The silences and absences within public welfare debates must be identified so that true reform can occur.
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Poverty and Inequality in the Context of Welfare Reform

Domenico Parisi, Steven Michael Grice, and Michael Taquino
Mississippi State University

In 1996 Congress passed the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), commonly known as the Welfare Reform Act. The act replaced Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) with block grants, and renamed the program Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). This change overhauled the former entitlement-based welfare system in three important ways. First, it devolved more responsibility for the design and implementation of TANF to states. Second, it encouraged greater community civic and faith-based responsibility to help the needy. Third, it mandated work requirements and time limits to encourage welfare-to-work transitions.

Since the passage of the act, the nation as a whole has experienced an overall decline in welfare caseloads of 56.7 percent, reaching the lowest levels of welfare participation since the 1960s (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: Number of Individuals on Cash Assistance (AFDC/TANF)

![Graph showing the number of individuals on cash assistance from 1961 to 2000.](image)

Although some take this dramatic decline as a sign of success, others interpret it more cautiously by shifting the focus from caseload reduction to poverty, inequality and social justice (Lichter and Crowley 2002). The argument is that dropping from welfare rolls does not necessarily mean that TANF clients are achieving economic independence (Parisi et al. 2002). In fact, of those who leave TANF only 60 percent are able to find employment, and of those, only a small fraction is able to earn a living wage (Beaulieu et al. 2000). For many working poor, the most logical strategy to make ends meet is to combine a paycheck with a welfare check (Harris 1993). Unfortunately, many clients are being forced to leave TANF even if they have to face the prospect of serious economic and social hardship (Parisi et al., forthcoming). In this context, one can easily see that current declines in welfare caseloads can be viewed as an indication that many low-income families living on the economic margins of American society will be left even further behind. This raises the question: Under what political, economic, and social circumstances are low-income families more likely to be left behind?

Political circumstances refer to strategies undertaken by states to implement the TANF program. A state can undertake either a strong, weak, or mixed strategy (Blank and Schmidt 2001; Gais et al. 2000). A strong strategy is one that emphasizes caseload reduction regardless of the outcome, and a weak strategy is one that is concerned with helping clients overcome employment barriers so they can successfully be placed on a path to self-sufficiency. A mixed strategy is one that combines strong and weak strategies.

Of the 50 states, 14 have implemented a strong strategy, six a weak strategy, and 30 a mixed strategy. Mississippi is one of the 14 states that has implemented a strong strategy (see Figure 2), and among the states with the highest declines in caseloads from 1996 to 2000 (74.6 percent). Given that Mississippi has a history of economic and social conditions unfavorable for clients to make successful welfare-to-work transitions, a substantial part of the decline it has experienced has been found to be attributed to the policy itself (Parisi et al. 2003).
Figure 2: Classification of States by TANF Implementation Strategy

The link between welfare policy and caseload decline can also be noted when other states are examined in relation to their TANF implementation strategy (see Figure 3).

Figure 3: Rate of TANF Decline by Implementation Strategy

However, the extent to which welfare policies might account for declines in TANF caseloads is contingent upon national and local economic conditions. There is no doubt that the healthy economy of the 1990s helped many low-income families make a successful welfare-to-work transition (Lichter and Crowley 2002). Yet, had welfare reform not materialized, the nation as a whole would not have experienced such dramatic declines. This can be best illustrated in Figure 4.

Figure 4: National Trends in Poverty, Unemployment, and Welfare
As this figure shows, unemployment and poverty trends tend to mirror each other. That is, if unemployment declines, so does poverty. In contrast, the percentage of the national population on welfare followed a path independent of unemployment and poverty until the passage of the 1996 Welfare Reform Act. This suggests that the combination of the healthy economy and current welfare policies might be driving the dramatic decline.

An issue that is often overlooked is that the macroeconomic and political forces that have contributed to national economic prosperity have also worked to further stratify American society, with some areas thriving and others mired in persistent poverty (Lichter and Jensen 2002; Parisi et al., forthcoming). This suggests that the extent to which the strategy undertaken by a given state might account for variations in TANF participation rates is contingent upon the local economic and social conditions in which clients are situated. Greater access to economic opportunities, such as employment and income, reduces the likelihood of using public assistance. However, for people living on the economic margins, the extent to which individuals rely on welfare checks is affected by access to social resources such as family, friends, and community civic and faith-based organizations (Parisi et al. Forthcoming; Parisi et al. 2003). In poor economic and social conditions, not only is a larger proportion of the population on public assistance, but those recipients also tend to use public assistance as their long-term economic survival strategy.

In conclusion, TANF implementation strategies, the national economy, and local economic and social conditions, are key factors in assessing the long-term consequences of welfare reform on the well being of many low-income families. This means that the debate on welfare reform should shift from caseload decline to poverty and inequality. This is important because, under the current system, the more disadvantaged populations are those more likely to bear the cost of their own disadvantage. Consequently, the focus should be on emphasizing changes in TANF implementation strategies toward improving individual well being and the differential ability of local communities to help their own residents.

Endnotes

2. TANF work implementation data from Blank and Schmidt (2001).
3. TANF work implementation data from Blank and Schmidt (2001); TANF drop rate data from the United States Department of Health and Human Services, 2002.
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Call for SSSP Nominations

This year we will be electing a President-Elect, a Vice-President Elect, regular and student members of the Board of Directors, Budget, Finance and Audit Committee, Editorial and Publications Committee, and the Committee on Committees. Please consider nominating a colleague or yourself for one of these offices. Nominations that include brief mention of the nominee’s SSSP involvement and other relevant experiences are especially helpful. The Nominations Committee will meet at the Annual Meeting in Chicago, IL so all nominations should be submitted to PJ McGann prior to August 1, 2003 at the following address:

PJ McGann  
Institute for Research on Women & Gender, University of Michigan  
204 South State Street  
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1290  
W: (810) 762-5977; F: (734) 764-9533  
Email: PJMCGANN@UMICH.EDU

SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS - 2003 ANNUAL MEETING

● August 15-17, 2003 • Wyndham Hotel • Atlanta, Georgia

Book on-line at http://www.it.utk.edu/sssp  
Follow the links to find:

TRAVEL DISCOUNTS & RESERVATIONS:  
• AIRLINE DISCOUNTS up to 15% off the lowest available fares*  
• WEB FARES  
• CAR DISCOUNTS up to 25% off regular rates  
• ZONE FARES region-to-region flat rates  
• CONSOLIDATOR AND NET FARES reducing the cost of high price tickets

ATC EXTRAS:  
• Advanced seat assignments  
• Special meal requests  
• Frequent flyer mileage updates  
• Personal Profiles for repeat customers

ASSOCIATION TRAVEL CONCEPTS  
Phone 800-458-6383  
Email reservations@atcmeetings.com

● United 800-521-4041 510CK  
Delta 800-241-6108 DMN195130A  
Alamo 800-732-3232 72620 GR  
Travel Dates: 8/12/03 - 8/20/03

* Tickets purchased at least 60 days prior to departure receive a 10% off coach and 15% off first class. Tickets purchased less than 60 days prior to departure receive 5% off coach and 10% off first class. Service fees apply to completed reservations booked on-line. Hours of operation are 9:00 AM - 7:30 PM PST.
Welcome New Members

The Society for the Study of Social Problems would like to welcome members who have joined since January, 2003:

IRMA LORENA ACOSTA MEXICO
EILEEN AHLIN MD
HELENA L. ALDEN FL
CARLA H. ALPHONSO SC
JENNIFER B. BARRETT TX
RACHELLE BEELEY GA
JENNIFER J. BEGGGS MO
AARON M. BEIM IL
SARAH BENATAR DC
CHRISTOPHER BONDY HI
DAVID BRAIN FL
NANCY BRANNON TN
GREGORY B. BROBERG AZ
C. ANNE BROUSSARD NH
MICHELLE BROWN IN
MEGAN H. BUSHNELL UT
ELIZABETH CAVALIER GA
CHRISTOPHER S. CHAMBERS FL
PENG CHEN CHINA
NATALIE CHEROT CA
JANICE E. CHESTERS AUSTRALIA
JOHNSON CHRISTINE NJ
KATHRYN L. CHURCH CANADA
CRISTINA CIELO CA
CHARLES L. COLE LA
DANIEL CORTES TEX
L. CRUST LA
NATALI DEL CONTE NV
PERLA R. DIOCHEA CA
HEATHER E. DILLAWAY MI
JACLYN M. DISPENSA PA
SUSAN M. DITTER GA
FRANK DIVONZO PA
MARC DIXON OH
SUZANNAH K. DOLANC MI
TERESA DONATI NJ
JEFFREY FAIRLEY LA
AMY FASULA GA
MICHAEL FLATT OH
SARAH J. FOLEY MO
BRENDA FORSTER IL
MARLENE GALLARDE CA
RISHA A. GIDWANI CA
BELISA GONZALEZ GA
CAROLINE E. GOYETTE WI
ZAID I. GRAHAM GA
KATIA GUENTHER GA
KELLY J. HAGEWEN NC
JIM HANLON NC
EMILIE HARDMAN AZ
ANGELA HARVEY AZ
GREGORY M. HEBERT LA
BELINDA A. HERRERA AZ
LYNDI N. HEWITT AZ
SALLY T. HILLSMAN AZ
CONNIE MARIE HOFFMAN AZ
CHUCKSON D. HOLLOWAY AZ
KATRINA HOOP CA
DANNY R. HOYT CA
EMILY S. IHARA CA
KEVIN S. IRWIN CA
MATTHEW JENDIAN CA
ZHEN JIANG CANADA
INGAR P. JOHNSON DC
KELLY JOHNSON DE
JOYCE A. JOYCE DE
DAVID P. KEYS DE
ZEYNEP KILIG CANADA
JOHN KIPLINGER MI
LARS M. KVALE MI
DANIEL ADAM LONG MI
MADONNA MAIDMENT MI
EMILY S. MANN MI
SUSAN L. MARET MI
ANDREW W. MARTIN MI
TRICIA MCTAGUE MI
STEPHANIE R. MEDLEY MI
AMY MENNERICH MI
STACEY MEROLA MI
SABINE MERZ MI
MAJA MIKOSIC MI
PHYLLIS MOEN MI
ALESIA F. MONTGOMERY MN
CINDY MONTGOMERY MN
JENNIFER L. MURRAY MN
ERIC MYKHALOVICH MN
MELINDA M. NAGAI MN
RAUL NĘCÓCHEA MN
DAVID NIBERT MN
CHARLES O'ROURKE MN
ROSYLEN OGLESBY VA
TAKAMITSU ONO GA
JENNIFER L. OSBORNE GA
SABRINA PENDERGRASS NC
MOLLY M. PERKINS GA
NANCY B. PLANKEY WI
KATHERINE M. POLASEK PA
CINDEE PRATT NC
DORIS MARIE PROVINE AZ
ALLISON PUGH CA
JAMES REED AZ
JOHN D. REITZEL FL
WADE T. ROBERTS AZ
REUBEN N. ROTH AZ
JOLANDA M. SALLMANN CANADA
KEN SALO IL
SCHOOL OF JUSTICE STUDIES AZ
CHARLES C. SCHROEDER IL
ALIS SEPICK NY
CATHERINE SENSENIG PA
VIC TOR M. FIGUEROA MEXICO
MARTIN SILVERSTEIN CANADA
PATRICIA E. SIMPSON CANADA
CARRIE L. SMITH TN
TRACEY SMITH-HARRIS CANADA
DAVID SOMMERFELD MI
ROBERTA SPARK CANADA
VYSOTSKY STANISLAV MA
MIKE C. STEWART FL
DANIELLE M. TEUNION-SMITH MI
KRISTY THOMAS CO
ERIC THOMPSON CA
ORNUMA THONGNIRAMOL TN
GEORGE E. TITA CA
REBECCA TRAMMELL CA
ALIA R. TYNER-MULLINGS NY
ANJANETTE URDANITIA CA
ELROI WASZKIEWICZ GA
ART WEBB CA
JASON WELLER PA
LORI L. WESTPHAL GA
KEŘÍ WHITE NJ
JAY CEE WHITEHEAD CA
CHRISTINE WILLIAMS TX
BETH WILLIFORD IN
KAREN YOUNG CA
TONY ZARAGOZA WA
PLAN TO ATTEND the FILM EXHIBIT
at the SSSP ANNUAL MEETING, AUGUST 15-17, 2003

The film exhibit is sponsored by California Newsreel, Media Education Foundation, National Film Board of Canada, and the University of Washington’s Comparative Law and Studies Center. Information about film rentals and purchase will be available at the conference. The film exhibit will be held in the Registration Area (Centennial B). A special screening of Hofmann’s Potion is scheduled on Sunday, August 17 from 8:30am - 10:15am in the Achilles room. A special screening of Brother Outsider: The Life of Bayard Rustin is scheduled on Sunday, August 17 from 4:30pm - 6:30pm in the Achilles room.

BROTHER OUTSIDER: THE LIFE OF BAYARD RUSTIN
Shown: Friday, August 15 from 8:30am - 9:55am
        Sunday, August 17 from 4:30pm - 6:30pm
Bayard Rustin was there at most of the important events of the Civil Rights Movement – but always in the background. Brother Outsider: The Life of Bayard Rustin presents a vivid drama, intermingling the personal and the political, about one of the most enigmatic figures in 20th century American history. One of the first “freedom riders,” an adviser to Dr. Martin Luther King and A. Philip Randolph, organizer of the March on Washington, intelligent, gregarious, and charismatic, Bayard Rustin was denied his place in the limelight for one reason – he was also gay. (Available from California Newsreel, 83 minutes)

CAPTIVE AUDIENCE: ADVERTISING INVADES THE CLASSROOM
Shown: Friday, August 15 from 10:00am - 10:45am
        Saturday, August 16 from 4:10pm - 4:55pm
For marketers who wish to reach the lucrative youth market, the relatively uncluttered medium of schools represents the final frontier – access to a captive audience of millions of students along with implied product endorsements. Diminishing federal, state, and local funding for education finds many schools hard pressed to resist the advertiser’s pitch. Featuring interviews with teachers, students, and parents, as well as media scholars. Captive Audience explores how education is short-changed and democracy is at risk when schools become marketplaces and commercialism goes to the head of the class. (Available from Media Education Foundation, 45 minutes)

HOFMANN’S POTION
Shown: Sunday, August 17 from 8:30am - 10:15am
Long before Timothy Leary urged a generation to "tune in, turn on and drop out," D-lysergic acid diethylamide (or LSD) was being used by researchers to understand the human mind. Discovered in 1943 by Swiss chemist Albert Hofmann, LSD was hailed as a powerful tool to treat alcoholism and drug addiction and to provide a window into schizophrenia and other mental illnesses. Much of that pioneering research was done by the team of Humphry Osmond, Abram Hoffer and Duncan Blewett, all working in Saskatchewan. While researchers were establishing the medical benefits of LSD, others - like author Aldous Huxley - promoted the drug as a powerful tool for mental exploration and self-understanding. At Harvard, Timothy Leary, Ralph Metzner and Ram Dass (then known as Richard Alpert) became popular heroes after the university cancelled their research project into psychedelics. Featuring interviews with many LSD pioneers, Hofmann’s Potion is much more than a simple chronicle of the drug’s early days. With its thoughtfull interviews, beautiful music and stunning cinematography, it is an invitation to look at LSD – and our world – with a more open, compassionate mind. (Available from National Film Board of Canada, 56 minutes)

KILLING US SOFTLY 3
Shown: Friday, August 15 from 10:55am - 11:30am
        Saturday, August 16 from 5:00pm - 5:35pm
Jean Kilbourne’s pioneering work helped develop and popularize the study of gender representation in advertising. Her award-winning Killing us Softly films have influenced millions of college and high school students across two generations and on an international scale. In this important new film, Kilbourne reviews if and how the image of women in advertising has changed over the last 20 years. (Available from Media Education Foundation, 34 minutes)

NAT TURNER: A TROUBLESOME PROPERTY
Shown: Friday, August 15 from 11:40am - 12:40pm
        Sunday, August 17 from 8:30am - 9:30am
The significance of Nat Turner’s revolt and how it continues to influence race relations today is deconstructed illustrating how fictions and history collide. Includes dramatizations of the literary images of Nat Turner. (Available from California Newsreel, 60 minutes)

NO LOGO
Shown: Friday, August 15 from 12:50pm - 1:40pm
        Sunday, August 17 from 9:40am - 10:30am
Using hundreds of media examples, this video shows how the commercial takeover of public space, destruction of consumer choice, and replacement of real jobs with temporary work – the dynamics of corporate globalization – impact everyone, everywhere. Naomi Klein argues that globalization is a process whereby corporations discovered that profits lay not in making products, but in creating branded identities people adopt in their lifestyles. (Available from Media Education Foundation, 50 minutes)

PATIENT ABUSE: SOUTH AFRICA’S STRUGGLE FOR AIDS TREATMENT
Shown: Friday, August 15 from 1:50pm - 2:50pm
        Sunday, August 17 from 10:40am - 11:40am
A documentary on one of the most urgent issues facing post-apartheid South Africa, the AIDS epidemic and the country’s leading AIDS activist organization, the Treatment Action Campaign. (Available from California Newsreel, 58 minutes)
PEACE, PROPAGANDA & THE PROMISED LAND U.S. MEDIA & THE SUBVERSION OF PEACE
Shown: Friday, August 15 from 3:00pm - 4:10pm
Sunday, August 17 from 11:50am - 1:00pm
With violence in the Middle East continuing to escalate, U.S. mainstream media are paying a great deal of attention to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Combining American and British TV news clips and interviews with analysts, journalists, and activists, Peace, Propaganda & the Promised Land exposes frequently biased, pro-Israeli reporting and how it shapes American perceptions. (Available from Media Education Foundation, 67 minutes)

PLAYING UNFAIR: THE MEDIA IMAGE OF THE FEMALE ATHLETE
Shown: Saturday, August 16 from 9:30am - 10:00am
Sunday, August 17 from 1:10pm - 1:40pm
Although the landmark 1972 Title IX law granted female athletes equality in the eyes of the law, the male-dominated world of sports journalism has been much slower to adapt, with coverage of female sports still lagging far behind that of men. Playing Unfair is the first film to critically examine this post-Title IX media environment in terms of the representation of female athletes. It demonstrates that while men’s identities in sports are equated with deeply held values of courage, strength and endurance, the accomplishments of female athletes are framed very differently and in much more stereotypical ways. (Available from Media Education Foundation, 30 minutes)

RICH MEDIA, POOR DEMOCRACY
Shown: Saturday, August 16 from 10:10am - 10:40am
Sunday, August 17 from 1:50pm - 2:20pm
Featuring Robert McChesney, this video connects the decline of journalism to the profit motives of the mega-corporations that own the media. Based on McChesney's award-winning book, Rich Media, Poor Democracy questions how media policy decisions get made, examines the way our media system affects news coverage, and offers suggestions for reclaiming our media — asking if there is a connection between independent, public media, and a vibrant healthy democracy. (Available from Media Education Foundation, 30 minutes)

SPEAK UP! IMPROVING THE LIVES OF GAY, LESBIAN, BISEXUAL & TRANSGENDERED YOUTH
Shown: Saturday, August 16 from 10:50am - 11:20am
Sunday, August 17 from 2:30pm - 3:00pm
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender (GLBT) students and their allies face unique challenges of violence and harassment in schools. Speak Up! explores what these students and their allies have done to transform their schools into safer and more welcoming environments. Interviews with students, parents, teachers, administrators, and national activists highlight not only the need for transformation, but offer resources and advice for those actively working for change. (Available from Media Education Foundation, 30 minutes)

SPIN THE BOTTLE: SEX, LIES & ALCOHOL
Shown: Saturday, August 16 from 11:30am - 12:15pm
Sunday, August 17 from 3:10pm - 3:55pm
Alcohol is linked to a high number of unnecessary student deaths, injuries, and sexual assaults every year. Yet in its portrayal in popular culture, alcohol offers a release from inhibitions and a path to happiness. Using numerous examples from the media, as well as interviews with college students, award-winning media critics Jean Kilbourne & Jackson Katz focus on the normalization of alcohol abuse. Spin the Bottle is the first educational program to step beyond an analysis of "binge drinking" to focus on techniques that alcohol marketers use to link the product to the fragile gender identities of young men and women. (Available from Media Education Foundation, 45 minutes)

STAGING AN EXECUTION: THE MEDIA AT MCEVIEGH
Shown: Saturday, August 16 from 12:30pm - 1:00pm
Sunday, August 17 from 4:00pm - 4:30pm
What 1400 media asked — and didn't ask — in the absence of expected protests at the execution of Timothy McVeigh. Through original footage shot in Terre Haute, Indiana, including interviews with local, state, national, and international media covering the event, this documentary explores how news packages structured media interviews and the framing of events surrounding capital punishment and how the protests that did occur were treated by the media. (Available from Bruce Hoffman, University of Washington and Michelle Brown, Indiana University, 30 minutes)

STOLEN EYE
Shown: Saturday, August 16 from 1:10pm - 2:00pm
Sunday, August 17 from 4:40pm - 5:30pm
In Stolen Eye, Jane Elliott continues her extraordinary experiential workshop on discrimination with a group of Aborigines and white Australians. Her "blue-eyed, brown-eyed" diversity training exercise, also seen in Blue Eyed and Essential Blue Eyed, attains a new level of effectiveness in a less familiar environment. (Available from California Newsreel, 50 minutes)

TOMORROW'S CHILDREN: PARTNERSHIP EDUCATION IN ACTION, FEATURING RIANE EISLER
Shown: Saturday, August 16 from 2:10pm - 2:45pm
Sunday, August 17 from 5:40pm - 6:05pm
Do politically expedient proposals for more testing prepare children for the challenges of the 21st century? What is the role of schools in a time when the mass media are children's most frequent teachers? In Tomorrow's Children, based on her groundbreaking book of the same name, Riane Eisler offers a practical blueprint for transforming how we educate our children and ourselves. (Available from Media Education Foundation, 35 minutes)

WRESTLING WITH MANHOOD: BOYS, BULLYING AND BATTERING
Shown: Saturday, August 16 from 3:00pm - 4:00pm
As professional wrestling explodes in popularity with male audiences, Wrestling with Manhood not only addresses the questions of whether wrestling is "real or fake" or causes imitative violence, but also penetrates down to the deep-rooted social values that sustain and nourish it as a powerful cultural force at the dawn of the 21st century. (Available from Media Education Foundation, 60 minutes)
YOU ARE CORDIALLY INVITED TO

the RECEPTION HONORING OUR PAST PRESIDENTS

and the

AWARDS BANQUET

at the

Wyndham Hotel
160 Spring Street NW

Saturday, August 16

RECEPTION: 7:00pm - 7:45pm
BANQUET: 8:00pm - 10:00pm

AWARDS TO BE PRESENTED

SSSP Division Awards: Winners of various student paper competitions and other division awards will be announced.

C. Wright Mills Award: For a distinguished book that exemplifies outstanding social science research and an understanding of the individual and society in the tradition of C. Wright Mills.

Lee Founders Award: For recognition of significant achievements that have demonstrated continuing devotion to the ideals of the founders of the Society and especially to the humanistic tradition of the Lee’s.

Minority Graduate Scholarship: This $10,000 scholarship is given annually for support of graduate study and commitment to a career of scholar-activism.

Social Action Award: This award is given to a not-for-profit organization in the Atlanta area in recognition of challenging social inequalities, promoting social change, and/or working toward the empowerment of marginalized peoples.

Join us for a catered reception with a cash bar honoring our Past Presidents. The reception is complimentary to all SSSP members and will be hosted by the pool. In the event of rain or extreme heat, the reception will be held in the pre-function area located outside Centennial A and B.

The Awards Banquet will be held in Centennial A and B. The Mexican Fiesta banquet will be served buffet style. It will feature a fresh fruit bowl, southwestern style garden salad, jicama and apple salad, bean and fennel salad, self-serve beef and chicken fajitas with condiments, pork burritos verde, cheese enchiladas, vegetarian black beans and Spanish rice, condiments bar, flan with kahlua and sopapilla desserts. A vegan entree will be available for those who request one. A cash bar will be available. Come celebrate with your friends and colleagues and enjoy the evening!

The reception honoring our past presidents is complimentary to all members.
The cost of a banquet ticket is $40 per person.

A limited number of banquet tickets will be sold in the registration area. Those with advance reservations will receive their ticket/s with their registration materials.
Announcing the

FINALISTS for the
2002 C. WRIGHT MILLS AWARD


Martha K. Huggins, Mika Haritos-Fatouros, and Philip G. Zimbardo, *Violence Workers: Police Torturers and Murderers Reconstruct Brazilian Atrocities*, University of California Press


David N. Pellow, *Garbage Wars: The Struggle for Environmental Justice in Chicago*, the MIT Press

Francesca Polletta, *Freedom is an Endless Meeting: Democracy in American Social Movements*, University of Chicago Press

*Congratulations to this year’s finalists!*

The 2002 C. Wright Mills Award will be presented on Saturday, August 16 at the Awards Banquet.

---

**C. WRIGHT MILLS AWARD COMMITTEE**

Vicki Smith, Chair, University of California, Davis
Beth Schneider, Chair-Elect, University of California, Santa Barbara
Mitch Duneier, University of California, Santa Barbara
Phoebe Morgan, Northern Arizona University
Belinda Robnett, University of California, Irvine
Ronnie Steinberg, Vanderbilt University
A. Javier Treviño, Wheaton College
This year's SSSP meeting again will include a book exhibit specially organized by the *LIBRARY OF SOCIAL SCIENCE* (LSS). LSS seeks your input in developing a comprehensive collection of titles on social problems and related fields. The book exhibit will include publications encompassing the full range of topics in sociology. It will bring together recent and significant titles and contribute substantially to the intellectual value of our conference. We especially wish to include *BOOKS WRITTEN BY AUTHORS WHO WILL BE SPEAKING AT THE MEETING*. If you are an *AUTHOR* and wish to have your book included – or are aware of recent titles in the field that should be included in this display – please complete and return this form.

There are two ways to complete this form:

1) Print & fill out the form, then fax to 413-832-8145, or
2) Save the page, type in the requested information, and email it to MeiHaChan@cs.com.

For additional information on the book exhibit, *authors and publishers may call 718-393-1075.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book Exhibit Recommendation Form</th>
<th>2003 SSSP Meeting in Atlanta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your Name:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Phone &amp; Email:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Date:</td>
<td>Publisher Contact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Date:</td>
<td>Publisher Contact:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Title:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Date:</td>
<td>Publisher Contact:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Society for the Study of Social Problems
53rd Annual Meeting Registration
August 15-17, 2003
Wyndham Hotel, 160 Spring Street NW, Atlanta, GA
(Program Participant Deadline: Participants on the Annual Meeting program must preregister by May 31.)

Last Name:____________________________________ First/Middle Name: __________________________

Work Affiliation(s) for badge: ________________________________________________________________

Preferred Mailing Address: _________________________________________________________________

Work Phone: ___________________________Home Phone: ___________________________Email: __________

*REGISTRATION FEES (US DOLLARS): Check one

☐ Member Registration Including Banquet
☐ Member Registration Only
☐ Student/Unemployed Member Registration Including Banquet
☐ Student/Unemployed Member Registration Only
☐ Non-Member Registration
(for non-exempt presenters who do not wish to become members)
☐ Non-Member Student Registration
(for non-exempt student presenters who do not wish to become members)

Preregistration (until July 15) On-Site
$135 $150
$95 $110
$60 $80
$20 $40
$145 $160
$70 $90

GUEST REGISTRATION: One guest registration is permitted with each full registration category above. Guest registration provides a name badge only (name only, no affiliation). Any guest who wants full access to SSSP sessions or special events and a program packet must register individually and pay the full registration fee and membership dues.

☐ Guest (name badge only)

$10 $20

Guest Badge: ________________________________________________________________

Last Name

First Name

SUBTOTAL

ADDITIONAL BANQUET TICKET(S): Saturday, August 16, 8:00pm - 10:00pm, $40 each
☐ Check here for a vegan entree(s).

DONATE A BANQUET TICKET PROGRAM:
Donate a banquet ticket to a deserving graduate student, foreign scholar, or scholar-activist, $40 each

SPECIAL EVENT: AIDS FUNDRAISER
Friday, August 15, 9:00pm - 11:00pm, tickets $15 each (Students and new members will receive a complimentary ticket.)
Pre-Dance Performances/Exhibits will begin at 8:00pm.

SUBTOTAL

*MEMBERSHIP DUES: You must be a current member to attend the Annual Meeting. If you are already a 2003 member, skip this section.

☐ Life Members, Emeriti, before 1989 $0 ☐ $25,000-$34,999 $65
☐ “New” Emeriti, beginning in 1989 $35 ☐ $35,000-$44,999 $75
☐ Students $20 ☐ $45,000-$54,999 $90
☐ Unemployed $20 ☐ $55,000-$64,999 $105
☐ First Year Employment after Ph.D. $35 ☐ $65,000-$74,999 $120
☐ First Time Professional Member $35 ☐ $75,000 & up $135
☐ $24,999 and under $50 ☐ Life Membership $1,200

SUBTOTAL

OVER GRAND TOTAL
Make check or money order payable, in US DOLLARS to SSSP or provide credit card authorization below.

Credit Card Type: □ Mastercard    □ Visa

Credit Card Number ___________________________  Exp. Date ___________  Signature (mandatory ) ___________________________

Office Use Only: Date ___________  Initials _______  Authorization #:______________________________

DEADLINE: Forms and payments must be postmarked by/faxed no later than July 15 to be eligible for the preregistration discount. Preregistration ends on July 15. Any forms received after July 15 will be processed at the on-site rate. All program participants must preregister by May 31 in order to have their names listed in the Final Program.

REFUND POLICY: Registration fees will be refunded to persons who notify us prior to July 15. Once the Final Program is printed and participant packets have been prepared, the cost of processing the participant has occurred. Unfortunately, under no circumstances can SSSP issue refunds for no-shows.

ACCESSIBILITY SERVICES: Registrants with disabilities may request accessibility services such as sign language interpreters, sighted guides, accessible accommodations, etc., to facilitate their full participation in the Annual Meeting. If you need accessibility services, please check the box below. The Administrative Officer will contact you about service arrangements.

□ Accessible Services Request: ___________________________________________

DONATE A BANQUET TICKET PROGRAM: Some members have purchased extra banquet tickets for graduate students, foreign scholars, and scholar-activists. Please check the box below if you are interested in applying for a complimentary ticket. Donated tickets will be distributed on a first come/first served basis. SSSP will notify all recipients no later than July 15.

□ I would like to be considered for a complimentary banquet ticket.

Please indicate your classification.    □ Graduate Student    □ Foreign Scholar    □ Scholar-Activist

MEETING MENTOR PROGRAM: Last year, we offered a mentoring program for graduate students and new members and it was met with much success.

Would you like to participate in the Meeting Mentor Program? If so, we will pair you with a mentor and provide you with his/her contact information no later than July 31.

□ Yes    □ No    If yes, list your areas of interest. ___________________________________________

Would you be willing to serve as a mentor for a graduate student or new faculty member?

□ Yes    □ No    If yes, list your areas of interest. ___________________________________________

ROOMMATE MATCHING SERVICE: Do you want to be in the roommate matching database? If so, we will send you a list of those who are interested in sharing a room no later than June 16. Please indicate your smoking preference.

□ Yes    □ No    □ Smoking    □ Non-smoking

RETURN FORM WITH PAYMENT IN US DOLLARS TO:

SSSP, University of Tennessee, 901 McClung Tower, Knoxville, TN 37996-0490; or fax to (865) 689-1534 (credit card payments only); or register online at http://www.sssp1.org (credit card payments only).

GENERAL INQUIRIES SHOULD BE SENT TO:

Michele Smith Koontz, Administrative Officer
SSSP, University of Tennessee, 901 McClung Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996-0490
Work: (865) 689-1531; Fax: (865) 689-1534; Email: mkoontz3@utk.edu
http://www.sssp1.org

SSSP FEDERAL ID TAX #: 35-126-3022

*Requests for exemption from meeting registration and membership dues must be approved by: Mona Danner, Program Co-Chair sssp2003@odu.edu or Nancy Wonders, Program Co-Chair nancy.wonders@nau.edu or Nancy Jurik, President nancy.jurik@asu.edu.
Wyndham Atlanta

GROUP: THE SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

DATE: AUGUST 12-20, 2003

ROOM RATE: $145.00 Single/Double/Triple/Quadruple
$175.00 Club Level

(PLEASE NOTE: THERE ARE A LIMITED NUMBER OF ROOMS WITH 2 BEDS PER ROOM. FIRST COME - FIRST SERVED)

MAKE YOUR HOTEL RESERVATIONS TODAY!
CALL TOLL-FREE @ 1-800-996-3426

With Every Room:

Pillow-top mattress, feather bed, 100% goose down duvet and pillows, 250-thread-count, cotton sheets, Golden Door bath products, cotton pique bathrobes, iron, ironing board, hair dryer, coffee maker, complimentary use of health club and swimming pool, oversized desk, clock radio with CD player, and video cassette player, 27" TV with internet access, High-Speed Internet access, dual-line cordless phone with dataport, voice mail, speaker, and conference capabilities.

How to Make Reservations:

Please call 1-800-996-3426 to make your reservations, ask for The Society for the Study of Social Problems room rate.

Cut-off Date:

Reservations must be confirmed by Monday, July 14th, 2003 to guarantee your negotiated group rate. Reservations received after this date or if the room block is filled prior to that date, are subject to availability and rate increase. Rates are subject to prevailing taxes at 14%.

Reservation Guarantee:

Guestroom reservations are guaranteed with a major credit card. Cancellation policy is 72 hours prior to arrival to avoid a penalty charge. Check-in is 3:00pm and Checkout is Noon. An early departure fee of one night's room and tax will be charged to any guest checking out prior to stated departure date.

Wyndham Atlanta • 160 Spring Street NW • Atlanta, GA 30303
Hotel Direct 404-688-8600