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A NOTE FROM THE EDITOR

In this issue, former SSSP President Doris Wilkinson presents a provocative argument for problems stemming from the use of the concept minority. I thank her for this essay and invite your comments and responses. We also have reviews of two books: Where Now for New Labour, by Anthony Giddens, and Through My Own Eyes: Single Mothers and the Cultures of Poverty, by Susan D. Holloway, Bruce Fuller, Marylee F. Ramboaud, and Constanza Eggers-Pierola. Thanks go to Richard Dello Buono and Keith Kilty for their reviews.

I also want to draw your attention to the biographies of candidates for the 2003 SSSP general election. We are fortunate to have an excellent slate of candidates to fill many important positions.

As always, I would like to encourage you to write letters to the editor, and to volunteer to write book reviews or essays for Social Problems Forum. Our Newsletter can only be as vibrant as the material that is contributed to it. Please contact me with contributions and ideas.

Stephen R. Couch, Editor
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SSSP MEMBER NEWS

Barbara Katz Rothman, City University of New York, currently a visiting professor at the University of Osnabrueck in Germany has been named a Leverhulme Visiting Professor in the United Kingdom for Spring 2003. She will be based at Plymouth University, but traveling throughout the UK.
Dear SSSP Member:

We want to inform you about an exciting new SSSP project—Justice 21—and to invite your participation. Justice 21 is a project designed to inform the public-at-large about the nation’s most pressing social problems and to propose a public policy response to those problems. This project will reaffirm the commitment of SSSP to social justice, and enable the association, as a corporate body, to speak on public issues. Every four years, coinciding with the national presidential elections, SSSP will issue a report on the nation’s social ills. This report will be an “agenda for social justice,” in that it will contain recommendations for action by the nation’s elected officials and policy makers. The report will be distributed to national progressive organizations, policy centers, national labor organizations, members of Congress, state governors, mayors of larger cities, national newspapers, alternative newspapers, and political journals.

The quadrennial report will be a product of the most valid and reliable knowledge we have about social problems and it will be a joint effort of the members and Divisions of SSSP. We are beginning preparation of the first Justice 21 report that will be issued in the spring or summer of 2004, and we invite you to consider preparing a “chapter” for this publication. We ask you, individually or with other colleagues, to consider submitting a brief proposal (1-2 pp) identifying a problem(s) of concern to members of SSSP, and to respond to the questions: What do we know? How do we know it? What is to be done? As the Coordinating Committee for Justice 21, we will consider all the proposals and invite members to prepare a draft statement for inclusion in the report.

Please consider submitting a proposal to us by April 30, 2003, and contact us if you have questions or would like additional information.

Sincerely,
Kathleen Ferraro, JoAnn Miller, Robert Perrucci, Paula Rodriguez Rust
kathleen.ferraro@asu.edu
millerj@soc.purdue.edu
perruccir@soc.purdue.edu
paularust@world.oberlin.edu

P.S. For an expanded discussion of Justice 21 see the May 2001 issue of Social Problems ("Inventing Social Justice").

Send all materials to:
Stephen R. Couch, Editor
Center for Environment and Community
The Pennsylvania State University
The Capital College
200 University Drive
Schuylkill Haven, PA 17972
Tel. (570) 385-6072
FAX: (570) 385-6027
Email: SRC@PSU.EDU
Anne Mercuri, Editorial Assistant
Pennsylvania State University
Society for the Study of Social Problems
University of Tennessee, Knoxville
901 McClung Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996-0490
Tel: (865) 689-1531
FAX: (865) 689-1534
Michele Smith Koontz, Administrative Officer
Email: MKOONTZ3@UTK.EDU
Nancy Brannon, Graduate Research Assistant
Email: SSSP@UTK.EDU
Tom Hood, Executive Officer
Email: TOMHOOD@UTK.EDU

Visit the SSSP Homepage - www.it.utk.edu/sssp

We welcome essays, commentary and letters for consideration. Submissions by email or diskette given preference. Copyright ©2003, Society for the Study of Social Problems. The Deadline for the next issue is April 26, 2003
FROM THE EXECUTIVE OFFICE
TOM HOOD

The Society begins the New Year with a strong agenda of work ahead. The bulk of our members are citizens of the United States of America. Our country’s leadership appears to be leading us toward war rather than peaceful solutions of international conflict. The leadership appears to be bent on promoting more economic inequality and to “turn back the clock” on issues of choice for women. Affirmative action in higher education is under attack by the Executive branch of our government as well. Many of these actions would appear to undermine the ideals of freedom and equality of opportunity which many believe are values which have made the United States of America great. The Society for the Study of Social Problems believes that as scholars we can pursue and speak out for justice. Now is the time for critical scholarship. Speak out for justice. Recruit others who believe that scholars can and should act to persuade those in positions of power to work for liberty, equality and fraternity to JOIN OUR CAUSE.

The Nominations Committee and Elections Committee have prepared a strong slate of candidates. Their records and their statements appear in this issue. You will be receiving your ballot shortly. Read the qualifications and candidate statements. Consider the choices. VOTE. We in the Executive Office want you to select the people who represent your choice for the position not just the choice of a minority of the members of the Society who took the time to vote. Let us have more than fifty percent of the membership vote in this election. This goal is one that I hope each of you who receive this issue of SOCIAL PROBLEMS FORUM will help the Society achieve.

The Atlanta meeting plans are moving ahead rapidly, by now most of you have made your submissions and are waiting to hear on acceptance for participation in the program. We are excited about the prospects of meeting in Atlanta. For those who have participated in or are familiar with the civil rights struggle, the Martin Luther King, Jr. Center is located in the center of the city not too far from our hotel. Atlanta is the location of progressive organizations like Project South. Clark Atlanta University is the location of the Environmental Justice Resource Center, a leader in research on just transportation and other environmental issues such as urban sprawl. The Center Director, Robert D. Bullard is well known for his pioneering work on environmental justice issues.

We hope that each of you will plan your year now so that you’ll be able to attend a meeting that promises to be exciting in a city where struggles for equality and justice continue. Atlanta remains one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the country. Between 1990 and 2000 the area grew 38.9\% to a population of 4,112,198, ranking twelfth in size of metropolitan areas in the country. We look forward to seeing you in Atlanta.

Following the instructions of the Board of Directors, we have updated our web site. The new site should be on line by mid-March. Be sure to visit and give us your feedback. Once again be sure to get acquainted with our new Graduate Assistant, Nancy Brannon and thank Michele Koontz for her continuing excellent service to the Society. We are here to serve you and to help SSSP achieve its purposes as an organization.

Don’t forget to ask a colleague to join or renew their membership and consider sponsoring the membership of a graduate student.

Tom Hood, Executive Officer
Feature Essay

Concept Refinement: Toward Rational Policy Making

Doris Wilkinson
University of Kentucky

One of the most emotionally and politically charged areas as well as conceptions in American society and culture and hence in the sciences, law, journalism and medicine is that of race. Presently, academic disputes about whether races exist abound in colleges and universities across the country. These spurious and irrelevant debates are not anchored in the racial history of the nation nor in reasonable dialogue about anatomical differences that have assumed both biological and social meaning. Race is not merely a social construction. Whatever we wish to call those who differ anatomically, biologically and genetically, the arguments against the race variable have no bearing on biology, history or prevailing empirical realities.

In addition to the current academic discourse, the long-term avoidance or minimization of the words race and racism in the social sciences has perhaps helped to pave the way for the virtual institutionalization of the "minority" construct. Yet, this multifaceted word is far more problematic than the cross-disciplinary one that has conventionally designated actual or measurable distinctions among and between people of different biological and genetic backgrounds.

A linguistic and historical appraisal of the minority descriptor discloses its numerous conceptual and methodological deficiencies. These suggest an ambiguous composite of immensely distinct ethnic groups as well as the inaccurate juxtaposition of life styles and behaviors with race and racial identity. The present application of the minority concept in the social sciences, the political arena and in the media denotes its obvious omission of a historical context and its lack of meaningfulness.

"Minority" has evolved as a functional tool that has minimal policy relevance and no scientific validity. A comprehensive assessment of the impact of the sustained application of the conception substantiates its erasure of distinct demographic attributes and associated historical processes. Further, this euphemistic label results in disregarding factual and unchallengeable essentials and the economic and social realities encountered by racially estranged and oppressed populations.

Actually, the purposively designed label is unconnected to the expressed desires and needs of identifiable racial and ethnic populations. Instead, the description coincides with new modes of attenuating "race matters" and class related social problems. Impartial inquiries into the contemporary uses of "minority" unquestionably confirm that the classification is insufficient in its scope. Also, it's use does not convey acceptable rules for concept construction nor rational decision making. With respect to the nation's ills, the arena of policy formulation requires sound premises and truths. Thus, in the specialties that concentrate on social problems, a compelling emergency exists to disassociate race - a bio-genetic construct - from behavior and life styles.

The protracted assertion and fixation on including races in the minority classification emits an unusual component of the social science consciousness. Understandably, the deliberate grouping of races in the minority assemblage is an affront. Hence, it is logical for those so identified to seek to be removed from the biased and useless categories to which they have been unwillingly assigned. Social scientists must be willing to accept the fact that behavioral paradigms are fundamentally different from racial taxonomies.
"In a free country, people should be able to identify themselves in whatever fashion they wish, and all people should recognize this . . . Undeniably all groups have their own history, but the greatest methodological error is to compare Black Americans to experiences, behaviors, or health conditions. . . The term minority lumps all groups together, thus creating a 'research' category that can produce results that do not square with the realities of the world. . . It strips you of your historical accomplishments. . . [Groups] should draw on their own relevant histories, and not consistently compare themselves to the history of Black Americans . . ." (Butler, 2002: 27-32.)

Selected References


FUTURE SSSP ANNUAL MEETINGS

August 15-17, 2003
Wyndham Hotel
160 Spring Street NW
Atlanta, GA

August 13-15, 2004
Cathedral Hill Hotel
San Francisco, CA

August 12-14, 2005
Crowne Plaza Hotel
Philadelphia, PA
Richard A. Dello Buono
Dominican University

In this short, political treatise written right around the attacks of 11 September 2001, renowned sociologist Anthony Giddens primarily seeks to defend the British Labour Party administration of Tony Blair. More generally, he sets out to argue the virtues of the so-called "Third Way" within European social democracy. Giddens who is currently the director of the London School of Economics and Political Science, devotes the bulk of his attention to defending Blair's policies from its critics on the left, where the rejection of the "New Labour" Party platform has been most consistent and indeed where dissent has been steadily growing even within the Labour Party itself. In the course of developing a "critique of the critics," he presents a capsulated version of Labour's Third Way project and why he believes it represents the best alternative for Europe.

Giddens essentially argues that the British Left has refused to confront the changing conditions of the global scene and for that reason has "unfairly" accused Blair and the New Labour leadership of veering to the right. In the first chapter, the reasons for this "fallacious" attitude of the left in Britain are summarized by reference to four basic factors: "insularity," "memory loss," "intellectual laziness" and the "Groucho Marx tendency."

Insularity refers here to the idea of how the British left supposedly fails to recognize that all social democratic movements by necessity had to swing to the right in order to confront new structural realities associated with increasing globalization. Citing Wolfgang Merkel's typology of "Third Way" strategies, Giddens acknowledges that Blair's version of "New Labour" can be distinguished from the Dutch "polder model," the "reformed welfare state path" of Sweden, and the "statist path" of the French socialists. Yet, all of these tendencies, he argues, have moved to the right in response to structural pressures which ultimately served to render traditional welfare state policies and Keynesian regulatory practices ineffective. Among these, the French socialists have been the most ideologically resistant to such reforms among European social democratic parties, rejecting the term "Third Way" and opting for a position best symbolized by Lionel Jospin's slogan, "Yes to a market economy, no to a market society." Yet, the point is well taken that European Social Democrats have as a whole moved to the "center" by preserving and even expanding some of the right-wing policies of their conservative predecessors. In this, the French have certainly represented no exception.

With respect to the "memory loss" of the left, Giddens reasons that social democracy had been largely defeated across Europe in the 1980's, just before staging a remarkable comeback in the 1990's. The electoral victories included those of Tony Blair in the UK, Lionel Jospin at the head of the red-green coalition in the French parliament, Gerhard Schröder and the Social Democrats in Germany, and the Olive Tree coalition in Italy, all of which coincided with the electoral reign of Bill Clinton in the United States. Like Clinton who won on a "New Democratic" platform of "returning the party of liberals towards the center," Blair likewise modeled his "centrist" platform of "New Labour" upon Clinton's winning formula.

It is of course no secret that the wave of social democratic governments that swept to power in Europe during the 1990's has since fallen into crisis. Giddens recognizes this by noting the scant margins of victory for most of the ruling social democratic parties, but maintains that this trend can be abated if the "new" social democrats can more clearly explain their position in ideological and political terms.
"Intellectual laziness" on the part of left critics relates to Giddens's assertion that the left does not wish to engage in the "hard analysis" which must acknowledge that policy decision-making involves a series of "trade-offs" with respect to social welfare expenditures. Giddens maintains that the only viable option for New Labour is to place a high priority on social investment in the form of job training and retooling programs as opposed to the traditional schemes of income redistribution generally demanded by old school social democrats. This requires that New Labour churn out the same messages which the Clinton Administration had produced in order to justify social spending cutbacks, invoking official admissions of the failure of traditional social welfare programs in their creation of dependency and bureaucratic inefficiency.

Finally, the "Groucho Marx" tendency refers to how the British left, according to Giddens, rejects the possibility that any real reforms can emerge within the established sphere of British politics, and so it attacks social democracy even more vehemently than the right. In summary, the strategy of the "new social democracy" is to engage in a profound rethinking of leftist doctrines in light of new changes such as increasing globalization, the so-called dysfunctionality of the welfare state, and the emergence of new risks and dangers associated with environmental crises.

Giddens insists that the new social democracy seeks to preserve the basic values of the left, i.e., solidarity and inclusiveness, protection of the vulnerable, and promotion of the goal of equality by way of a strong government and active public institutions. But the strategies to attain such goals must now utilize new formulas to fulfill these objectives, including a substantial reform of the state, greater fiscal discipline, an overhaul of the welfare state, promoting equality via opportunity structures rather than direct redistribution schemes, an embracing of law and order politics, an incorporation of greater environmental sensitivity in policy-making, and the creation of an international perspective which includes embracing Britain's integration into the European Union.

In taking up this agenda, new social democrats must at the same time concentrate on the conditions that are necessary to achieve electoral victory. For Giddens, this essentially signifies abandoning the project of leftist ideological impurity and adopting more centrist imagery in refocusing efforts on the "real concerns" of voters across a wide spectrum of cross-class constituencies.

Giddens very clearly asserts his belief that many reforms introduced by Thatcher in the UK and the conservative governments of France and Christian Democrats of Germany were entirely necessary. Hence, it was correct for the social democratic governments that followed them to maintain, and in some cases, expand such policies. He argues that the "old left" and "Thatcherism" each had strong points which must now be reconciled by social democrats in a context of "trade-offs." Indeed, Giddens argues that "new Labour" correctly had to move to "outflank" the right on issues of national defense and law and order.

In building New Labour's case for privatization via the formation of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), Giddens expresses his own position that Blair must move still further in embracing them. He argues that political considerations have prevented Blair from moving more aggressively in this direction, thus creating public-private mixtures that seem to exhibit the negative aspects of both public and private enterprise. He makes reference to the debacle of the British Rail System, but summarily dismisses the failure of the private firm Railtrack as simply the product of the sorry state of the British rail system prior to the privatization. So while the Labour Party administration needs to intervene in order to rescue the rail system, Giddens argues that this does not mean that Labour should advocate renationalization of this or any other industry. Just as the Bush Administration needs to intervene to save the U.S. airline industry, so too is the Blair government obliged to assist British Air in order to avert wide-scale social fallout. But this does not mean that such moves are a desirable political direction to pursue in the Third Way. In short, Giddens seeks to identify privatization with the democratization of the social economy, something that effectively collides with his own observations. For example, he correctly points out that in various cases, privatization simply resulted in the creation of a private monopoly, free of the kind of competition which he argues can compel producers and service providers to be efficient. The key, he argues, is for the process to be gradual, well-thought out and free of "political motivations." Not much structural analysis to be found here.

Giddens concludes that the main challenge facing New Labour is the need to further develop its ideological core, creating a vision of the type of society which the UK should become, with particular emphasis upon clarifying the role of public institutions, conceding greater centrality to environmental criteria in its decision making, and a projecting a clear formula for how the UK should relate to the international order. The "second phase of the Third Way," i.e., the second term of the Blair administration, ostensibly created the conditions for engaging in a more comprehensive redefinition of the project of New Labour.
On an optimistic note, Giddens asserts that the current crisis of conservative forces is equally convincing. The collapse of Soviet communism, he argues, has proved even more ideologically disorienting for the right since the disappearance of anti-communism eliminated its principal unifying feature. He notes that Christian Democracy, the main conservative force in Europe, has fallen into a full scale collapse while "compassionate conservatism" or "caring conservatism" has proven in the United States and elsewhere to be more of a short-lived campaign gimmick than a bona fide move towards the center on the part of right wing forces.

The weak level of analysis contained in this book will undoubtedly surprise readers who are familiar with the more theoretical treatises of Anthony Giddens. Although he is to be commended for the clarity and lack of jargon in a work which is basically designed to sway voters in Great Britain, the total lack of a critical analysis makes the essay more suitable for fragmentary publication in The Economist, with perhaps some manageable excerpts for Newsweek. In academic terms, it is most useful as a primary source for those interested in exploring the current crisis which plagues European social democracy.

It is probably no coincidence that Giddens completely avoids any discussion of British foreign policy aside from European integration, because here one begins to sense even more clearly the essential similarity between Thatcherism and Blair's New Labour strategy. Blair has repeatedly had to confront his own closest allies for his near total support of U.S. interventionism, something which has well outlined the "new Democratic" administration of Clinton and has blended in well with the post-Sept. 11th militarism of the Bush-Rumsfeld regime. The popular media imagery which surfaced in Britain by mid-2002, posing Blair as a "poodle" lackey to Washington, has further served to heighten internal tensions within the Labour Party.

In one very particular sense, this book is inspiring because it shows how the sociological imagination is capable on occasion of expressing itself politically and in plain English. This notwithstanding, Giddens falls far too excessively into the "party politics" of the Labour Party to offer much insight into the generalized crisis of European social democracy. It is insufficient to argue that New Labour needs to sharpen its message to the voters. Giddens needed to explain why Blair finds himself increasingly trapped in the social contradictions that surround an ideological reform process being fought out within social democratic parties, one that has effectively presided over a neo-conservative policy agenda on both the domestic and international fronts. He may, however, be working against the clock. Recent electoral setbacks of the social democratic parties and coalitions in Italy, Norway, and particularly France seem to suggest that even Blair's more right-wing formula may be insufficient to maintain voter support for long. The split caused by growing anti-immigrant sentiments and candidates on the right (e.g. France's Le Pen and the National Front, Holland's Fortuyn and the LPF, Austria's Haider and the FPÖ, etc.) and a growing anti-globalization, anti-capitalist and/or anti-imperialist militancy on the left (e.g. France's Laguiller and the French Trotskyists (Lutte Ouvrière), Germany's Fischer and the Greens (Die GRÜNEN), etc.) is producing growing electoral support in both directions, marking a political sea change on the continent.

Susan D. Holloway, Bruce Fuller, Marylee F. Rambaud, and Costanza Eggers-Pierola
Through My Own Eyes: Single Mothers and the Cultures of Poverty
Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997
Keith M. Kilty
Ohio State University

While those who live in poverty are often the objects of study, only occasionally are they given the opportunity to describe their lives in their own words. Most of the time, it is others – whether social scientists or journalists or other commentators – who describe what they believe means to be poor. According to Susan Holloway and her colleagues, those who observe the lives of the poor more often than not fail to see them as individuals, instead describing them in categorical terms. Further, these observers see the poor as different from the non-poor as well as often also seeing them as responsible for their plight. The intent of Through My Own Eyes: Single Mothers and the Cultures of Poverty is to give a group of poor women an opportunity to tell their own stories about their lives and circumstances. As the authors suggest in the subtitle, these firsthand accounts will show just how diverse lives in poverty can be. The intent of this
book is certainly laudable and potentially a valuable addition to the literature on poverty and inequality. Unfortunately, it is questionable what new light the authors shed on these matters.

This qualitative study is based on in-depth interviews with 14 poor women, all single mothers, living in four neighborhoods in the Boston area. Each woman was interviewed a minimum of three times between July 1991 and May 1994. They vary in race and ethnicity, with six being Black, four Latina, and four white. Four of the women’s lives are discussed in detail, although the authors do not make it clear why they chose those particular women, nor do those descriptions connect with the issues later raised in the book. Specific chapters focus on a range of concerns, including conceptions of children’s behavior, methods of child rearing, child care, discipline and obedience, education, and welfare. Since child care is an important topic, there is also a chapter drawn from interviews with preschool teachers, in terms of how the teachers relate to the lived experiences and worldviews of the mothers.

While some of the descriptions of the lives of these single mothers are poignant and compelling, the book is a limited addition to the growing literature giving voice to those living in poverty. A much more powerful account of women in poverty can be found in Diane Dujon and Ann Withorn’s For Crying out Loud: Women’s Poverty in the United States (1996) or the article by Sandra Sue Butler and Mary Katherine Nevin, “Welfare Mothers Speak: One State’s Efforts to Bring Recipient Voices to the Welfare Debate,” in the Journal of Poverty (1997). In fact, the authors of Through My Own Eyes overstate the significance of their book and suggest that there is very little similar literature available. Their literature review is not only skimpy but very selective and ignores the wealth of information that exists on the lives of the poor, particularly using the voices of those in poverty.

The authors seem to confuse a number of issues, and that is likely due to their limited awareness of the dynamics of poverty and inequality. As is often the case, they confuse poverty and public welfare. Throughout the history of this country, most poor people have had to fend for themselves. Even at the height of the AFDC program in the early to mid 1990s, less than a third of all those officially defined as poor received public assistance, and, with the advent of “welfare reform” in the form of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) of 1996, even fewer now receive public aid. Yet the authors assert early in their book (page 8) that government supports were growing throughout the 1980s, an actual era of reduction in public support that coincided with increasing poverty rates. Identifying Lawrence Mead as a “moderate” (or even “liberal”) illustrates the authors’ limited grasp of the politics of poverty policy.

One of the points that the authors highlight is the support that some of the women received from family and community and how significant that was for their well-being. The authors seem to feel that this was a critical finding on their part. Yet Carol Stack made this same point in her classic All Our Kin in 1974 – a piece of literature that is not cited anywhere in this volume.

The authors present a confusing picture of the politics of poverty and poverty policy. They note at some points how significant government assistance can be, but they also fall into the critique of welfare programs advanced by neo-liberals and conservatives during the past twenty years. People need to rely on their own strengths and resources, according to the authors. While that is certainly true, it also helps to have resources to pay for rent and food and clothes and transportation and child care. As Michael Harrington pointed out many years ago, a lack of money is at the root of poverty. Their critique of the “culture of poverty” thesis reflects their limited familiarity with conceptions of poverty and inequality. In fact, they use the term “culture” apparently as a synonym for life perspective.

While there are some gripping personal stories in Through My Own Eyes, the book has limited relevance for understanding the lives of the poor now, since the data were collected prior to the elimination of AFDC and the introduction of TANF in 1997. Congress is now considering reauthorization of PRWORA, including even more punitive rules and limited support to recipients of public assistance. If the economy continues its decline, the circumstances for poor women and their children are increasingly perilous. A study just published by the U.S. Conference of Mayors documents increasing problems for the poor in finding affordable housing and maintaining adequate food supplies in their homes (see their 2002 Hunger and Homelessness report - http://www.usmayors.org/USCM/home.asp).
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 an 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://itc.utk.edu/sssp/ for current contact information) or directly to the SSSP Vice-President at rdellob@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 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 (eerl@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!
ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NEWSLETTER EDITOR

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
THE CENTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND COMMUNITY
200 UNIVERSITY DRIVE
SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA 17972
(570) 385-6072

DATE: July 9, 2002

TO: SSSP Board of Directors and SSSP Editorial and Publications Committee

FROM: Stephen R. Couch, Editor, Social Problems Forum: The SSSP Newsletter


I have now completed three years as Editor of the SSSP Newsletter (Volume 30, Number 3 through Volume 33, Number 2). This year’s three issues have appeared on schedule and within the allotted budget. I have requested the same budget amount for the coming year.

I wish to extend my sincere thanks to all who contributed material to the Newsletter during the past year. I also wish to thank Tom Hood and Michele Koontz for their excellent support, and the Newsletter’s Editorial Assistant, Anne Mercuri, for her invaluable assistance.

With the Winter 2001 issue, the Newsletter assumed its new name, Social Problems Forum: The SSSP Newsletter. The Newsletter also took a new format, one which attempted to present a more up-to-date style while maintaining continuity with the old Newsletter format. I look forward to your comments and suggestions to continue to improve the Newsletter’s appearance.

This coming year, I will be soliciting guest coordinators for a new feature for the Newsletter. Entitled “Perspectives on Social Problems,” the feature will consist of three or four essays addressing theory, research and policy on a particular social problem. The essays of 1000-1500 words should provide SSSP members with interesting reading on various social problems from a variety of perspectives. I would be happy to consider suggestions for topics and volunteers for acting as a guest coordinator.

I am also hoping to increase the number of other substantive essays, book and film reviews, and letters to the editor. In order to do this, I will need assistance from the SSSP Board and membership. I will attempt to be even more proactive in seeking written material for the Newsletter from our membership. At the same time, I need your help to submit unsolicited material; to encourage others to submit material; and to send me ideas of people to approach for material. I am convinced that the Newsletter, while doing a good job of communicating information among our membership, can do a better job at promoting dialogue and discussion among us about issues of common interest. I ask your active help in bringing these changes to fruition.

Thank you for your continued support of the SSSP Newsletter.
Final Committee Report – C. Wright Mills Award Committee

Rhys H. Williams, University of Cincinnati, Chair

On behalf of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, the 2001-02 C. Wright Mills committee was delighted to make the award to Pierre Hontagne-Sotelo of the University of Southern California for her book, *Domestica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence* (University of California Press).

The winner was chosen from among a list of seven finalists, the others of which were:

- Elizabeth Chin
  *Purchasing Power: Black Kids and American Consumer Culture*
- Gary Alan Fine and Patricia Turner
  *Whispers Along the Color Line: Rumor and Race in America*
- Robert Gottlieb
  *Environmentalism Unbound: Exploring New Pathways for Change*
- Leslie McCall
  *Complex Inequality: Gender, Class and Race in the New Economy*
- Barbara Perry
  *in the Name of Hate: Understanding Hate Crimes*
- Mitchell L. Stevens
  *Culture and Controversy in the Homeschooling Movement*

While the committee found it difficult to choose only one winner, it was also unanimous in its judgment that Professor Hontagne-Sotelo’s book represented the C. Wright Mills tradition in its highest form. Combining ethnographic data with interviews, survey responses, and historical material, Hontagne-Sotelo charts the “intersection of biography and history” and does a masterful job of showing the connections between “private troubles” and “public issues” in the reproduction of inequality. *Domestica* represents an engaged sociology that does not substitute ideology for empirical and conceptual rigor.

This year’s C. Wright Mills Committee worked together well with a spirit of cooperation. As several questions about procedure arose, including selecting the seven finalists from the 12 books that received the highest rankings in the first round readings, the committee made collective decisions with little rancor or problem. In that regard, having the committee chair serve a two-year term works well, providing at least some measure of precedent for decision-making. However, the committee does have some suggestions that could facilitate future years of committee work.

First, the committee suggests that the criteria for consideration for the award be communicated more clearly. This year, as last, the committee received a number of ineligible books. These included novels, books without a 2001 copyright date, and edited collections. In addition, two nominees were second, largely unaltered editions of previously published books. While the committee reached consensus easily on eligibility issues, clearer guidelines would prevent unnecessary time and expense for the committee and for publishers.

Second, two committee members were authors of potentially eligible books. In one case, the person withdrew from the committee; in the other the author withdrew the publisher’s nomination of the book. While again there was no ultimate problem for the committee, it seems unnecessary to negotiate these arrangements anew each year.

Third, as chair this year I took it upon myself to communicate directly with all the authors whose books were finalists – both announcing their selection as a finalist, and in communicating the final decision. This saved the executive office from having to serve as an information conduit, and kept authors from wondering unduly about the outcome. I suggest that procedure be codified as well.

Finally, as Chair of the committee, I want to express my appreciation to the committee members for their hard work and spirit of cooperation. The committee members were: Vicki Smith, University of California, Davis Chair-Elect; Jackie Eller, Middle Tennessee State University; Peter Kivisto, Augustana College; Donileen R. Loseke, University of South Florida; Eleanor M. Miller, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee and Clayton Mosher, Washington State University.
Lisa Anne Zilney and Michele Smith Koontz performed the day to day operations of the Executive Office this year without a hitch as Michele delivered and began rearing Andrew, Paul and Michele’s first child. Pugh and Co. helped with some of the bookkeeping needs during Michele’s maternity leave. Financially the investments of the Society experienced the same loss as other associations and individual investors. However our economy of operation and the support of the University of Tennessee, the University of California at Irvine, Pennsylvania State University and the schools where many of our officers and committee chairs are located, made possible the continued successful operation of the Society as one of the finest professional associations for social scientists concerned about scholarship in pursuit of justice.

This year Michele moved her office to her home and visits the University at least one day each week. A combination of telephone, e-mail, and fax enables close communication with me, Lisa, and most importantly, the members and officers of the Society. Increasingly, I rely upon Michele to keep the affairs of the Society in order. Those of you who were at the Cincinnati meeting of the Society in 1991 heard me say that a long-term objective I held was to reduce the role of the Executive Officer in the affairs of the Society. Many of the tasks of the Executive Office are routine matters which are best handled by someone who is skilled in organizing, keeping records, responding to members’ requests and resourcing committees. To do this effectively requires learning to respect the varied views and values of our diverse membership and to recognize that each and every member deserves to be heard and to receive some response from either the Executive Office or an appropriate elected officer or committee member. WE ARE A SOCIETY OF MANY DIFFERENT OPINIONS, VALUES AND STYLES OF EXPRESSION. We celebrate this by respecting each other’s right to be heard and respecting the will of the majority when it comes to making hard decisions.

Michele Koontz has been working as Administrative Officer for ten years. She has served as Meeting Manager for one year less. She performs her work with excellence and sensitivity to the goals of the Society and the personal feelings of the members. She has learned how to negotiate with hotels successfully and to be tough with members who want privileges that are against the principles of and decisions made by the Society and its officers.

Recommendation #1 - Consider reducing the role of the Executive Officer in the conduct of the daily business of the Society.

I understand as I have always understood that as Executive Officer, I am responsible for bringing the perspective of a practicing social scientist professional to the day to day affairs of the Society. I have knowledge of the past and present practices and traditions, although my understanding of them is limited by my particular interpretations. I often provide a perspective that is different than the perspective of a student seeking to enter the profession or an administrator in the employ of the Society. This function will continue to be valuable for the Society, but it may be possible to reduce the amount of compensation extended to the Executive Officer to more accurately reflect the amount of time devoted to the position. Reducing the course load by one course during the academic year is valuable in the conduct of the affairs of the Society. Defining the position not more than 1/2 time during the summer months would more accurately represent the time devoted to Society business. It is possible that it could be reduced to 1/3 time. I recognize that this reduction is possible because of the experience and expertise of the current Administrative Officer. Should the occupant of that position change, the role of Executive Officer might be forced to increase as the new person is trained and learns the workings of the Society. The development of a well-accepted operations manual and regular evaluation of the operations of the Executive Office (John Alessio completed a second regularly scheduled evaluation this year) puts the control of the Society where it belongs—in the hands of the elected officers and the Board of Directors. I would be happy to work with the Society toward the goal of defining a reduced role for the Executive Officer, including the reduction in compensation mentioned above.

Last year, I indicated that I plan to change my relationship to the University of Tennessee in the year 2003. This year I have formalized my plans. I shall take emeritus status with the University of Tennessee, starting in July 2004. I have learned that emeritus status does not preclude running contracts through the University of Tennessee. Therefore, should the Society desire to retain the contract with the University of Tennessee for the operation of the Executive Office, I believe that it can be managed for the year 2004 and beyond. Some changes may be necessary in the way that the contract is written. Should the Society ask me to continue as Executive Officer in 2004, I would not need release time from courses for the Fall Semester. The same amount could be provided as a salary for time spent or some compensation might be built into the contract to reimburse the Department of Sociology for hosting the Executive Office. Currently, release time funds from the Society are not exhausted by hiring adjunct faculty to teach courses I am released from teaching. Some evaluation of changes in the contract that should accompany having an emeritus faculty member serve as Executive Officer could be recommended by the Permanent Organization and Strategic Planning Committee. As many of you know I am happily married, my wife is retiring in 2003 and she has endorsed the idea of my continuing to work as Executive Officer should the Society desire my service. (I believe that the contribution to fringe benefits would be reduced because TIAA-CREF contributions would stop with moving to emeritus status. Health insurance is another matter.)

How independent is The Society for the Study of Social Problems? During the past several years, I have asked you to consider the tie that the Society has with the American Sociological Association. Clearly clustered around the ASA are Sociologists for Women in Society, the Association of Black Sociologists, the Association for the Sociology of Religion, the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction, the Sociological Practice Association and the Rural Sociological Society. Is SSSP strong enough
as a Society to meet away from ASA at least every other year at a different time and a different place? Would we attract fewer or more individuals to our meetings? I had to give up my activity in the Association for the Sociology of Religion once I became very active in SSSP. I had to cut back my activity in several sections of ASA. Some sessions of SSSI were out of the question. The overlapping schedule forced me to choose. When the Society for the Social Psychological Study of Social Issues (SSPSSI) approached the Executive Office several years ago, I looked at their model of meeting. This Society was at least one of the inspiration points for Al Lee in making an effort to start SSSP as he wrote in the Journal of Social Issues that commemorated the 25th anniversary of that Society over 30 years ago. The model that they have followed for some years is to meet with the American Psychological Association every other year. On alternate years they meet in another place at a different time. Some alternate years they take the relatively inexpensive alternative of meeting on a university campus with good conference facilities such as the University of Michigan. Many universities could provide facilities adequate to host our annual meeting should we decide to take that route. Many second tier cities have hotels adequate to host our annual meetings but not large enough to host ASA as well. These cities often have lower hotel rates. Being tied to meeting the same place as ASA means that we price ourselves out of the range of some of our members. Should we try a meeting at a different time and place from ASA in 2006? As you know, we contract with hotels three years in advance to assure ourselves of suitable meeting facilities at a favorable price, as close to ASA as possible and that has unionized workers. Is SSSP strong enough to meet separately from ASA on alternate years? Would this make it possible for more of our lower paid members to attend the meetings?

As I have thought about the issue of the cost of attending annual meetings, I have reflected on the changing function of the annual meeting in terms of scholarly exchange. List serves, chat rooms, and discussion groups on the internet have made it possible to have the kind of valuable brief conversations that occur at annual meetings. Now these conversations can be held year round. Sometimes they focus on a book or an article in the same way that conversations might focus on a presentation in a session at an annual meeting. Often you can locate persons who are working on problems similar to the ones that interest you through visiting web sites or through exchanges of e-mail. Annual meetings do provide the opportunity to do workshops and to learn about and/or to polish techniques used in teaching and research. Annual meetings provide a book and non-print fair which offers an opportunity to learn about new publications and media of use in your areas of scholarship and teaching. Face-to-face contact is different than contact by the postal service or the internet and you do meet and become acquainted with persons who share your interests.

Annual meetings are essential to conducting the business of the association or society and provide experience in representative and direct democracy within the boundaries of the Society. In SSSP you may meet some people at the annual meeting who will encourage you in your activist work to better society and to ameliorate the social problems you have recognized. As the internet has grown in importance, do people feel that it is less necessary to attend professional meetings in order to learn new things, detect trends within the field, find out about new publications and films and renew collaborative and cooperative relationships with friends in the discipline?

Recommendation #2- A committee should be formed to examine the functions of attending the annual meeting today. If the functions have changed, then perhaps a change in the way in which SSSP designs its annual meetings should change. For example, if annual meetings are seen as an opportunity for continuing education more than for informal scholarly exchange, perhaps more time in the meeting should be given to workshops designed to introduce and teach research and teaching skills.

In addition some research should examine what portion of expenses of attending the annual meeting are born by the participant herself rather than her employer. Are annual meetings an occasion for building one’s vita, for scholarly exchange, for family vacation, for making contacts with colleagues, for promoting one’s books and/or videos, for looking at support from granting agencies? What makes spending one’s money to come to the SSSP meetings worthwhile?

Since our journal, SOCIAL PROBLEMS, is easily accessible to non-members, what are the advantages of SSSP membership? The current membership is reported elsewhere in your packet of materials. Michele supplied this data on current members:

**CURRENT MEMBERS**

As of 7/31/02-1632  As of 7/31/01-1609  As of 7/31/00-1665  As of 7/31/99-1792  As of 7/31/98-1819

This trend represents a steady decline. Michele has recommended that we change our membership committee so that the Chair and other members serve longer terms. Longer terms would allow the membership committee to try and evaluate different strategies for recruiting members. Based on her experience with the Society, she believes that it would profit the Society to have members serve three-year terms with a third of the committee changing each year. The committee is quite small given the need to have an active recruiting committee. Perhaps the Bylaws could be changed not only to lengthen the terms from one year to three, but also to increase the size of the committee. The Bylaws empower the Board of Directors to propose amendments to the membership by majority vote.

Recommendation #3 – Propose an amendment to raise the number of persons on the membership committee to nine with three persons appointed to a three year term each year. Retain the current method of selecting a chair and chair elect with the stipulation that the President-elects’ recommendation for Chair-elect be from among those members of the committee who have served on the committee for at least one year.

Finally a personal word. I deeply appreciate the privilege of serving as Executive Officer of the Society for the Study of Social Problems. Each year I learn a little more about the variety of people who are at work in our chosen field of study and the many projects they support and goals they achieve. My heartiest thanks to the Board and the members of the Society for being given this challenging opportunity.

_Tom Hood_  
Executive Officer
Final Report of the 2001-2002 Lee Student Support Fund Committee

Catherine Fobes, Committee Chair

First, I want to thank JoAnn Miller and Carolyn Perrucci for their fine work in serving on this year’s committee. I am also grateful to Michele Koontz for her excellent guidance and assistance. Initially, we received sixteen applications, two of which had small requests of $170 and $233.50. The mean request for the remaining fourteen applicants was $458.40. There were no applicants from outside the United States or from Alaska or Hawaii.

Since we had a firm limit of $4,000, we decided to pay the two small requests in full, leaving us with a balance of $3596.50. We decided to divide that by fourteen and award each remaining applicant $256.89. However, in the process of checking the preliminary program to verify that each awardee was listed on the program and checking the membership database to verify that each awardee was a current student member, Michele discovered one awardee who was neither on the program nor a current member of SSSP. Upon further investigation, we found out that he had submitted a paper to ASA, not SSSP, so we eliminated his request. In addition, two awardees withdrew their applications in May.

This left us with a total of thirteen awardees. We decided to reallocate the remaining money from these three students evenly between the eleven awardees whose financial needs had not been fully met (excluding the two awardees with small requests). The final amounts awarded to each student are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Applicant</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adriana L. Bohm</td>
<td>$326.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2109 Pine Street, 2R Philadelphia, PA 19103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Robert A. Brooks</td>
<td>$326.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5920 Founders Crossing Ct., #204 Alexandria, VA 22310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Soo-Yeon Cho</td>
<td>$326.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of MO-Columbia 109 Sociology Building Columbia, MO 65211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Glenn S. Coffey</td>
<td>$326.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-11/3700 Sutherland Avenue Knoxville, TN 37919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dannielle J. Davis</td>
<td>$170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1804 W. William, #6 Champaign, IL 61821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Alesha D. Durfee</td>
<td>$326.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>516 N. 46th Street Seattle, WA 98103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Diane M. Gifford</td>
<td>$326.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>505 Bolin Creek Drive Carrboro, NC 27510</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Patrick F. Gilham</td>
<td>$326.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Sociology, UCB 327 University of CO-Boulder Boulder, CO 80309-0327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Christa M. Kelleher</td>
<td>$233.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Mount Vernon Street Arlington, MA 02476</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Katrin Kriz</td>
<td>$326.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329 Newton St. Waltham, MA 02453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Glenn Muschter</td>
<td>$326.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1415 Washington St., #304 Denver, CO 80203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tasleen J. Padamsee</td>
<td>$326.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2536 Stone Rd. Ann Arbor, MI 48105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Aimee V. Win</td>
<td>$327.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Dalrymple St. Jamaica Plain, MA 02130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LOCAL ARRANGEMENTS COMMITTEE REPORT
SSSP 2002 Annual Meetings
Chicago, Illinois

Tracy Memoree Thibodeau, Chair
Michele Koontz, Administrative Officer, SSSP and Tom Hood, Executive Officer assisted in most of the activities summarized below.

W Chicago City Center
Michele and Tom had previously made contact with representatives of the W Chicago City Center. At that time they reviewed the facilities and finalized arrangements for the meeting.

Audio Visual Equipment
Michele assumed responsibility for securing audio-visual equipment.

On-Site Registration
Ms. Thibodeau received and delivered registration bags and restaurants guides to be included in registration materials.

Program
Ms. Thibodeau wrote a welcome to Chicago message that was included in the preliminary and final program. Ms Thibodeau also reviewed the preliminary and final program and found everything to be fine.

Banquet
At Joel Best’s request, Ms. Thibodeau contacted Elizabeth Thomas at Roosevelt University about holding the banquet in the Michigan and Congress Lounge. Heather Dalmage served as liaison between the Roosevelt University and SSSP to ensure that the Society could use the facilities at no charge. Ms. Thibodeau also made initial contact with Larry Posen of Chartwells Dining Services. Ms. Thibodeau and Michele discussed the menu options and a proposal for Joel.

Book Exhibit
Ms. Thibodeau received and delivered materials (over 60 boxes) from various publishers.

Media
Ms. Thibodeau drafted a general press release that was edited by Michele and Tom. The press release was distributed on August 2, 2002.

Other
Ms. Thibodeau encountered many problems finding a suitable location for the Board of Directors Dinner. Michele and Ms. Thibodeau finally decided on Italian Village, a restaurant within walking distance, but a bit pricier than originally outlined. Ms. Thibodeau selected a local organization, Open Hand, to receive the proceeds from the AIDS fundraiser. The organization arranges meals for persons with AIDS in the metropolitan area. Not knowing any semi-professional groups, Ms. Thibodeau contacted a professional band – Biff and the Waybacks – to perform at the fundraiser. The local arrangements chair also took responsibility for providing beverages for the President’s private party.

Submitted by Tracy Memoree Thibodeau 8/13/2002

---

TO: SSSP Social Action Award Committee
SSSP Board of Directors
FROM: Jon Shefner, 2002 Social Action Award Committee Chair

REPORT TO THE SSSP BOARD AND SOCIAL ACTION COMMITTEE

As committee chair, I solicited nominations from committee members and from other local members of SSSP. The committee received three nominations for the Social Action Award in 2002. These included the Chicago Legal Advocacy for Incarcerated Mothers (CLAIM), Bottomless Closet, and the South Side Help Center. I made an error in asking for votes from those not on the committee. I committed this error by getting lists of officers and committee members confused. To those board members who do not see their votes reflected, please accept my apologies.

Of the eight committee members, two did not respond to repeated email contact. Of the remaining six committee members, all were unanimous in their choice of Chicago Legal Advocacy for Incarcerated Mothers (CLAIM) as recipient of the 2002 SSSP Social Action Award. I will be in touch with the directors of that organization to tell them of the award and invite them to the banquet.
2002 Minority Scholarship Fund Committee Report

To: Board of Directors, Society for the Study of Social Problems
From: Cecilia Menjivar, Chairperson
2002 Minority Scholarship Fund Committee

Committee Members: Joyce Chinen, University of Hawaii—West O'ahu (Chairperson-Elect); Ione Y. DeOlllos, Ball State University; Jolan Hsieh, Arizona State University (Graduate Student); Lorna Rivera, Univ of Massachusetts-Boston; Carolyn Perrucci, Purdue University; Mindy Stombler, Georgia State University

At the start of this committee's tenure, Michele Koontz sent the chairperson a packet of information and evaluation materials. This packet contained a call for applications, the board report from the previous year, a template of evaluation materials, and a list of resources provided by the SSSP office. This material was most helpful in the execution of the 2002 chairperson's duties. With help from the SSSP office, the Call for Applications was announced in a range of regional and national social science publications.

The committee members were sent application materials at the end of March, 2002. They received 14 complete application packages, a Criteria Rating Sheet for each applicant, a First Round Ballot, and a Committee Timetable. One applicant withdrew during our review period because she accepted another scholarship; thus, the committee only considered 13 applicants. One application was rejected because it was postmarked 10 days after the deadline and two students submitted only the electronic submission form, and never sent any additional materials. By May 15, 2002, the committee members completed the ranking of the 13 applicants. Committee members ranked three applicants higher than the rest, with one of these clearly emerging as the number one applicant (this candidate was selected as the top applicant by all but one committee member who voted her second). Given the close rankings of the top three candidates, the committee agreed to select one recipient and two honorable mentions.

The 2002-2003 SSSP Minority Graduate Scholarship recipient is Marta Maria Maldonado of Washington State University. The Honorable Mentions go to P. Rafael Hernandez-Arias of Brandeis University and Marla del Pilar Lugo of Rutgers University. They demonstrated a serious commitment to social activism through a variety of activities, and reflect the fine tradition of past scholarship recipients.

As indicated in the table below (see Table 1), the composition of the pool consisted of nine women and five men. There were eight Latino/Hispanic/Mexican American applicants (one described herself as Latina/Asian) and six African Americans. Within these categories there were gender differences: whereas the Latino category was evenly divided by gender (four and four), there was only one male among the six African American applicants. There were no Asians (except for the above mentioned and, for a second year in a row, no Native American applicants). All the applicants are pursuing doctorates in sociology in universities located in all regions of the country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>4*</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One of the Latinas described herself as half Asian (of Indian ancestry).

As in 2001, the pool of applicants was small in comparison to previous years. In fact, the number of applications have been declining for some years now (1995=40; 1996=23; 1997=44; 1998=33; 1999=35; 2000=20; 2001=15; 2002=[14 with one withdrawal]=13). And although the pool of candidates this year was of very good and some excellent ones were selected, we had a discussion (electronically) about the decreasing number of applications.

Some committee members thought that we should not be concerned about the declining numbers because we still receive an excellent pool of applicants and we do not have the resources to assist most of them. Others, however, were concerned and proposed suggestions for improving the numbers.

One committee member was not sure if the declining number of applications is a reflection of the numbers of minority individuals in doctoral programs, an increase in the number of awards available (thus the one withdrawal this year), or something SSSP needs to do to encourage more applicants. Thus, this committee member suggested that we might want to look into how we disseminate information about the fellowship to potential applicants.

Another member thought that we should try to increase the number of applicants because this is one way to recruit "ideal colleagues," that is, scholar activists who will be active members of SSSP in the future. One way to do this may be to start to publicize the fellowship earlier, and perhaps extend the window between the publication of the announcement and the deadline for the applications. This committee member also suggested sending announcements to more ethnic studies departments, and related associations and listservs.

Finally, the chairperson would like to thank the committee members for their hard work and Michele Koontz for prompt and extremely valuable assistance.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Board of Directors
FROM: Michele Smith Koontz
      Administrative Officer & Meeting Manager
RE: Meeting Manager Report

I. 2002 ANNUAL MEETING:
   I am pleased to report that 433 attendees have pre-registered for the Annual Meeting. Of these attendees, 24 (6%) are exempt from paying meeting registration. Last year at this time, we had 372 pre-registered. This is an increase of 16%.

   We have 88 sessions with 306 papers and 22 panelists scheduled. Last year, we had 288 papers and 28 panelists scheduled. The Film Exhibit, sponsored by the American Correctional Association, California Newsreel, and the Media Education Foundation, will feature 9 films.

   For the second year, we allowed spouses/guests of members to register for the meeting for a nominal fee ($10-$20 depending on when they registered). Each spouse/guest will receive a name badge only (name only, no affiliation). Any spouse/guest wanting full access to sessions or special events etc a program packet must register individually and pay the full registration fee and membership dues. There were 29 people who registered guests. I did not include these people in the total number of pre-registered attendees.

II. PRE-REGISTRATION:
   Thanks to the motion that was passed by the 2000-2001 Board of Directors (That the SSSP Office identify, at the end of each Annual Meeting, those participants who failed to pay registration fees. Those non-paying participants will be notified next year, if they submit proposals for the program, that if they do not pay the pre-registration fees they definitely will not be placed on the program), the problem of collecting pre-registration fees from program participants was not as difficult.

   After the initial mailing requesting payment of pre-registration fees, 112 participants failed to pay. This is a decrease of 43% from last year. An email was sent stating that they would be deleted from the final program if payment was not received by July 22. Thirty-six failed to respond. None of the non-paying participants was removed from the final program because none of them was delinquent in paying 2001 registration fees.

   The preliminary program and pre-registration information was made available on the website. Without this option, there would be an even larger number of non-paying participants.

III. ADVERTISING:
   A letter was faxed to 150 publishing companies encouraging them to advertise in the final program. This year, $1,350 in advertising was sold to Aldine de Gruyter and Georgia State University. This amount will help offset the cost of printing the final programs.

IV. BOOK EXHIBIT:
   The Library of Social Science is now in the fourth year of its collaboration with SSSP. They continue to organize and manage the book exhibit without cost to SSSP. Another exciting, comprehensive collection of titles featuring the latest and most significant books from 34 major publishers in the field will be on exhibit.

   Some members have requested that we expand the size and scope of our book exhibit. Is this something that the Board would like for the Executive Office to explore with the Library of Social Science?

V. REGISTRATION WORKERS AND LOW INCOME ACCOMMODATIONS:
   Seven student members will be working at the registration desk. In exchange for working 12 hours, they will receive a complimentary shared hotel room for the nights of August 14, 15, and 16. Five members received a reduced room rate of $67.50 plus tax per night.

   Information about the roommate matching service was sent to program participants and included in the preliminary program. Nine members requested this service. On June 18, an email was sent to them listing the names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses of those willing to participate.

VI. MEETING MENTOR PROGRAM:
   Information about the meeting mentor program was placed in the Social Problems Forum: The SSSP Newsletter and the preliminary program. Three graduate students requested this service. I contacted three meeting veterans to see if they were willing to serve as meeting mentors. Kathleen Ferraro, Jane Hood, and Mark Peyrot agreed to serve in this capacity.

VII. ACCESSIBILITY ISSUES:
   SSSP has taken proactive steps toward meeting the special needs of our disabled members. Written guidelines were distributed to all meeting participants to assist them in being increasingly creative in their inclusiveness. We requested that
all attendees refrain from wearing any scented products. Smoking is not permitted in meeting sessions, the hotel lobby, or the hotel restaurant.

Again, SSSP has reserved a hospitality suite where attendees coping with meeting fatigue, illness, or stress can escape from the noise and bustle of meeting activities. This space is provided in response to concerns brought to the Executive Office by the Accessibility Committee and members.

There was a section on accessibility services on the registration form. Registrants were able to request accessibility services that would facilitate their full participation in the Annual Meeting. One member requested a note-taker.

VIII. AUDIO-VISUAL:
SSSP will provide an overhead projector and screen in every meeting room. Any additional equipment had to be arranged with the in-house audio visual department. The cost of additional equipment will be borne by the presenter.

When negotiating the hotel contract, Tom and I were able to secure a 35% discount on audio-visual equipment. The hotel contract allows presenters to bring their own equipment if desired. In an effort to reduce audio-visual costs, the American Correctional Association, California Newsreel, and the Media Education Foundation were asked to share the costs associated with the film exhibit. All agreed to pay a $100 fee.

IX. AIDS FUNDRAISER AND THE GRADUATE STUDENT AND NEW MEMBER RECEPTION:
This year we combined the AIDS Fundraiser and the Graduate Student and New Member Reception. The music will be provided by Biff & The Waybacks. They are a rock and roll revue performing songs from the 1950's to today. All graduate students and new members will receive a complimentary ticket with their registration materials. All others will pay a $10 cover. Heavy hors d’oeuvres will be served and a limited cash bar will be available.

All proceeds (after expenses) will go to Open Hand Chicago. They focus on serving the nutritional needs of people living with or significantly affected by HIV/AIDS. They will become affiliated with a suburban group this summer and expect to provide approximately 700,000 meals in the Chicago metro area this year.

A special thanks to the Sociology and Criminology Department of Dominican University for their financial contribution to this event.

X. CATERING:
Hotel catering costs were very expensive this year. I am happy to report that I stayed within budget when planning all of the catering events.

XI. RECEPTION HONORING PAST PRESIDENTS AND THE AWARDS BANQUET:
The Reception Honoring Past Presidents and Awards Banquet will be held at Roosevelt University. We have found that it is less expensive when the Reception Honoring Past Presidents is held at the banquet site. The reception will feature heavy hors d’oeuvres and a limited cash bar. The reception will cost SSSP $6 per person. Note, SSSP had to purchase the wine/beer/soda/ juice that will be sold at the reception. Drink coupons will be available. All profits from the sale of the drinks will help offset any costs associated with the reception and banquet.

The banquet will be served buffet style. The cost of a banquet ticket is $40 per person. No transportation will be provided. Currently, we have sold 123 tickets. There are 27 tickets remaining.

At the request of the Student Representatives of the Board of Directors, we introduced the “Donate a Banquet Ticket Program.” Members could purchase banquet tickets for graduate students, foreign scholars, and scholar-activists. Donated tickets were distributed to the first nine students who requested a ticket. Thanks to the following individuals who participated: Nancy Jurik, Helena Z. Lopata, Donileen Loseke, Kathleen Lowney, Nancy A. Matthews, R. Sam Michalowski, Pamela Roby, and Teresa Scheid.

XII. INTERNATIONAL COALITION AGAINST SEXUAL HARASSMENT and the REDISCOVERING THE OTHER AMERICA: A NATIONAL FORUM ON POVERTY AND INEQUALITY:
I worked with James Gruber to plan ICASH’s conference on August 17 and 18 and Keith Kelty to plan the National Forum on Poverty and Inequality on August 18. SSSP provided ICASH with one complimentary meeting room on August 17. ICASH will pay a $500 meeting room rental fee on August 18. The Poverty Forum will pay a $1,500 meeting room rental fee on August 18. This is due to their request for meeting space being made after the hotel contract was signed. As you know, hotel contracts are negotiated three years in advance.

Their programs were placed in the Social Problems Forum: The SSSP Newsletter, the preliminary and final program. I coordinated their audio-visual, catering, and room set-up needs with the hotel. I will receive an honorarium from both groups for serving as their meeting manager. They will reimburse SSSP for all charges related to their conference.

XIII. MEETING MANAGER RESPONSIBILITIES:
I worked closely with Jody Grossman, Conference Services Manager, in planning the annual meeting. I provided her with details for 1) hospitality rooms; 2) VIP amenities; 3) audio-visual requirements; 4) catering for 23 food functions; 5) meeting room set up; and 6) signage. I will review the master account before leaving the hotel. Jody responded pro-
fessionally and competently. It has been a true pleasure to work with her.

I spent numerous hours reviewing the wants and needs of the membership. Upon compilation of the requirements of the membership, I set out to accomplish the following:

1) Prepare the overall design for the program and front cover. Prepare front matter describing accessibility services, book exhibit, child-care information, conference site, film exhibit, parking services, transportation options, special events, and special features of the meeting site for the preliminary and final program.

In an effort to reduce annual meeting costs, the 2000-2001 Board of Directors passed a motion that allowed the Executive Office to check with Sociological Abstracts to see if papers could be placed in the data file without purchasing printed copies. We were able to arrange for online abstract submission. This was a savings of $1,336. Unfortunately, only 5 program participants have submitted an abstract at the time of this report. By reducing the font size and number of pages, changing the program layout, using a non-glossy cover, and mailing the preliminary program as a self-mailer, SSSP saved $1,319 in printing and postage costs.

2) Negotiate a contract with a travel and rental car agency that offered special rates for the membership.

(Association Travel Concepts allows members to call the vendors directly or use their own agency. SSSP receives credit when members provide the SSSP ID# before purchasing their ticket. Unfortunately, we did not receive any complimentary airline tickets last year.)

3) Efficient registration and book exhibit area.

I have recruited 7 graduate students to assist Lisa and myself during registration. I also compiled the following materials that will be included in the registration bags: Final Program, Business Meeting Agenda, Evaluation, City Map, and ASA Restaurant Guide.

I have been very fortunate to work with Joel Best, Kathleen Lowney, Tracy Thibodeau, Tom Hood, Lisa Anne Zilney and Jody Grossman. I want to thank them for their guidance, knowledge, and support that was given freely throughout the year.

I would like to thank you, the Board of Directors, again for giving me the opportunity to serve SSSP as meeting manager. I welcome the opportunity to continue this service next year in Atlanta, GA.

---

To: SSSP Board of Directors
From: Peter Conrad
Re: Report from the Editorial and Publications Committee

At our meeting during the 2001 SSSP annual meeting we discussed a number of pertinent issues related to the Society. Two main issues concerned the Editorial and Publications Committee this year.

The first was the long-stalled "Presidential Series," a collection of topical edited volumes, edited by former officers of the SSSP. Originally University of California Press had the right of first refusal and was slated to publish this series, but their interest was frankly minimal. One volume, on aging, is in the UC Press pipeline. Finally this year, UC Press agreed they had no interest in the series and the SSSP could seek other publishers. The E & P committee decided to move ahead and contact more textbook-oriented publishers. Five expressed interest when approached at the ASA meetings and two publishers sent in completed proposals. The proposals were sent to E & P members by email, and after some discussion, the strong support was for the Rowman and Littlefield/Altamira proposal. As of this writing we have received a draft contract from Rowman and Littlefield; we have made some suggestions for revision and expect to sign the contract within the month.

We hope to publish two to three volumes a year. All volumes will include approximately 15 articles from Social Problems and an introduction by the editors. Royalties will go to the society. The first two volumes are virtually ready to go and hopefully will be published by the 2003 meeting. These are a volume on drugs and alcohol by Orcutt and Rudy and a volume on health and health care by Conrad and Leiter. The Orcutt and Rudy volume had been previously approved by the committee, and the Conrad and Leiter volume was approved with a 4-0-1 vote. We will send an invitation letter to former officers to solicit future volumes. We agreed to develop a process via email discussion for evaluating future volumes in the series. (As I presented this report to the SSSP board, Judith Levy, co-editor of the aging volume, indicated that she might approach UC Press to have the volume shifted to Rowman and Littlefield and be published as one of the initial volumes in the series.)

The second issue was discussion of a proposal by Past President Robert Perrucci to produce AN AGENDA FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE every four years, which would focus on pressing social problems and allow SSSP to articulate a report to the nation. The Board passed the following motion last year:

THAT THE PERRUCCI PROPOSAL BE REFERRED TO THE EDITORIAL AND PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE TO EXPLORE MODELS AND MEANS BY WHICH THIS PROPOSAL COULD BE ACHIEVED.

The E & P Committee has discussed this proposal and, while sees it as a proposal with merit, is unsure how to proceed. This is a large task, probably too large for the E & P Committee. The E & P recommends that a special subcommittee, perhaps under the direction of Professor Perrucci, be created to implement this proposal, at least on a trial basis. Finally, as chair of the E & P Committee I am working with Tom Hood and Ron Troyer to evaluate potential contract bids to publish Social Problems. We received 5 bids and have designated 3 finalists. Decision will be made by the end of the year.
MEMORANDUM

TO: SSSP BOARD OF DIRECTORS
FROM: SSSP LEE SCHOLAR ACTIVIST SUPPORT FUND COMMITTEE
Chair: Patricia Morgan Members: Alfonso Latoni, Lora Lempert
RE: REPORT OF ACTIVITIES

Seven applications were received by the committee by March 15, 2002 requesting a total of $7110.46. Six of the applicants were international scholars from Europe, Asia, South and Central America, and the Middle East.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicants</th>
<th>Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIANA AVILA, Project Counseling Services</td>
<td>$1250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lima Peru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR ROY BOURGEOIS, SOA WATCH</td>
<td>$405.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus, GA 31903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELENA DIAZ, Universidad de la Habana</td>
<td>$1050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Habana Cuba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARCO A, GANDASEGUI, Jr, Universidad de Panama</td>
<td>$950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republica de Panama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHAMED GHANAYEM</td>
<td>$1430.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem, Palestine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHRISTINA MAROULI</td>
<td>$1580.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyroupoli Greece</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEIRDRE M. SMYTH</td>
<td>$445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanjing, Jiangsu China</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL REQUESTED: $7110.46

Initial allocations were based on a percentage of request and on need. Subsequently, however, two applicants (Marouli and Ghanayem) cancelled their presentations at the meetings. In addition, an emergency request was made to provide travel support for Dr. Taye Wolde Semayat. This request was approved by the Board of Directors. The final allocation of the Lee Scholars Award is as follows:

2002 Lee Scholar-Activist Support Fund Recipients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Diana Avila</th>
<th>Requested</th>
<th>$1250.00</th>
<th>Awarded</th>
<th>$814.99 (65%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Roy Bourgeois</td>
<td>$405.00</td>
<td>$405.00</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Elena Diaz</td>
<td>$1050.00</td>
<td>$1050.00</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Marco Gandasequi</td>
<td>$950.00</td>
<td>$685.01</td>
<td>(72%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Deirdre Smyth</td>
<td>$445.00</td>
<td>$445.00</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Taye Wolde Semayat</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>$600.00</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAND TOTAL: $4700.00 $4000.00

The committee would like to thank Richard Dello Buono and Michele Koontz for their assistance. Finally, the Chair would like to thank Alfonso Latoni for his help throughout this convoluted process.
ARRANGING THE VISIT

I initiated arranging the trip to the SSSP site office on February 18, 2002. There seemed to be some confusion about whether the visit should occur, and it took longer than I expected to come to an agreement with the Executive Office. It was May 24 before our meeting on May 28 was finalized. The result is that I did not feel comfortable asking others to attend with me at such a late date, so I went alone. I recommend that the Executive Office routinize the site visit so that it automatically takes place during a particular month of the second year. It should be initiated and organized by the Administrative Officer. I suggested some related policy language to the Permanent Organization and Strategic Planning Committee (POSPC) which has been reviewed and supported via email. That proposal will come forward separately.

INTRODUCTION

Once the visit had been arranged, Dr. Hood arranged meetings with the Dean (Dr. Lorayne Lester), Department Chair (Dr. Suzanne Kurth), SSSP Administrative Officer (Ms. Michele Koontz), and the SSSP Graduate Assistant (Ms. Lisa Zilney). A separate meeting was also arranged with Dr. Hood at the end of the day. Upon arriving at the University of Tennessee, I was warmly received by Dr. Tom Hood, the Executive Officer. We met in Dr. Hood’s office and discussed the plan for the day. Through the course of that conversation I became aware that the department may want to take back its graduate assistantship from SSSP.

INTERVIEWS

Dean Lester:

Dr. Hood accompanied me to the Dean’s Office and remained for the visit. It was helpful for Dr. Hood to be there because, as he explained, the Dean did not know much about SSSP or the current arrangements with the Sociology Department. The questions I sought answers to in all of my visits related to the extent to which the SSSP was valued and supported by the host institution. The Dean, who was at that time serving her last month in the position, knew little about SSSP. It is a very large college, and she had many such arrangements under her jurisdiction.

I pursued the issue of support, and Dean Lester spoke positively about SSSP being in her college. I asked if the support for the Executive Office would continue and she said she did not know since she was leaving. We discussed the support for the graduate assistantship, and Dr. Lester’s office didn’t have a record of the actual origin of the SSSP GA, and therefore did not know whether it would continue. I asked her if she would write a letter for the new dean’s files requesting that SSSP be provided its current level of support. She said she would do so with Dr. Hood’s assistance, since she did not have all of the details related to the organization. I raised the issue of whether the SSSP might be valued more in a smaller college or institution where there were not so many similar kinds of activities. Both Dean Lester and Dr. Hood acknowledged that such might be the case. It was clear from the meeting that the presence of SSSP on campus was not widely known or thought about.

Department Chair Kurth:

I met with the chair of the Sociology Department, Dr. Suzanne Kurth, by myself. We had a very candid conversation. It became very clear from the meeting that there is not much support from the department for the SSSP Executive Office remaining within their domain. The chair herself seemed reasonably supportive, but her read on the department was as follows:

1. They want the graduate assistantship back;
2. They do not have sufficient space to offer a great deal in the way of offices;
3. If the SSSP Executive Office left, few faculty members, if any, in the Department would care;
4. She described the Department’s disposition toward the SSSP Executive Office as viewing it as one might “an old shoe” - it wasn’t interesting to anyone anymore;
5. Some of the described disposition was believed to be related to changes taking place in the Department.
Dr. Kurth believes the department benefited from having SSSP, but that it does not see the benefit now. Some of the department members are SSSP members, but that doesn’t seem to make a difference. Not many in the department know what Dr. Hood is doing relative to his position with the organization. Ms. Lisa Zilney has contributed to the department and Ms. Michele Koontz is viewed as being like a member of the department.

Administrative Officer Ms. Michele Koontz and Graduate Assistant Lisa Zilney:

I met with Administrative Officer Koontz and Graduate Assistant Zilney in the Sociology Department. Ms. Zilney described her responsibilities, which include much of the day-to-day membership contact – responding to inquiries, updating the membership and completing membership reports. Both Ms. Zilney and Ms. Koontz run the Executive Office’s daily operation. They consult with the director, Dr. Hood, on a need basis only. Ms. Koontz made it very clear that she could not do her job without the support of a GA.

In addition to the routine operation of the SSSP office, Ms. Koontz is paid an additional fee to organize the annual SSSP conference. She does so at less expense than an outside contractor would require. Ms. Koontz currently works out of her office in her home, which I later visited.

According to Ms. Koontz and Ms. Zilney, Dr. Hood exercises fiscal authority for the organization – signing checks, making deposits, and setting up contacts with the University. Ms. Koontz and Dr. Hood work on the budget together and work with the Budget Committee to plan the budget. The Budget Committee is one of the organization’s most active committees.

Ms. Koontz at Her Office – Joined Later by Dr. Hood:

After lunch I visited Ms. Koontz’s office in her home. It was more than adequate and very well organized. I asked Ms. Koontz several questions about her activities and relationship to the SSSP organization. She described additional responsibilities that she has: working with the president, president-elect, division heads, and committee chairs. These positions are frequently communicating with her office. Ms. Koontz commented that she loves her job and would be able to do it telecommunicating from almost anywhere.

We discussed strategies for increasing membership and Ms. Koontz committed to trying some new lists to broaden our possible pool. I recommended getting the lists from some of the progressive SIGS of the American Educational Research Association, since they tend to be interested in many of the issues that SSSP represents. Ms. Koontz also expressed a desire to make the membership committee more active than it has been in the past. It appears that our membership has been pretty stable. It is good that we have not been losing members, but there is no reason we couldn’t be growing – especially during these high awareness political times.

The three of us discussed the advantages and disadvantages of having the Executive Office in one place for an extended period of time. Generally the advantages are that the individuals in the positions become more familiar with their responsibilities and are then able to run the operation more smoothly. The arrangement with the institution is stabilized and does not have to be renegotiated. The disadvantages are that the institution may lose interest and support may not come as freely. I also expressed concern about Executive Offices of organizations becoming routinized to the point where it becomes confusing who actually runs the organization. The members and elected representatives sometimes become too dependent on a fixed executive office. Such offices then become the central authorities of the organizations and run the organization more than was originally intended. This point was briefly discussed as a possible problem for organizations structured like SSSP. This problem is exacerbated by the short time that elected officers are in office, and the difficulty in getting volunteers to remain active and do the needed work. It is sometimes easier for Executive Office staff to simply do the work themselves. Dr. Hood mentioned that he has told the SSSP Board that the Executive Office role should be reduced. He pointed out that other similar organizations do not have an Executive Officer.

Both Ms. Koontz and Dr. Hood expressed their belief that the SSSP GA position was originally given to the department specifically for the SSSP Executive Office. I suggested finding that documentation, but they could not produce it without going to archives that were located out of state (Brooklyn College Archives). Notwithstanding, in accordance with my suggestion mentioned earlier, Dr. Hood was copied a strong letter of support from the outgoing Dean Lester to the
provost that included an indication that the SSSP GA position continue to be provided by the College of Arts and Sciences (see attached).

Dr. Tom Hood

My last meeting of the day was with Dr. Hood, SSSP Executive Director. This was a very candid conversation. Dr. Hood announced that he intends to retire in 2004 and would like to continue as Executive Officer until then and beyond if possible. We talked about the lack of support and interest within the Sociology Department. Dr. Hood expressed that he felt there could be increased departmental support in the next few years from new faculty coming into the department. This is not consistent with what Department Chair Kurth believed to be the case. She felt that the newer faculty members were the least supportive of the SSSP Executive Office. It is hard to know how much of the newer faculty member disposition is directed toward SSSP and how much is related to common internal departmental politics – new faculty wanting their own space, more control etc. Dr. Kurth seemed to believe it was the latter, and I would tend to agree. Whatever the reason for waning departmental support, it seems that strong local support and respect would be essential for the healthy operation of the SSSP Executive Office. Perhaps Dr. Hood can, indeed, turn things around and revitalize departmental interest in housing the SSSP Office. The letter of support from the outgoing dean is encouraging to the extent that it appears that the Executive Office may continue to have a University supported GA. There are, of course, no guarantees that the provost and/or incoming dean will respect the outgoing dean’s request. At no time did anyone suggest that Dr. Hood had not done a good job as Executive Officer, or that there were any problems in working with him.

Dr. Hood also suggested that he might be able to run the SSSP Executive Office out of another unit in the University e.g., University Studies, which is housed directly out of the Provosts Office. Dr. Hood has a long relationship with the University and has a lot of connections with other units therein. We discussed a number of possible scenarios involving different configurations of graduate assistants, and a possible part-time assistant for Ms. Koontz. We also talked about the possibility of not having an Executive Officer. It is very clear that Dr. Hood is open to a wide range of possibilities – all within the scope of what is best for SSSP. He has done a good job for SSSP, would like to continue, but is willing to step aside for an alternative plan.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

With Dr. Hood’s retirement not far away, the support for SSSP in Dr. Hood’s department seemingly growing weaker, and the length of time SSSP has been located at UT now approaching twelve years, it seems prudent for SSSP to begin to make alternative plans for the future. My experience and observations based on this site visit suggest the following:

1. Dr. Hood is willing to help SSSP transition in any direction that the board decides would be beneficial to the organization;
2. SSSP is very fortunate to have a competent Administrative Officer who is capable of performing and/or overseeing all of the needed office duties for the organization;
3. it is my understanding that SSSP does not currently provide financial support to the president or president-elect for release time or summer stipends;
4. changes are inevitable, and it should be an organizational decision as to when and how it will occur, i.e., SSSP should not wait until something happens to force it to act – the Board should be proactive so as to maximize alternatives and a smooth transition;
5. SSSP should work closely and respectfully with Dr. Hood and Ms. Koontz to arrive at a transition beneficial to them and the organization.

I want to emphasize that this report is one person's observations and recommendations. I was the only POSPC member at the site visit and the POSPC did not have an opportunity to discuss the issues herein before this report was completed. We will be discussing them, however, during our upcoming meeting at the conference.

Whatever alternatives SSSP decides to move toward (if any), the SSSP Board and members owe a great deal to the current SSSP Executive Office for its long-standing successful operation of the SSSP organization. Thanks Tom, Michele, and Lisa!!!

c. SSSP Executive Office
    Permanent Organization and Strategic Planning Committee
SSSP MEMBERSHIP MEETING SURVEY

The SSSP Board of Directors passed a motion to conduct another survey of the membership to determine if the member would be interested in coming up with an arrangement other than meeting at the same location and at the same time (overlap) as the ASA. This motion was carried out through the joint efforts of the SSSP Executive Office and the Permanent Organization and Strategic Planning Committee (POSPC). The POSPC designed the questionnaire, analyzed the data, and provided this report. The Executive Office disseminated and collected the questionnaires and forwarded the returns to the chair of the POSPC.

The study was a partial replication of the survey conducted in 1992, which showed overwhelmingly that the members wanted to overlap with the ASA meetings. That study had a return of 485 and the current study had a return of 421. I did not respond to the survey myself, and confess to having estimated three of the answers of one respondent that were given in discursive form (No, I would not do that in a scholarly paper! But I felt the information was sufficient to justify using the data for our purposes, and it did not affect the general results). This year’s survey was conducted during the summer when a lot of faculty members are away from their offices, which may have contributed to the relatively low return rate.

The current survey was modified from the one conducted in 1992. Questions regarding meeting preferences were structured and worded differently and the response scale for all questions was 0-10, instead of yes/no or Likert in format. The following is the survey as disseminated to the membership.

SSSP Membership Questionnaire on Future Annual Meeting Programs

While the SSSP is financially stable as an organization, it has not been able to make its annual meeting pay for itself. The organization may be able to save money if its meetings are held in places that are not as expensive as the meeting locations of the ASA. With that knowledge, and all else being equal, how would you respond to the following questions?

Please respond with a 0 - 10 scale. Let 0 = no likelihood, and 10 = maximum likelihood

1. What is the likelihood that you will attend the SSSP meetings if they do not coincide (location & time) with the ASA meetings in the future? _______
2. If the ASA and SSSP are not held in the same location and are not at the same time, what is the likelihood that you will attend the ASA meetings in the future? _______
3. If we continue the same pattern of having the SSSP meetings with the ASA meetings (same location and overlap in time) what is the likelihood that you will attend SSSP meetings in the future? _______

Let 0 = completely dissatisfied, and 10 = completely satisfied

4. To what extent are you satisfied with the amount of joint programming we have with other organizations such as the Association of Black Sociologists, Sociologists for Women in Society, and other affiliations with similar research and policy related concerns to that of the SSSP? _______
5. To what extent are you satisfied with the amount of workshop programming on critical issues with meeting site community groups (e.g., groups dealing with homelessness and gangs), which allows SSSP members with specialization on these issues to participate in an exchange of views and policy perspectives with local community representatives? _______

Please evaluate the importance of following items relative to considering sites for the annual meetings.

Let 0 = not important at all, and 10 = maximum importance

6. The City _______
7. Hotel _______
8. Distance from Home _______
9. Quality of Program _______
10. Whether I am on the Program _______
# RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attend SSPP</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>2.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend ASA</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>3.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay same</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>2.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other org program</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>2.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local workshops</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>2.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city importance</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>2.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hotel importance</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>2.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance importance</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>3.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality importance</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.16</td>
<td>1.974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>importance on program</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>3.067</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above results speak pretty much for themselves. It is clear from the mean scores that there is less likelihood of attending the SSPP meetings than the ASA meetings if the two are separate. If we look only at the respondents who scored a 5 or greater on the SSPP attendance question (V1) and less than 5 on the ASA attendance question (V2), we have what we might consider SSPP loyalists. That is, given completely separate meetings, these are the people who would be more likely to attend the SSPP meetings than the ASA meetings. There were only 53 SSPP loyalists. When these conditions are reversed and we look only at the respondents who scored a 5 or greater on the ASA Q and less than 5 on the SSPP Q, there are 111 ASA loyalists left standing. This does not mean that there are not people who give near equal weight to going to both, it simply means that a lot of people might choose between the two, and most would choose ASA.

If we repeat the above analysis among only the respondents most likely to attend the SSPP meetings if there is no change at all (5 or higher on V3), the results do not change much – 48 SSPP loyalists and 103 ASA loyalists respectively.

When aggregated into high medium and low categories, the same results can be shown again in still another way. The crosstabulation represented below shows that the greatest number of respondents in the entire table are in the high ASA (VV2) and low SSPP (VV1) cell of the table. Those in the high SSPP and low ASA cell (N=31) make up only about 37% of those in the high ASA and low SSPP cell (N=83). These respondents would be the truest SSPP and ASA loyalists respectively among the SSPP most active members i.e., those responding to the survey.

## VV1 * VV2 Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VV1</th>
<th>VV2</th>
<th>1.00</th>
<th>2.00</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I suspect that the people who responded to the questionnaire are the people most actively involved with SSSP and the ones who represent a reasonably stable core of SSSP meeting attendees. We really do need to pay attention to what they are telling us. It appears clear that our most active members prefer the current overlapping meetings.

Other Issues

Satisfaction with programming involving other organizations, and satisfaction with workshops involving local community groups seem to be reasonably high — mean scores of 7.24 and 7.01 respectively.

In terms of what tends to be the most important factors in considering meeting sites, the results are varied and interesting. As the mean scores in the first table above demonstrate, the hotel and the traveling distance are only of modest importance, with the hotel importance being represented by the lowest of all the mean scores in the survey: 4.4. This later finding is significant information for our Executive Office since the organization goes through a lot of trouble to organize good deals in nice hotels. Perhaps this is something that we need not worry about quite so much, and it might be an area in which we could save some money. In some cities it may even be possible to arrange SSSP meetings at nearby university campuses and still have the same overlap with the ASA.

The low score for traveling distance may reflect the competitive airline rates that seem less affected by distance than they once were — sales, web search deals, etc.

It is reassuring to know that the highest mean score on the entire survey was for the importance of the quality of the SSSP Program: 8.16. We obviously need to continue organizing high quality programs.

Since names were provided on most of the emails, I was able to construct a gender variable for many of the respondents. If I wasn’t reasonably confident I left it blank, and the reader must realize that names are not a full-proof way of determining gender. Based on this constructed gender variable, there were 192 females and 154 males. The results among these respondents were interesting enough to report. For the most part, the specific results reported above were not greatly affected by controlling for gender, i.e., as related to the magnitude of differences on important questions and combinations of questions. There was, however, an interesting pattern. All of the mean scores for females were higher than the mean scores for males with the exception of the importance of the city, hotels, and travel distance. Males were higher on all three of those items. It might be interesting to discuss what these findings mean.

John C. Alessio, Chair, Permanent Organization and Strategic Planning Committee

---

TO: SSSP Board of Directors
FROM: Rachel Einwohner, 2001-2002 Chair of Smigel Committee
RE: Annual Report of the Smigel Committee

This year the Smigel Committee received a single application and awarded the applicant, Nancy S. Berns, the full amount that she requested ($406.60). Nancy is an underemployed sociologist who will be working as an adjunct faculty member at Drake University next fall. She will also be presenting a paper at this year’s meetings.

With only one applicant, the committee’s work was minimal and was conducted entirely over e-mail. The committee meeting that was scheduled for August 15 has been canceled.

In the future, the members of the Smigel Committee may wish to consider broadening the eligibility criteria for the award. I know that this is the second year in a row in which there was only one eligible applicant. The criteria of participation in the meetings (i.e., presenting a paper or serving on a committee) might be too limiting. That is, there may be very few unemployed and underemployed sociologists who submit papers to the SSSP or agree to serve on committees, knowing that it might be difficult for them to afford to travel to the conference. Future Smigel committees might therefore consider allowing a broader range of unemployed and underemployed individuals to apply for the award, including people who do not plan to present papers. The committee could then prioritize applications from those individuals who will present their work, but might possibly still have funds left over to help more people get to the meetings.

I will be participating in another conference during this year’s SSSP meetings, but if anyone has any questions about this year’s Smigel Committee please e-mail me at einwohner@sri.soc.purdue.edu.
BACKGROUND ISSUES

Last summer, Dr. Joel Best, then President-elect, asked if I would agree to be the Program Chair. At that time he shared his theme, “The Future of Social Problems” with me. Last August Dr. Best and I met with the 2001 Program Chair, Lionel Maldonado, and the SSSP Executive Office staff. We were briefed on the program process and had opportunities to ask questions. It was at that time that Dr. Best and I decided that we did not believe a large Program Committee was necessary, so we did not add other members. Rather, we both believe that the program is successful because of SSSP’s active divisions and their members. We decided that most sessions should be initiated by the divisions and their organizers.

Before accepting the position of Program Chair, I told Dr. Best that there were two concerns I wanted to build into the program. First, I believe that the SSSP needs to have a more active graduate student presence at meetings. So even before the 2001 meeting, I contacted the graduate student representative to the Board of Directors and said that I would give graduate students three sessions and told them if they needed more, they could request them. They could create any kind of sessions (i.e., “how to land the first teaching job,” or “common sense advice for successfully completing the dissertation” or any other topic that they desired). My only caveat was that the information for their sessions had to be submitted according to the announced SSSP deadlines. Despite this initial contact over a year ago, as well as several conversations with graduate students last August, and follow-up e-mails and phone conversations, the sessions never materialized. Of course, graduate students are involved in the program as presenters in many sessions. Despite the setback this year, I believe these sessions are a good idea and will encourage the next Program Chair to consider them.

The second concern I had stems from my involvement on my university’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). Recently, there have been numerous changes to both federal law and regulatory statutes concerning research on human subjects that conceivably would affect many SSSP members. I thought it was a good idea to schedule some sessions around this issue. At the joint meeting of the 2002 Program Committee and Division Chairs last August, the other Chairs agreed. So I have scheduled two sessions with George Pospisil of the Office for Human Research Protection of the federal government. He will lead two sessions. The first (Session #2) will outline these regulatory changes and immediately afterward (Session #9), he will conduct a question-and-answer session. I invite the Board to attend as many of these sessions as possible.

CURRENT STATUS OF THE PROGRAM

Here are key statistics about the 2002 Program. Eighty-seven sessions are currently scheduled. One more session, with Dr. Taye Wolde Semayat, is expected to occur. The divisions organized fifty-nine sessions. Nine divisions requested permission to have more than three sessions; each was accorded at least one more session. Sixty-one people either contacted me in my role as Program Chair with submissions or their names were referred to me by organizers. From those submissions, I created twenty-eight sessions. Most of these Program Committee sessions were the by-product of organizers having a wealth of submissions to their sessions. If an organizer had more submissions than time allowed, that organizer would first try to place the paper in another session (usually within the same division). If that was not possible, the information was forwarded to me. I grouped papers together, created sessions, and found presiders for those sessions.

Dr. Best and I came up with the ideas for several other Program Committee sessions. We decided to have a session which would honor the contributions of Malcolm Spector and John Kitsuse on this the 25th anniversary of their book, Constructing Social Problems. We asked Jim Holstein if he would preside and organize the session. He accepted, and chose several notable SSSP members to present. Jim Holstein also asked both authors if they would like to invite people to this session. Writing as Program Chair, I invited all those persons (about 50) to the session. We supported Ray Michalowski’s idea to host an open forum on “The Academy of the Future: Digital, Defunded, and Distance Dominated? (Session #57).

We followed recent history of the SSSP by encouraging sessions sponsored with other professional associations. ICASH has its workshop scheduled on Sunday. Also on that day, another forum will take place, the “National Forum on Poverty and Inequality – Discovering the Other America.” There is at least one session which is co-sponsored with the ASA and SWS.

Few registration waivers were requested. Dr. Best and I agreed that any undergraduate who is presenting on the Program would have the registration fee waived (i.e., many are presenting in Session # 83 - the AKD student paper session). We felt this was a way to encourage their continued interest in sociology. There were a few non-sociological scholars whose registration was also waived. Any remaining monies were either returned to the SSSP and/or used in the effort to bring Dr. Taye Wolde Semayat to the meeting.

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED

The only problem was that the submission system does not always work smoothly. This is especially true if a person submits an abstract to more than one organizer. While the form does have the person list the other organizers to whom the paper was submitted, there is not always a lot of communication between organizers. This can be very problematic, especially if both believe the other person accepted the paper. The Program Chair is the person individuals will write to if they have worries about their acceptance, but the Program Chair does not have access to all of those decisions. While Michele Koontz was just remarkable in getting
this kind of information back to me, there are still glitches, especially at the organizer level.

I believe it is time that the SSSP considers an on-line, searchable, secure, non-public database related to the program. Organizers would input the names, titles, etc., of every submission. When decisions are made (acceptance, rejection, etc.), they would also be entered. The entire database would be searchable, so that only other organizers, the SSSP Executive Office, and the Program Chair could access it and find answers to these kind of problems. The database could be broken into fields for relevant data, with pull-down menus for the name of each division, etc. There would be a minimum of typing involved, etc. After the preliminary program is created, the database could be deleted and readied for next year. While I do not have the programming skills to create such a database, I have, on the next page, created what the data entry page might look like. Future Program Chairs would have to decide if all this information is beneficial to them or not. I believe that such a database would greatly facilitate the job of Program Chair.

I wish to thank Tracy Thibodeau, the Local Arrangements Chair, Michele Koontz for her wonderful support and quick replies to e-mail, and Joel Best. It is his vision which has informed this year’s program.

Data Entry Information for SSSP Program Searchable Database

This table lists the information which an organizer would have to input for every abstract. Not all of this data would be submitted at the same time. If a person only submitted an abstract to one session, only the first 8-10 fields would ever be completed. Asterisks indicates preliminary attempt to designate searchable fields. Most all of this information has to be typed by the organizer and given to the SSSP Executive Office or the Program Chair anyway in order for the preliminary program to be created.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Last Name, First Name of Person Submitting Abstract *</th>
<th>2. Address of Person Submitting Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Date Submitted to Organizer</td>
<td>4. Last Name of Organizer that Abstract Was Submitted to *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Session Number Abstract Was Submitted to *</td>
<td>6. Division Sponsoring the Session *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Date of Organizer’s Decision</td>
<td>8. Decision of 1st Organizer (Y or N) *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. If no, sent to whom? (Last Name) *</td>
<td>10. Did other person receive it? (Y or N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Session # for 2nd choice *</td>
<td>12. Division for 2nd choice session *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Decision of 2nd organizer (Y or N) *</td>
<td>14. Date of 2nd Organizer's Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. If no, sent to whom? (Last Name) *</td>
<td>16. Did other person receive it? (Y or N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Session # for 3rd choice *</td>
<td>18. Division for 3rd choice session *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Decision of 3rd organizer (Y or N) *</td>
<td>20. Date of 3rd Organizer's Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. If no, sent to whom? (Last Name) *</td>
<td>22. Did other person receive it? (Y or N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Program Committee Decision if different*</td>
<td>24. Comments *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fields #1-4, 7, 9, 14, 15, 20, 21, 23, and 24 should probably be text boxes.
Fields 5, 6, 11, 12, 17, 18 could be a text box or a pull-down box.
Fields 8, 10, 13, 16, 19, 22 should be a pull-down box.
Annual Report: Social Problems
(Submitted to the SSSP Board of Directors and Editorial and Publications Committee)

Although my term as Editor officially ended on June 1, 2002, the UCI Social Problems editorial office is continuing to finish up work with authors whose papers were submitted before then – and to assist the “transition” to a new Editor, Jim Holstein, and a new editorial office at Marquette University. At this point we have completed two full volumes (for 2000 and 2001) of the journal – and have already accepted enough papers as of this week to complete the third (2002). The database and system that we developed in the first two years of our operation for processing manuscripts, contacting reviewers, and making collective decisions on papers continues to work extremely well. (Indeed, we feel that we’ve “fine-tuned” it this year – now that we’re nearing the completion of our work, we finally really know what we’re doing!) But once again, we had some internal personnel changes. An Associate Editor (Nancy Naples) departed last fall and was replaced by another UCI faculty member (Kitty Calavita). Also Managing Editor, Cheryl Larsson, who suffered from some health problems the last couple of years, was forced to take medical disability leave in March of this year. Although Ms. Larsson continued to be extremely cooperative and helpful, her inability to work on campus caused some disruption and delays in the formatting and production of final “copy” the past two issues, and required some reorganization of the editorial office (with Editorial Assistant Danielle MacCartney taking on more responsibility for that part of the operation).

A quick review of some of the elements of our “system” seems appropriate: The most crucial part is the development (by former Editorial Assistant Danny Downey, now an Assistant Professor at the University of Utah) of a completely revamped database using MS ACCESS. This past spring we hired Rick Norris (Associate Editor Judy Stepan-Norris’ husband) to further simplify and streamline the program (making it more “user-friendly”); he did the job for considerably less than the $2000 we had been allocated by the SSSP. As part of a very smooth editorial “transition” we’ve now passed that database on to Jim Holstein at Marquette. We also changed the way manuscript referees are solicited: except in very unusual circumstances when we are unable to find a scholar’s electronic address, we contacted virtually all potential reviewers by e-mail prior to mailing evaluation packets to them. This was a very labor-intensive endeavor (which gradually got easier as we added information to the database). But we think it resulted in quicker reviewer turnaround and a higher probability that these readers would return useful evaluations. Indeed, we rarely made “calls” on papers until we had at least three (and often four) reviews. (Professor Holstein has also adopted the use of e-mail solicitation at his new editorial office.) At UCI we also made collective decisions on all manuscripts: the UCI faculty Associate Editors with varying specializations (currently Valerie Jenness, Belinda Robnett, and Judy Stepan-Norris, with Kitty Calavita) read and evaluated manuscripts and reviews and consulted with the Editor on all decisions. At the beginning of this calendar year, Jim Holstein also began to serve as one of our Associate Editors – a strategy to facilitate a smooth transition that I would recommend in the future. I would point out that by waiting for at least three referees to report, and then using a formal process that involves at least one (and occasionally more) Associate Editors in the decision leads to extra administrative work and sometimes slows the process. However, we believe the additional time and effort is worth it since it leads to a very thorough and fair review process. While more people were involved in decision-making, the Editor still wrote all decision letters – we decided early on that these should provide relatively detailed information to authors about why and how decisions were made, as well as advice for revision (particularly when we invite resubmission to this journal). I have some mixed feelings about this. I think the more thorough feedback to authors is good (though, believe it or not, we did get a couple of complaints from authors who didn’t want us to add our critique to that of the referees!). But this did sometimes slow the process a little. And, if I had to “do it again,” I think I would try to structure the editorial office so that some of this time-consuming letter writing was shared with other colleagues – it was a rather exhausting part of the job for three years!

Managing Editor Cheryl Larsson did a marvelous job upgrading the “output” that went from the editorial office to the printer and UC Press. She produced uniform electronic copy of all the contents of each issue and forwarded it in one file to the printers. Ms. Larsson’s efforts helped us to considerably “catch up” on our production schedule: the last issue of 1999 was about three months late (appearing in February 2000) and the difficulties of “transition” and our initial year at UCI made it difficult for us to “close up” that lag. But by efficiently producing an improved final product that was relatively error-free, we were able to get back to being “on schedule” by last summer’s August 2001 issue. We fell slightly behind on the November 2001 special issue – which, in the wake of the 9/11 tragedy, serendipitously focused on “Globalization and Social Problems,” at a time when that was a very hot topic – but the delays in that instance were related to coordinating author work for a “themed” issue. But in March 2002, Ms. Larsson was forced to take medical disability leave because of severe back problems. She eventually had successful surgery later in the spring. Although she’s now recovering nicely, she plans to retire as a UCI staff person at the end of this summer. Even from home, Ms. Larsson continued to help the remaining staff run the editorial office. But her physical absence and inability to do many of her “usual” office tasks made things tough: Editorial Assistant Danielle MacCartney had to learn how to take care of a number of new tasks involving contacts with both authors and the UC Press
about page proofs, “permissions,” etc. As a result a couple of recent issues were somewhat delayed – despite a great deal of extra work by Ms. MacCartney.

On the attached sheet is a copy of some statistical data for the past year, updated to August 12th. Since June 1st of last year 274 manuscripts arrived in our office (this does not count initial submissions that arrived after June 1, 2002 and were forwarded to Marquette; it does include a handful (10 to be exact) of revised and resubmitted papers that came post-June 1st that our office continued to “handle”). Coincidently, 274 is exactly the same number that we received last year during the 12 month period from June 1st to June 1st (with the additional 10 papers that arrived later, the 2001-2002 year saw a slight decline in submissions – but by handling 883 submissions over three years we averaged 294 per year). We continue to have a relatively low acceptance rate – 9.5 percent (almost identical to last year). But I should note, in the interest of full disclosure, that we “count” revised and resubmitted manuscripts in the denominator of that rate – which “double counts” some papers. We are no longer having the trouble that we had in our first year of “filling” issues – in fact, I hope that we will use almost all of our press allocation of 640 pages (and we’ve filled more pages the past two years than my predecessor did in his first two years as Editor). Note that in the past year 31% of all “R&R”ed papers were accepted (and also note that we differentiated between “strong” and “weak” R&Rs: the acceptance rate for the stronger ones is almost certainly well above 50%). Initially in 1999 we decided to discourage multiple rounds of revision. We still do – and we’ve been particularly reluctant to “pass along” second or third R&Rs to the new Editor (which seems a bit unfair to both Professor Holstein and the authors). But a fairly significant number of already revised papers were offered additional R&Rs this past year – and we decided to only do that if we were relatively confident that the paper would be published (in many instances, this involves an “expedited review” with only one or two referees reviewing the final version, so it is “close” to a “conditional acceptance”). This past year we actually “deflected” a lower percentage of papers – only 40% or 17%. This means that, after the Editor and an Associate Editor read the paper, we decided that they didn’t fit this journal or were not up to our publication standards (in some of these cases the editor’s letter offers suggestions for revision and invites the author(s) to resubmit). Frankly, our most recent deflection rate may be too low – we have had a number of papers this past year which received rather overwhelmingly negative reviews: we probably should have “stopped” some of these papers before they were sent to external evaluators. When papers are sent out to referees, on average we ultimately receive just under four reviews (because of the way the e-mail solicitation system works, we sometimes even get five or six evaluators, although this is rare). Despite a fairly complicated and labor intensive review process our average process time is just 73 days (a little over ten weeks). Note that the processing time varies according to the final decision on the paper: when we “deflect” a paper we do so in just over a week. In the past three years we have sent out well over 5000 referee solicitations via e-mail; we now have complete information on 2135 reviewers listed in our database. (I can provide more detailed statistical data upon request.)

At this time, the August issue is in press (unfortunately, it will be about four weeks late), and we have accepted eight additional papers – most of which will probably appear in the November 2002 number which is currently being formatted. The highlight of the past year – at least for me! – was the appearance of the special issue on “Globalization and Social Problems,” in November 2001. I have received quite a bit of positive feedback on that issue. Indeed, Rebecca Simon was sufficiently enthusiastic to suggest that I propose publishing an edited collection with UC Press based on the issue. Although UC Press decided not to pursue this project, I have gotten some initial positive interest from the University of Minnesota Press – and plan to submit a prospectus for an expanded edited collection (including the articles in the special issue plus some invited chapters from prominent scholars in this area). Regardless of the final outcome with that further publication, I think despite the additional work (and difficulty getting all the authors to finish up the necessary revisions “on time”), special issues are extremely valuable. This particular themed issue brought Social Problems into the awareness of a number of scholars who may not have considered it a possible outlet for their work (and, in fact, we continued to get quite a few submissions on this broad topic until the end of my term). It takes time and planning (in fact, an incoming Editor almost needs to be ready to issue a “call” immediately upon taking the job to get this done within a three year term). But I would encourage future editors to consider doing this sort of special issue – they generate interest in both the journal and SSP.

In the last several months, we put some effort into facilitating the transition to the new Editor, Jim Holstein at Marquette. At the beginning of this year, Professor Holstein officially became an Associate Editor – and we began sending him copies of files. He and I have been in almost weekly e-mail communication since then. In mid-March, Jim came out for a two-day visit to Irvine – he spent time with each member of the office staff (Editor, Editorial Assistant, and Managing Editor) and learned about how we did our day-to-day work here. I would strongly recommend that this sort of campus visit become an institutionalized part of editorial transitions in the future. In early June, Editorial Assistant Danielle MacCartney flew to Milwaukee and helped Jim and his staff set up the database, sort out the paper files, etc. Danielle has been communicating with Jim and also directly with the Editorial Assistant at Marquette. Finally, when I began my term as Editor my predecessor (for only noble reasons) decided not to “pass along” any accepted papers (except, ironically, one authored by then Editorial Assistant Dennis Downey). As a result we felt like we were “scrambling” for papers to fill our first issue. Jim and I discussed this problem and decided that the UCI editorial office should, essentially, “stay open” this summer and continue to process promising revised
and resubmitted papers, with the idea that we may accept more than we need for the November 2002 issue and some of those may end up in the February 2003 issue. I think this is a good policy for the SSSP to recommend (or at least strongly suggest) for future “transitions.” I doubt that we will accept more than three or four papers to “bequeath” to Professor Holstein – but that should really help him with the February issue as he gets things rolling at Marquette.

In conclusion, I feel that we had a successful run at the UCI editorial office of Social Problems. This was due to the excellent work that all members of the “editorial team.” I would like to thank all the Associate Editors over the three years (Professors Calavita, Delgado, Holstein, Jenness, Naples, Robnett, Stepan-Norris), Editorial Assistant (Danielle MacCartney), Managing Editor (Cheryl Larsson), and our regular work-study student (paid for by the UCI School of Social Sciences) undergraduate sociology major Myesha Garrett. Once again, I would like to make special mention of Dennis Downey – as the inaugural Editorial Assistant, Dennis really kept things afloat during the first year the journal was at UCI, and his work on the database will provide a lasting contribution to the SSSP and future Social Problems’ Editors. (And congratulations to Dennis on his tenure-track appointment at the University of Utah and – just this week! – finishing his PhD!). I would also like to thank Michele Koontz and Tom Hood who were founts of information and helped make the job in Irvine much more pleasant and productive. Overall, the past three years numerous asked me if the job was “fun” yet – I’m not sure that editing a large prestigious journal like Social Problems ever seems like “fun.” However, I did get a very strong sense of satisfaction that, at least at times, we were doing our job reasonably well, upholding some high standards, but also providing a service to both our readers and the authors who entrusted us with their manuscripts. I am very honored and proud to have served in this capacity and to have enjoyed the trust and confidence of the Society!

David A. Smith
for the UCI Social Problems editorial team

---

**Social Problems Annual Report, 2001/02**

**Total manuscripts submitted:** 274  
Original submissions: 193  
Revised manuscripts: 81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editorial Decisions:</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Revise</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>Deflect</th>
<th>Withdraw</th>
<th>Pending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#’s</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#’s</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of original</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#’s</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of revised</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Editorial time to process (days):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Avg</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>Revise</th>
<th>Reject</th>
<th>Deflect</th>
<th>Withdraw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Ms</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Editorial Summaries**

Acceptance rate: 9.5%
Average reviews per manuscript: 3.75
Editorial activity (June 1999 – July 2002):
Solicitations for review: 5,260
Reviewers in database: 2,135
TO: SSSP BOARD OF DIRECTORS
RE: COUNCIL OF DIVISION CHAIRS ANNUAL REPORT
FROM: PJ McGANN, Chair, Council of Division Chairs

The Chairs of the Special Problems Divisions have been considering a number of common issues this year, including policy regarding the student paper competitions, the need for better mentoring of Division Chairs, and the historical problem of how the Society should respond to inactive divisions.

I. STUDENT PAPER COMPETITIONS

A number of issues surfaced this year regarding the Student Paper Competitions. Chairs were confused as to policies regarding dual paper submissions, whether a student must be a member of the division to participate in its student paper competition, and if the Society mandates that divisions follow a uniform policy in running their competitions. The Chairs were divided over whether the same paper can be submitted to multiple competitions; not all of the Chairs participated in the discussion regarding membership. Given the Chair's preference for local control of divisions matters over uniform policy, it was suggested that whatever their policies on these matters, Divisions need to state the guidelines clearly in their announcements. Divisions should also be made aware of potential problems arising from their policies, and possible ways to avoid resulting difficulties (that divisions must be notified if a paper is submitted to more than one competition, for example). A summary of division guidelines distributed to the Chairs is one way to address this concern.

II. DIVISION CHAIR MENTORING

Another concern of Division Chairs is the variable mentoring they receive. Although some Chairs felt they received excellent mentoring from their out-going Chair, others received little or none. Some Divisions have instituted a co-chair system as a way to institutionalize chair mentoring and divide the workload of running the division. In my role as Chair of the Council of Special Problem's Divisions, I have also informed incoming chairs of their duties and distributed a copy of the Division Chair calendar at the first meeting of the Chair's Council. Chairs are also referred to the SSSP Bylaws for more complete description of their roles and responsibilities, and are encouraged to contact me or Michele Koontz for additional information or assistance. Even so, it is clear that the transition for new chairs is not as smooth as it might be.

One of the ways I intend to address this problem is by expanding the comments in the Division Chair Calendar. It might also be helpful to provide more in-depth explanation of chair duties when election results are announced -- including the expectation that the chair will attend the Chair's Council and that the transition in chairs normally occurs at the divisions business meeting. This change will compliment my existing practice of sending the Chairs multiple reminders of their duties, including their responsibility to attend the meetings of the Chair's Council.

III. THE PROBLEM OF INACTIVE SPECIAL PROBLEMS DIVISIONS

By far the major preoccupation of the Chairs over the past year has been the nagging problem of how to respond to inactive divisions. This conversation began at the 2001 Annual Meetings in Anaheim in response to a charge by the Board of Directors to devise a policy regarding the handling of inactive divisions. In our initial discussions it became clear that many chairs did not fully understand the function of divisions within the Society. Related to this, many chairs -- not necessarily incoming chairs -- also did not understand the roles and responsibilities of division chairs. After clarifying these issues we considered what an active division is. This conversation was preparatory for next defining what an inactive division is. Both of these conversations then framed our suggestions for how the Society might respond to an inactive division (however defined).

In what follows I summarize the input from the Chairs of the Special Problems Divisions regarding their vision of an active division, the minimal requirements of an active division, the rationale behind these criteria, and possible responses by the Society when a division does not meet the minimal requirements.

A. WHAT IS AN ACTIVE SSSP DIVISION?

The Chairs agree that an “active” division is one that “does what it’s supposed to do.” These activities are listed below, divided into two tiers, roughly in order of perceived importance within each tier. The first tier includes activities deemed essential for a healthy and active division; the second tier includes activities deemed less than essential, but nonetheless important for healthy division life.

TIER 1: ESSENTIAL DIVISION ACTIVITIES
A. Timely Division Chair Elections
B. Annual Meeting Paper Sessions
C. Division Newsletter
D. Student Paper Competition
E. Division Business Meeting at the Annual Meeting

TIER 2: NON-ESSENTIAL DIVISION ACTIVITIES
A. Division gathering at the annual meeting
   (e.g. reception, tour, or other activity beyond sessions)
B. Division scholarly awards
C. Non-newsletter publications

B. TOWARD A POLICY REGARDING AN “INACTIVE” DIVISION

1. MINIMUM STANDARDS OF DIVISION ACTIVITY

The Chairs agreed that only Tier 1 or “essential” division activities should be considered when assessing whether or not a division has become inactive. The proposed minimum standards of division activity are (a) an election for chair every two years (as mandated in SSSP bylaws); (b) at least two scholarly sessions at the annual meeting; (c) publication of one newsletter published over an
eight-month period; (d) an annual student paper competition; (e) convening an annual business meeting. Two of these criteria deviate from customary division practice: normally divisions are allotted three paper sessions at the annual meeting and two newsletters per year. It is proposed that failure to meet any of the minimum standards is an indication that a division has become inactive.

2. RATIONALE FOR THE MINIMUM STANDARDS OF DIVISION ACTIVITY

Because the Chair is central to Division functioning the Chairs felt that division elections must be held on time, i.e. at least every two years. Although divisions are allotted three sessions at each annual meeting, the Chairs felt there should be some leeway on this indicator. While number of sessions may be a proxy indicator of division membership interest, it might also reflect a momentary, “less than ideal” fit between session themes and member research. Number of sessions might also fluctuate when a division’s members fail to attend the annual meeting due to other commitments, as when Environment and Technology members attend the meetings of the Rural Sociological Society, for example.

Because division newsletters are the primary means of communication among members, timely newsletter publication is thought essential. However, because newsletters may be delayed for various reasons unrelated to member interest and participation -- the newsletter editor and/or division chair is/are temporarily over-whelmed with professional or personal obligations, the relationship between editor and chair might be strained, or a chair might simply be doing a “less than able” job, to name a few -- the Chairs felt there should be some latitude in this indicator.

In our initial discussion regarding what constitutes an active division, the annual student paper competition was considered a Tier 2 activity. However, in subsequent conversations the Chairs agreed that the paper competitions serve many purposes (such as positive “PR” and increased visibility for the division, membership recruitment and retention, networking among students and faculty, mentoring). Thus, it is proposed that student paper competitions are an essential aspect of division activity.

Division Business Meetings at the Annual Meeting are often poorly attended (something this year’s experiment with multiple, simultaneous meetings might address). Despite this fact, division business meetings provide an additional avenue of member participation and are thus viewed as essential. Also, SSSP bylaws mandate that Divisions convene a division business meeting at the annual meeting.

Notably absent from this understanding of a minimal division activity is division membership. The chairs were in over-whelming agreement that a division’s number of members is a crude measure of activity at best. As such, it should not be used as the sole standard of whether a division is considered active, inactive, or should be recommended for termination. The Chairs note, for example, that smaller divisions may be more active than larger divisions. They also warn against conflating a division’s popularity with its level of activity.

However, according to current SSSP Bylaws, the Chair’s Council may recommend to the Board of Directors that a division be terminated when its membership falls below 150 for two consecutive years. In contrast, the Chairs felt that division membership should only be considered in combination with other indicators of division inactivity. One suggestion to this impasse is that division membership might be considered a “tipping point” that nudges an otherwise borderline division into inactive status. Alternatively, many Chairs felt that if division membership is used as an indicator of inactivity that the threshold number should be lowered from its current standard (150), perhaps to 100.

C. IMPLEMENTING POLICY BASED ON INDICATIONS OF DIVISION INACTIVITY

(As this aspect of the Chair’s discussion is on-going, what follows is preliminary and somewhat sketchy.)

Although the Chairs agreed that the problem of inactive divisions is real, that existing policy regarding inactive divisions (however defined) is inadequate, and that the status quo does not serve the membership, most Chairs were very uncomfortable deciding what actions to take in response to an “inactive” division (however defined), and indicated a strong preference for referring this matter to the Board of Directors.

When pressed, the Chairs felt it would be best if the Society undertook a series of steps in responding to an inactive division. The proposals for these steps were varied and mostly abstract, but included a sequence of responses from less to more punitive, and from less to more public.

For example, a division that has one indicator of inactivity might be warned via a letter to the Division Chair that it is in danger of lapsing into inactive status. The divisions would then be given a timetable for action to address the indicator, such as to have an election by a certain date. If the required action is not taken in the allotted time frame, a notice of inactive or probationary status might then be mailed to division members -- in hopes that they might intervene, perhaps nudging the Chair into action on their behalf. Finally, if the measures suggested in the warning and notice are not taken, all Society members should be notified that the division has been placed on Probation due to inactivity, that the division is in danger of being dissolved by a certain date, and what remedies must be taken to avoid dissolution of the inactive division.

This process could be accelerated in some instances, as when a Division shows more than one indicator of inactivity. If a division shows two or more indicators of inactivity, for example, the letter of warning to the Chair and the notice of probationary status to division members could be issued simultaneously. Whatever the mechanism and its time frame, many of the Chairs felt that the final decision to dissolve a division should be referred back to the Board of Directors.

D. A WORD OF CAUTION REGARDING THE ROLE OF DIVISION CHAIRS IN DIVISION INACTIVITY

Throughout our discussions nearly all of the Chairs voiced concern that divisions not be “punished for the sins of the Chair.” Because of the centrality of the Chair role and the Chair’s influence on division activity, the Chairs felt that the Society must build in “safeguards” for division members in the event that a division chair does not fulfill her or his duties. The series of steps described above is one possible way to protect division members from negligent chairs. Another would be the timing of these steps over the course of three years undertaken with the idea that if the apparent inactivity is due to Chair deficiency that a new chair could return a division to full, active status.
2003 STUDENT PAPER COMPETITIONS AND OUTSTANDING SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS
sponsored by the
Society for the Study of Social Problems

CONFLICT, SOCIAL ACTION, AND CHANGE DIVISION  Deadline: 5/1/03
The Conflict, Social Action, and Change Division will award $100 for a solely written paper by a current graduate student on issues related to the division's mission. Please send three copies of the paper to: Chris Baker, Walters State Community College, Morristown, TN 37813; chris.baker@ws.edu.

CRIME AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY DIVISION  Postmark Deadline: 3/15/03
The Crime and Juvenile Delinquency Division announces its 2003 Graduate Student Paper Competition. Papers may be empirical or theoretical, and they may be on any aspect of crime, deviance, and/or social control. To be eligible, a paper must have been written during 2002, and it may not be published, accepted for publication, or under review for publication. Papers which have been presented at a professional meeting or which have been submitted for presentation at a professional conference are eligible. Papers must be student-authored; they can be single-authored by the student, or co-authored by two students, but may not be co-authored by a student with a faculty member or other non-student. A 25 page limit, including all notes, references, and tables. Send papers and a cover letter specifying that the paper is to be considered in the Crime and Juvenile Delinquency Division Graduate Student Paper Competition to: Thomas Vander Ven, Dept of Soc and Anthro, Ohio University, Athens, OH, 45701. Include a brief letter from your advisor certifying graduate student status. The winner will be announced in spring 2003, and will receive a $300 stipend.

ENVIRONMENT AND TECHNOLOGY DIVISION  Deadline: 4/15/03
The Environment and Technology Division announces its 2003 Graduate Student Paper Competition. Papers may be theoretical and/or empirical and may be on a topic relevant to environment and technology, including environmental movements, technology and risk, political economy and the environment, or environmental justice. The winner will receive a monetary award plus payment of the winner’s SSSP membership fee for the 2003 SSSP meeting to help the winner attend the meeting. The winner will be offered the opportunity to present this paper at one of the Environment and Technology sessions being held at the 2003 SSSP meetings. To be eligible, the paper must meet the following criteria: 1) The paper must have been written between January 2002 and April 2003; 2) The paper may not have been submitted for publication (papers presented at other professional meetings or that have been submitted for presentation at other meetings are eligible); 3) The paper must be authored by one or more students and not co-authored by faculty or colleague who is not a student; 4) The paper must be 25 pages or less, including notes, references, and tables; and, 5) The paper must be accompanied by a letter from a faculty member at the student's university nominating the paper for the Environment and Technology Division Graduate Student Paper Competition. Students should send two copies of their paper accompanied by a letter of support to: Erin Robinson, Dept of Soc, 430 Park Hall, University at Buffalo-SUNY, Buffalo, NY 14260; 716-645-2417, ext 462. Papers will also be accepted over email: eerl@acsu.buffalo.edu. The winner will be announced prior to the 2003 SSSP meetings.

FAMILY DIVISION  Deadline: 3/1/03
The Family Division announces its 2003 Graduate Student Paper Competition. Papers should be of professional quality, and may relate to any aspect of sociology of the family. Authors should be currently enrolled as graduate students, or individuals who received their Ph.D.s in May 2002 or later. To be eligible, a paper may not be published, accepted, or under review for publication. Papers which have been presented at a professional meeting or which have been submitted for presentation at a professional conference are eligible. Papers must be student-authored; they can be single-authored by the student, or co-authored two students, but may not be co-authored by a student with a faculty member or other non-student. Papers should be of 20-35 pages in length, including all notes, references, and tables. Send papers and a cover letter specifying that the paper is to be considered in the Family Division Graduate Student Paper Competition to: Amy Hequembourg, 44 Richmond Avenue, Apt. 5, Buffalo, NY 14222. Alternatively, papers may be sent electronically to Amy Hequembourg at ah5@acsu.buffalo.edu. The winner and any runners-up will be announced in Spring, 2003. The winner will receive a modest cash stipend and registration fees for the 2003 SSSP Annual Meeting.

HEALTH, HEALTH POLICY, AND HEALTH SERVICES DIVISION  Deadline: 6/1/03
All graduate students are encouraged to apply for this annual paper award competition. The paper should be related to the broad Division interest, including health and illness, health policy, and health services. The paper submission should not exceed 30 double-spaced pages and should be prepared for anonymous review (with the author specified on a title page but not referred to in other parts of the text). Current graduate students and recent graduates (who received their degrees after January 2002) may submit a paper if it was written while still a student. Papers based on theses or dissertations are acceptable. (Please do not submit the thesis or dissertation itself.) Co-authored papers are acceptable as long as all the listed authors are current graduate students. Double submission to other SSSP award competitions would be disqualified. The award recipient will be required to present the winning paper at the 2003 SSSP annual meeting in Atlanta. Thus it is strongly recommended that an abstract of the paper be submitted to any Health Division session organizer or the roundtable organizer by the January 31st deadline. The recipient will receive a monetary prize of $100, student membership to SSSP, SSSP conference registration, and
a ticket to the SSSP awards banquet. Send three copies of the paper and a short letter of submission identifying your graduate program to: Professor Judith N. Lasker, Dept of Soc and Anthro, 681 Taylor Street, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA 18015.

**LAW AND SOCIETY DIVISION  **  **Deadline:** 3/1/03

The Alfred R. Lindesmith Award is annually given to the best paper presented at the previous year’s SSSP annual meeting that is law-related and written by one or more untenured faculty and/or graduate student(s) and has not been submitted for publication prior to presentation at the SSSP meeting. If your paper or that of a friend’s meet these criteria, please submit three copies of the paper to: Mathieu Deflem, Dept of Soc, University of South Carolina, Sloan College 217, Columbia, SC 29208, deflem@gwn.sc.edu, W: (803) 777-6596.

**SEXUAL BEHAVIOR, POLITICS, AND COMMUNITIES DIVISION  **  **Deadline:** 3/1/03

The Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities Division announces its 2003 Graduate Student Paper Competition. Papers may be empirical and/or theoretical, and they may be on any aspect of sexuality, including sexual behavior, sexual identity, sexual politics, sex law, political activism, or sexual communities. The winner will receive a stipend of $100 plus payment of the winner’s SSSP membership fee for the 2003 SSSP meeting to help the winner attend the meeting. The winner will be offered an opportunity to present this paper at the SBPC sessions being held as part of the 2003 SSSP meeting. To be eligible, a paper must meet the following criteria: 1) The paper must have been written between January 2002 and March 2003; 2) The paper not have been submitted or accepted for publication (papers that have been presented at a professional meeting or that have been submitted for presentation at a professional meeting are eligible); 3) The paper must be authored by one or more students, and not co-authored with a faculty member or colleague who is not a student; 4) The paper must be 25 pages or less, including notes, references, and tables. 5) The paper must be accompanied by a letter from a faculty member at the student’s college or university nominating the paper for the Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities Division Student Paper Competition. Students should send five copies of their paper, accompanied by a letter of nomination from a faculty member to: Lloyd Klein, History and Social Sciences Dept, Louisiana State University, Shreveport, One University Place, Shreveport, LA 71115; W: 318-797-5123; F: 318-797-5122; lklein@pilot.lsus.edu.

**SOCIAL PROBLEMS THEORY DIVISION  **  **Deadline:** 4/1/03

The Theory Division invites papers for its annual Student Paper Competition. To be eligible, papers must be authored or co-authored by students only. They must pertain to some aspect of social problems theory and must have not been accepted for publication (papers that have been presented at a professional meeting or that have been submitted for presentation at a professional meeting are eligible). Papers co-authored with faculty are not eligible. Manuscripts should be no longer than 25 pages. The 1st place winner will receive $150 and the 2nd place winner will receive $100. Both winners will have their meeting registration fees paid and receive a banquet ticket for the 2003 Annual Meeting. The winner(s) will be announced prior to the 2003 SSSP Annual Meeting. Please send four copies of the paper to: Dr. Kathryn Fox, Dept of Soc, University of Vermont, 31 South Prospect Street, Burlington, Vermont 05405-0176. If you have any questions, email the Committee Chair at kfox@zoo.uvm.edu.

**SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL WELFARE DIVISION  **  **Deadline:** 3/1/03

The Sociology and Social Welfare Division will award $150 for a solely written paper by a current graduate student on issues related to poverty and/or welfare reform. Please send three copies of the paper to: Alfred Louis Joseph, 104C McGuffey Hall, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056; josephal@muohio.edu.

**TEACHING SOCIAL PROBLEMS DIVISION  **  **Deadline:** 3/15/03

The Teaching Social Problems Division announces its 2003 Graduate Student Paper Competition. Papers may be on any aspect of teaching about social problems. Topics for papers can include “best practices” in the classroom, service-learning courses, using technology, using media, assessment of learning, and other areas. The winner will receive a stipend of $100 plus payment of the winner’s SSSP registration fee for the 2003 SSSP meeting to help the winner attend the meeting. The winner will be offered an opportunity to present this paper at one of the Teaching Social Problems Division sessions being held as part of the 2003 SSSP meeting. To be eligible, a paper must meet the following criteria: 1) The paper must have been written between January 2002 and March 2003; 2) The paper may not have been submitted or accepted for publication (papers that have been presented at a professional meeting or that have been submitted for presentation at a professional meeting are eligible); 3) The paper must be authored by one or more students, and not co-authored with a faculty member or colleague who is not a student; 4) The paper must be 25 pages or less, including notes, references, and tables; and, 5) The paper must be accompanied by a letter from a faculty member at the student’s college/ university nominating the paper for the Teaching Social Problems Division Student Paper Competition. Students should send five copies of their papers, accompanied by a letter of nomination from a faculty member, to: Professor Will Holton, Dept of Soc, 500 HO, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115; (617) 373-3833; w.holton@neu.edu. The winner will be announced prior to the 2003 SSSP Annual Meeting.

**FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION, CONTACT:**
Michele Smith Koontz, Administrative Officer
University of Tennessee, 901 McClung Tower
Knoxville, TN 37996-0490
W: (865) 689-1531; F: (865) 689-1534; mkoontz2@utk.edu
http://www.it.utk.edu/sss
ELECTION BIOGRAPHIES

PRESIDENT ELECT (2003-2004)
President (2004-2005)

Gary Alan Fine

**Present Position:** Professor of Sociology, Northwestern University. **Former Positions:** Professor and Department Head, University of Georgia, 1990-97; Assistant Professor to Professor, University of Minnesota, 1976-90. **Degrees:** Ph.D. Harvard University, 1976; B.A. University of Pennsylvania, 1972. **Major Publications:** *Whispers on the Color Line: Rumor and Race in America* (with Patricia Turner), University of California Press, 2001. *Difficult Reputations: Collective Memories of the Evil, Inept, and Controversial*, University of Chicago Press, 2001. *Gifted Tongues: High School Debate and Adolescent Culture*, Princeton University Press, 2001. "Games and Truths: Learning to Construct Social Problems in High School Debate," *The Sociological Quarterly*, 2000, 103-23. "John Brown's Body: Elites, Cultural Resonance and the Legitimization of Political Violence," *Social Problems*, 1999, 225-49. "Scandal, Social Conditions and the Creation of Public Attention: 'Fatty' Arbuckle and the 'Problem' of Hollywood," *Social Problems*, 1997, 297-323. "Naturework and the Taming of the Wild: The Problem of 'Overpick' in the Culture of Mushrooms," *Social Problems*, 1997, 68-88. **Honors and Professional Recognition:** Opie Award, 1988, American Folklore Society for *With the Boys: Little League Baseball and Preadolescent Culture*; Charles Horton Cooley Award, 1999, Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction for *Morel Tales: The Culture of Mushrooms*. **SSSP Offices/Committees:** Member, Board of Directors (1993-1996); Chair, Council of Social Problems Divisions (1991); Chair, Social Problems Theory Section (1990-1992). **Other Professional Affiliations:** American Sociological Association (1974-present); Chair, Sociology of Culture Section; Social Psychology Section, Sociological Theory Section, Sociology of Youth and Childhood Section; Midwest Sociological Society (1976-present); President (2001-2002); Southern Sociological Society (1976-present), Vice-President (1996-1997); Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction (1975-present), President (1990-1991). **Candidate's Statement:** Having been a member of SSSP for over a quarter of a century, I am honor- ed to stand for President. I have always felt that SSSP is my home, and I believe that during this time *Social Problems* has been the most exciting and most significant publication in the discipline. As President, I will work on ensuring that the Annual Meeting program is vibrant and welcoming. In particular, the President of this organization has an affirmative responsibility to ensure that all members of the organization feel welcome. Each section needs to be respected and included. This responsibility extends to more than academics in research universities, but to all faculty, including those at teaching schools and at community colleges. Further, a signifi- cant number of our members are employed outside of academic life, many as social activists. The meetings are designed for them as well. Finally, our future and our life blood are our graduate students. They are full members of the organizations, and not merely incidental trainees. My program committee will represent all of these groups; it will, to paraphrase Bill Clinton, look like SSSP. In addition, I will work with the Board to find the best uses of our resources, while using our resources to support those activist goals to which we are committed. The President of any academic organization must be committed to service. If elected, I will serve this organization to the best of my ability.

Raymond J. Michalowski

dendent and President would be a serious and sacred duty to ensure that the SSSP continues to confront the forces of inequality and injustice - both nationally and globally - that will threaten social peace in the coming years. The Society also has a particularly important role to play in confronting the increasing challenges faced by the Academy at a time when its component universities, particularly public ones, are increasingly being pressured to transform themselves from centers of higher learning educating new generations of critical thinkers into knowledge stores serving customers.


Martha A. Hargraves


PJ McGann

Board of Directors (2003-2006)

Donald Cunningen


Keith M. Kilty

gence of Biological Determinism and the Assault on Human Diversity," *Race, Gender & Class* 5:61-75 (with E.A. Segal), 1998. "Institutional Racism and Media Representations: Depictions of Violent Criminals and Welfare Recipients," *Sociological Imagination* 34:105-128 (with E. Swank), 1997. **Honors and Professional Recognition:** Louis Nemzer Award for Academic Freedom, AAUP/OSU Chapter, Nov. 2001; Teaching Award, Multicultural Teaching Program, OSU, April 1993. **SSSP Offices/Committees:** Chair, PCI Division, 2000-2002; Committee on Committees, 2000-2002, Chair, 2001-2002; Chair, Elections Committee, 1997-1998; C. Wright Mills Award Committee, 1998-1999. **Other Professional Affiliations:** AAUP/OSU Chapter - Vice President (1999-Present), Chair, Committee A (2000-Present); Social Welfare Action Alliance, Treasurer, 1993-2000. **Candidate's Statement:** It is an honor to be a candidate for the SSSP Board of Directors. I have been an active member of this organization for over 25 years, largely because of its unique nature. SSSP has a tradition of encouraging careful and critical scholarly work while also maintaining a tradition of advocacy for the oppressed in our society. Throughout my professional life, I have shared these two commitments and appreciated the support of this organization and its members. Some in the academic world might see these two values as contradictory, but SSSP has provided those of us with these mutual goals with a haven. We live in a society that is increasingly fracturing along racial, ethnic, gender, and class lines, which means that it is more and more important to try to find ways to resolve the deep conflicts that divide and separate us. To understand the causes of these divisions requires sound research and theory, but it also means that we must accept our responsibilities as social scientists and citizens to try to bring about change. This Society supports and honors those endeavors. During the past two years while I chaired the Poverty, Class, and Inequality Division, some of our members suggested that we organize a national forum on poverty and inequality, which we did this past summer following the SSSP meetings. Without the support and encouragement of the Society, a number of its social problems divisions, and many of its members, we would not have been able to accomplish this task. I would like to help the Society continue to support the application of sound social science to understanding and resolving the problems of our society and will work toward that goal if elected to the SSSP Board of Directors.

**Lloyd Klein**

**Present Position:** Assistant Professor, Louisiana State University-Shreveport. **Former Positions:** Assistant Professor, Louisiana State University, Shreveport, 2000-Present; Assistant Professor, University of Tennessee, Chattanooga, 1999-2000; Adjunct Associate Professor, Medgar Evers College, CUNY, 1986-1992. **Degrees:** Ph.D., CUNY Graduate School, 1993; M.A., Brooklyn College, CUNY, 1978; B.A., Queens College, CUNY, 1974. **Major Publications:** "Who Wants to be a Peacemaker? Emphasizing Humanist Perspectives In the Classroom Setting." (Co-authored with Sheila Van Ness), *Professing Humanist Sociology, ASA Teaching Resources Center, 2000; It's in the Cards: Consumer Credit and the American Experience*, Praeger, 1999; "Do Ask, Do Tell: Assessing Implications of Community Notification Requirements Within Offender Legislation," *Selective Issues in Victimization*, Carolina Academic Press, 1998. "Big Brother is Still Watching You: The Revival of Surveillance Programs Against American Citizens," *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*, 1992. "Taking a Bite Out of Social Injustice: Crime Control Ideology and its Peacemaking Potential" (Co-authored with Joan Luxenburg and John Gunther), *Criminology as Peacemaking*, Harold Pepinsky and Richard Quinney (eds) Indiana University Press, 1991. "Perceived Neighborhood Crime and the Impact of Private Security," co-authored with Joan Luxenburg and Marianna King), *Crime and Delinquency*, 1989. **SSSP Offices/Committees:** Chairperson, Accessibility Committee, 2001-2003; Chairperson, Crime and Delinquency Division, 1999-2001; Chairperson, Sexual Behavior, Politics, and Communities Division, 1996-1998. **Other Professional Affiliations:** American Sociological Association, Council, Marxist Section, 2002-2005; Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Membership Committee, 2001; Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Program Committee, 1994. **Candidate Statement:** I have been a SSSP member since 1977. During that period, I have settled into a professional role within the sociology discipline. The SSSP was and continues to serve as an important factor in my sociological orientation. The SSSP is an important organization and its work must continue. I bring a strong commitment to the Board of Directors position. First, a quarter century of experience with the organization gives me knowledge about where the SSSP has been and the appropriate directions for future growth. Second, my service over the last decade in the role as division chair for the Sexual, Behavior, Politics, and Communities and Crime and Delinquency Divisions provides much input about the continued governance of this organization. Additionally my committee work covers such areas as student support and meeting organization. Third, my service on a Board of Directors in the Shreveport, LA area provides a base of experience transferable to the SSSP and its own organization needs. The board should encourage policies enabling continued member support and the creation of appropriate policies for editorial, professional concerns, financial growth, and advance planning for future meeting sites. My role would encourage activism in encouragement fulfillment of the above concerns and other issues brought before the board. Finally, I would strongly encourage committee participation by individuals capable of continuing the mission of the SSSP as brought forth by Al Lee and the original founders.

**Kathleen S. Lowery**


David A. Smith

United States' role and position in the world was particularly high. Indeed, it is the global dimensions of social problems (and the social problem of "globalization") that animates much of my own research. I think it is imperative that the SSSP move into the twenty-first century with a real focus on world-wide dimensions of many of the most pressing problems facing humankind. While a global perspective can and should be developed in much of the on-going work that goes on within the Society and it's current Divisions, I also believe that we should explore establishing a new Division that will focus on global social problems. Many of my sociological colleagues who do global/comparative teaching and research share the principles of SSSP, but believe (mistakenly, I think) that their work wouldn't "fit." Bringing these folks into the Society would benefit them - and us! If elected, I will be a voice for more attention to "the global" on the Board of Directors. But as the former Editor of Social Problems, I am also acutely aware of the enormous vitality and great variety of work being done by SSSP members. So I am very committed to enhance the Society's efforts to promote intentional inclusivity toward diverse people and ideas.

Amy S. Wharton


BOARD OF DIRECTORS (2003-2005)
Student Representatives

Glenda Kelm

Present Position: Doctoral Student, University of California, Irvine. Degrees: B.A., Criminology, magna cum laude, The Ohio State University, 2000. Other Professional Affiliations: American Society of Criminology, Student Membership, 2000-Present; Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Student Membership, 2001-Present. Candidate's Statement: Glenda Kelm graduated magna cum laude with a B.A. in Criminology from The Ohio State University and is now a doctoral student in the Department of Criminology, Law and Society at the University of California, Irvine. She is actively engaged in funded research on citizen-initiated drug sentencing reform, with a focus on the coalescence of a social movement integral to drug policy reform. Glenda is currently finishing her Master's Thesis on Proposition 36 implementation efforts in California. She served as the graduate student representative at faculty meetings for the 2001-2002 academic year. She received a Mentoring Award in 2001 from the School of Social Ecology in recognition of her work with undergraduate students as a Teaching Assistant. And finally, she served as an assistant to the SSSP Program Chair in 2000 for the 2002 annual meetings of the SSSP.

Aimee Van Wagene

Epistemology of Haunting: A Review Essay," Critical Sociology, forthcoming, 2003. "New Global Technologies of Power: Social Control, Social Inequality and Social Justice," in Mary Romero and Eric Margolis, eds., Blackwell Companion to Social Inequalities, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, forthcoming 2003 (with Stephen Pfohl and William Wood). Honors and Professional Recognition: Donald White Award for Teaching Excellence, Boston College, 2002; Hilda Havnes Manchester Award in Sociology, George Washington University, 1997; Young Scholar Award, Cosmos Club Foundation, 1996-1997. Other Professional Affiliations: Critical Sociology, Editorial Collective Member, 2002-2003. Candidate's Statement: The choice to make a career in sociology was not an easy one for me. As I studied as an undergraduate, I became acutely aware that the science of sociology carried with it an expectation that good scholars bracket their political engagement and activism from their scholarship - from the doing of sociology. And though I wasn't sure what I wanted to study in a graduate program in sociology, I was sure that I didn't want to be that kind of scholar. Encouraged that there was a niche out there where scholarship and political engagement are inseparable, I made the choice (for better or worse!) to become a sociologist. SSSP is such a crucial home for students who share this perspective as we make our way through the contested and competitive terrain of professional sociology. Since attending my first SSSP meeting in 2000, I've come to depend upon the meeting to remind me that there is another way to do sociology. The dynamism of the organization, I think, is in the continuing exploration of this other way. As a member of the board of directors, I would seek to find ways the organization can invigorate this exploration of another way, both to sociology and to do political action. I'm hopeful that there are new strategies to discover and that SSSP can be the center for such discovery. I am running for this office because I have found SSSP to be an organization that very much values the participation of its student members. I'd like to give back in service to the organization. Further, I would like to ensure that student members continue to be valued, encouraged and recruited as move into the future of the study of social problems.

TREASURER (2003-2004)

Susan M. Carlson


SECRETARY (2003-2004)

Dean Knudsen

Present Position: Professor of Sociology, Purdue University. Former Positions: Professor of Sociology, Purdue University; Associate Professor, Purdue University; Assistant Professor, Ohio State University, 1964-1969. Degrees: Ph.D., University of North Carolina, 1964; M.S., University of Minnesota, 1961; B.A., University of Sioux Falls, 1954. Major Publications: Child Maltreat-
BUDGET, FINANCE & AUDIT COMMITTEE (2003-2006)

David L. Levinson


David R. Rudy

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES (2003-2006)

Otis B. Grant


Henry S. Rubin

Present Position: Visiting Assistant Professor, Tufts University. Former Positions: Visiting Assistant Professor, Clark University, 2001-2002; Visiting Assistant Professor, Clark University, 2000-2001; Lecturer, Harvard University, 1996-2000. Degrees: Ph. D., Brandeis University, 1996; M.A., Brandeis University, 1992; B.A. University of California, Santa Cruz, 1988. Major Publications: Self Made Men: Identity & Embodiment in the Lives of Transsexual Men, Vanderbilt UP, Spring 2003. "Phenomenology as Method" in GLQ v. 4, #2, p. 263-281, Duke University Press. 1998. "Between a Metaphysics of Presence and Absence," in Reclaiming Gender: Essays on Transsexuality and Transgressing Gender at the Fin de Siecle, ed. Stephen Whittle, London: Cassells Press, 1999. "Reading Like a (Transsexual) Man?" in Men Do Feminism, ed. Tom Digby, New York: Routledge, 1997. "Report on the First All-FTM Conference: A Vision of Community," in the Journal of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual Identities, v. 1, #2, April 1996. Honors and Professional Recognition: Certificate of Distinction in Teaching (15 Consecutive Semesters), Granted by Harvard University's Derek Bok Center and Dean of Undergraduate Education. SSSP Offices/Committees: Division Chair, Sexual Behaviors, Politics, & Communities, 2000-2002. Other Professional Affiliations: American Sociological Association, 1996-Present; Association for Jewish Studies, 2001-Present. Candidate's Statement: I have been a member of the SSSP for five years. In that time, I have been actively involved in the business of the organization, especially in the Division of Sexual Behaviors, Politics, and Community. I recently finished my two year term as Division Chair. Under my leadership, the division was the epitome of an "active division" as defined by the Council of Division Chairpersons. I was particularly committed to creating links between research and scholars in Sexuality and other topics, such as Education and Crime. Newsletter editorials and co-sponsoring panels and receptions at annual meetings were the primary means of accomplishing this goal. If elected to the Committee on Committees, I would bring this same spirit to the organization as a whole.

Wendy Simonds

Present Position: Associate Professor of Sociology, Georgia State University. Former Positions: Visiting Assistant Professor, Emory University, 1990-1996. Degrees: Ph.D., Sociology, City University of New York, 1990; B.A., Design of the Environment,

"Watching the Clock: Keeping Time During Pregnancy, Birth, and Postpartum Experiences," *Social Science and Medicine*, 2002, 559-570. **SSSP Offices/Committees:** Local Arrangements Chair, 2003; Health and Health Policy Section Grad. Student Paper Award Committee, 2001-2002, 1999-2000, Chair, 2000-2001; Social Problems Advisory Board Committee Member, 1999-Present; C. Wright Mills Award Committee Member, 1999-2000, 1998; Program Co-Chair, 1993. **Other Professional Affiliations:** SWS; ASA. **Candidate's Statement:** I have tried to avoid organizational responsibilities but seem to keep managing to get sucked into them, especially for SSSP. Luckily, I really care about this organization. If elected, I would try to do as little damage as possible.

**Ronnie J. Steinberg**


**EDITORIAL & PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE (2003-2006)**

**Wendy L. Chapkis**

Other Professional Affiliations: ASA - Chair of Graduate Student Paper Award Committee (2003), Member of the Simon and Gagnon Award Committee (2002). Candidate's Statement: There is a critical need for progressive voices in this increasingly dangerous time; I am willing to help the SSSP to ensure those perspectives find their way into print.

Lora Bex Lempert


Jane D. McLeod


**Honors and Professional Recognition:** Award for Best Publication, ASA Section on the Sociology of Mental Health, 1993-1994; Faculty Mentor Award, University of Minnesota Department of Sociology, 1991; McKnight-Land Grant Professor, University of Minnesota, 1991. **SSSP Offices/Committees:** Chair, Mental Health Division, 1999-2001. **Other Professional Affiliations:** ASA - Section on the Sociology of Mental Health, Chair-Elect (2002-2003), Medical Sociology Section Nominations Chair (1999-2001), Section on Sociology of Children Council Member (1998-2000), Section on the Sociology of Mental Health Council Member (1998-2000)

**Doris Wilkinson**


"Conceptual and Methodological Issues in the Use of Race as a Variable: Policy Implications," *The Milbank Quarterly*, vol. 65 (Supplement 1) (1987): 56-71. "Americans of African Identity," *Society*, vol. 27 (May/June, 1990): 14-18. Selected in 2002 as a landmark essay in the 40 year history of Society/Transaction. **Honors and Professional Recognition:** Distinguished Scholar Award, ABS, 1993; Great Teach Award, National Alumni Association, 1992; Distinguished Arts and Sciences Professor, University of Kentucky, 1992; Public Humanities Award, Ky. Humanities Council, 1991; Women's History Award, Midway College, 1990; DuBois-Johnson-Frazier Award, the ASA, 1988. **SSSP Offices/Committees:** President, 1987-1988; Committee on Permanent Organization, 1985-1987; Associate Editor (Editorial Board)/Social Problems, 1978-1981; SSSP Representative to the National Council of Associations for Policy Sciences, 1981; Editorial and Publications Committee, 1977-1980; Member, Lee Founders Award Committee, 1982-1983; Active Participant in Annual Meetings. **Other Professional Affiliations:** American Sociological Association - Vice President (1990-1993), Numerous Committees, Participant in Annual Meetings; Eastern Sociological Society, President, 1993-1994; Sociologists for Women in Society - 2nd Vice President, Numerous Committees, Participant in Annual Meetings; District of Columbia Sociological Society - Former President, Participant in Annual Meetings. **Candidate's Statement:** I am deeply honored to have been nominated for membership on the Publications Committee at this stage in my career. My experiences related to this committee's mission have been extensive. Since my graduate school days, I have designed and created newsletters and served as an advisor for others preparing them for their organizations or departments. Presently, I am a member of my department's Marketing, PR, and Recruitment Committee and one of my tasks is to assist with gathering information for the newsletter. Further, I have served as the newsletter editor for the Eastern Sociological Society and the Association of Black Sociologists. I have also been a reviewer for *Social Forces*, the *American Sociological Review*, and the *American Journal of Sociology*. Additionally, I have been a member of the editorial boards for several major journals in the profession - *Social Problems*, *Gender & Society* (appointed to the founding Board by Judith Lorber), *Sociological Forum*, *Youth*, and the *National Journal of Sociology*, and *Race & Sociology*, among others. Moreover, I have been a long-term member of the SSSP and have served in numerous capacities within the organization. The membership honored and recognized my efforts by electing me to serve as President in 1987. Actually, I credit the Society for the Study of Social Problems for my inclusion and participation in other professional organizations, including the ASA. Over the years, I have developed many friendships in the "community of colleagues" within SSSP. Thus, I look forward to continuing to work with and for an invaluable professional association that has meant so much to me and to many others. Our official journal - *Social Problems* - remains a valuable medium of communication and learning for faculty and students. Many articles from the journal have been included in my teaching and research bibliographies.

---

**CAST YOUR VOTE!**
THANK YOU, SSSP CONTRIBUTORS!

The Society wishes to acknowledge the generous support of the following individuals, whose 2002 financial contributions have greatly aided in the success of SSSP programs and initiatives. If we can be of service, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Tom Hood
Executive Officer

Michele Smith Koontz
Administrative Officer

C. WRIGHT MILLS FUND
Ann Butzin
Cheryl D. Childers
Edward S. Gallagher
Eugene B. Gallagher
Lynn H. Green
Peter M. Hall
Ronald A. Hardert
James M. Henslin
Beth B. Hess
Barbara S. Heyl
Butler A. Jones
Peter Kivisto
Michele Lamont
Allan Lummus
Eileen G. Moran
Fritz Sack
Samuel F. Sampson
Rose Somerville
Regi Teasley
Athena Theodore
J. Wilson Watt

ERWIN O. SMIGEL FUND
Cynthia S. Burnley
Bert Ellenbogen
Ira Fybish
James M. Henslin
Beth B. Hess
Jane C. Hood
Butler A. Jones
Louis Kriesberg
Allan Lummus

GENERAL FUND
Benigno E. Aguirre
Univ of Alabama-Birmingham
Trinidad Dejesus Arguello
Gordon Bazemore
Bernard Beck
Raquel Kennedy Bergen
Ca Boudreaux
Takeia Bradley
Ann Butzin
Chung-Yung Chang
Albert K. Cohen
Bill Cohen
Lori Cronyn
Paula L. Dressel
Eloise Dunlap
Werner J. Einstadter
Cary H. Federman
John Richard Felton
Virginia Kemp Fish
William Gaudio
Herbert H. Haines
James M. Henslin
Beth B. Hess
David E. Holloway
Charles R. Howard
Thomas P. Imse
Larry Isaac
Daniel T. Krejci
Felice Levine
Richard M. Levinson
Paul Luken
Allan Lummus
John D. MacDougall
Nancy Mannikko
John D. McCarthy
Margaret M. Miller
S. M. Miller
Laura E. Nathan
Harold L. Orbach
David R. Simon
Paul J. Spencer
Anselm Strauss
John R. Taylor
Michael Timberlake
Isidor Wallimann
James B. Wozniak
T. R. Young

LEE FOUNDERS FUND
James M. Henslin
Beth B. Hess
Butler A. Jones
Allan Lummus
S. M. Miller
Laura E. Nathan
Lawrence T. Nichols
Marvin B. Sussman
Kathleen A. Tiemann

LEE SCHOLAR-ACTIVIST SUPPORT FUND
Nancy Andes
Lars Christiansen
Victoria L. Erickson
Lynn H. Green
James M. Henslin
Beth B. Hess
Shirley A. Jackson
Louis Kriesberg
Stephanie A. Levin
Allan Lummus
Margaret M. Miller
Eileen G. Moran
Laura E. Nathan

Jonathan Shefner
Rose Somerville
Eric Stromberg
Kathleen A. Tiemann
Lee Williams

LEE STUDENT SUPPORT FUND
Herbert A. Aurbach
Albert K. Cohen
James M. Henslin
Beth B. Hess
James A. Holstein
Butler A. Jones
Valerie Rachel Leiter
Allan Lummus
Kathleen A. Tiemann

MINORITY GRADUATE SCHOLARSHIP
Laura S. Abrams
Herbert A. Aurbach
Sandra L. Barnes
Robert Benford
Ricky Neville Bluthenthal
Brandy M. Britton
Bruce M. Brown
Thomas R. Burtis
Roderick D. Bush
Ann Butzin
Evita G. Bynum
Leonard Cargan
Susan M. Carlson
Frank T. Cherry
Joyce N. Chinen
Cl. Cole
Klara R. Cook
John Cross
Donald Cunnigen
Laurel Davis
Juarez Firmo Dos Santos
Craig M. Eckert
D. Stanley Eitzen
Carol Engelbrecht
Stephen L. Fielding
Cheryl Townsend Gilkes
Jeff Goodwin
Masayuki Goto
Lynn H. Green
Teresa J. Guess
James M. Henslin
Beth B. Hess
Barbara S. Heyl
Charles R. Howard
Bruce D. Johnson
Alfred L. Joseph
Peter Kivisto
Louis Kriesberg
Kalyna Katherine Lesyna
Hylan Lewis
Bruce G. Link
Kathleen Lowney
Allan Lummus
Bernard N. Metzler
John Moland
Suzanne T. Ortega
Tola Olu Pearce
Robert Perrucci
James F. Roome
Nicolette Rousseau
Samuel F. Sampson
Gideon Sjoberg
Victoria Ann Smith
John R. Taylor
Michael Timberlake
Glenn T. Tsunokai
Edgar H. Tyson
Steven P. Vallas
Steven P. Wallace
J. Wilson Watt
Joyce E. Williams
Peter Cleary Yeager
T. R. Young

SOCIAL ACTION FUND
Nancy Andes
Steven E. Barkan
Robert Benford
Leonard Cargan
Susan M. Carlson
Laurel Davis
Jean Elson
James M. Henslin
Beth B. Hess
Glyn Hughes
Keith M. Kilty
Lora Bex Lempert
Allan Lummus
Raymond J. Michalowski
S. M. Miller
Brenda F. Seals
Rose Somerville
Paul Stretesky
Athena Theodore
Kathleen A. Tiemann
J. Wilson Watt
T. R. Young
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS
2003 LEE FOUNDERS AWARD

Nominations are now open for the 2003 Lee Founders Award. Members of the Society are urged to submit the names of nominees.

Established in 1981, this award is made in recognition of significant achievements that, over a distinguished career, have demonstrated continuing devotion to the ideals of the founders of the Society and especially to the humanist tradition of Alfred McClung Lee and Elizabeth Briant Lee.

PREVIOUS WINNERS INCLUDE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name and Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Thomas J. Scheff, University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Valerie Jenness, University of California, Irvine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Beth B. Hess, County College of Morris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Norma Williams, University of Texas at Arlington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Gary L. Albrecht, University of Illinois, Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John L. Kitsuse, University of California, Santa Cruz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Irwin Deutscher, University of Akron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>No Winner Chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Gideon Sjoberg, University of Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Joyce A. Ladner, Howard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Irving Kenneth Zola, Brandeis University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Marvin B. Sussman, University of Delaware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Richard Cloward, Columbia University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Francis Fox Piven, CUNY, Graduate Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Louis Kriesberg, Syracuse University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Arlene Kaplan Daniels, Northwestern University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>James E. Blackwell, University of Massachusetts, Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>John Useem, SSSP Life Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruth Hill Useem, SSSP Life Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Jessie Bernard, Pennsylvania State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Butler Jones, Cleveland State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Elliot Liebow, National Institute of Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Charles V. Willie, Harvard University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>S. M. Miller, Boston University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joan Moore, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2003 award will be presented at the 53rd Annual Meeting in Atlanta, GA, August 15-17, 2003. Nominations and supporting documents should be sent no later than April 15, 2003 to:

Raymond Michalowski, Chair
Northern Arizona University,
Criminal Justice,
Box 15005
Flagstaff, AZ 86011
Work: (928) 523-3710; Fax: (928) 523-8011
Email: raymond.michalowski@nau.edu

CRITERIA FOR THE LEE FOUNDERS AWARD

1. The nominee must have been an active member of the Society for some years prior to receiving the award.
2. The nominee must have made significant achievements embodying the ideals of the founders of the Society. These achievements may be in the areas of scholarly research, teaching, or service leading to the betterment of human life. Nominees for the award must have demonstrated a commitment to social action programs that promote social justice.
3. The nominee’s achievements should reflect the humanistic tradition of sociology, as exemplified in the contributions of Alfred McClung Lee and Elizabeth Briant Lee, for whom the award is named.
4. The nominee’s achievements may be expressed in a body of work that provides understanding and insight for practical application and the development of social conflict, including one or more of the following:
   a. Studies of peace and war, ethnic and/or racial conflict, and social movements.
   b. The role of mass media as related to social problems.
   c. The role of propaganda in the creation of and the persistence of social problems.
   d. The systematic study of social inequality (for example, problems of poverty, discrimination, racism, sexism and unequal distribution of wealth).
5. The achievements should include substantial community service at the local, state and/or national level.
6. It is assumed that the above achievements will have been accomplished by the nominees over a distinguished career and that they will reflect a long-term commitment to the ideals of the Lees.

GUIDELINES

1. Any member of the Society may nominate one or more persons for the award. Members of the Lee Founders Award Committee are encouraged to nominate.
2. All nominations must be accompanied by supporting evidence sufficiently detailed for the committee to render a decision (e.g., a resume; additional supporting description of the nominee’s work, demonstrating that the contributions meet the criteria for nomination). Please include supporting information not covered in a resume. List names of colleagues who would be willing and able to write supporting letters upon the request of the committee or include letters of support with your nomination.
CALL FOR APPLICATIONS

2003 MINORITY SCHOLARSHIP

Applications are being accepted for the 2003 Minority Scholarship. Members of the Society should urge qualified candidates to apply for this award. The deadline for applications is March 15, 2003. Applicants will be notified of the results by July 15, 2003.

The Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP), in keeping with its philosophy of active engagement with social problems, participation in social problem solutions, and advancement of knowledge through study, service and critical analysis, established the Minority Graduate Scholarship at its annual meeting in August 1993.

SCHOLARSHIP PURPOSE

- To identify and support developing minority scholars who exemplify and give fresh voice to the SSSP history and commitment to scholarly activism
- To give renewed energy and wider lenses to diversity in scholarship
- To increase the pool of minority social and behavioral scientists
- To establish a formal commitment to diversity through support of a minority doctoral student in the Social and/or Behavioral Sciences inclusive of course work or dissertation research support who demonstrates a commitment, through his or her scholarly examination, of any aspect of inequality, injustice and oppression

SELECTION CRITERIA

- A person accepted into an accredited doctoral program in any one of the Social and/or Behavioral Sciences so as to expand their perspectives in the pursuit and investigations into social problems
- A grade point average or equivalent of at least 3.2
- Evidence, through scholarly work and/or commitment to a career of scholarly activism as demonstrated by: course work and research, activism in school and/or community and career plans—Advanced graduate students preferred.
- Statement of financial need as expressed by the applicant and Graduate Program Director or Advisor
- Applicant should be a citizen of the United States

FUNDING

A $10,000 scholarship will be funded to one student with an additional $500 awarded for attendance at the annual meeting. Payments will be made in equal installments in September 2003 and January 2004. SSSP believes that the support of students will foster the commitment required to enable the student to fund living arrangements as well as academic or research costs.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF RECIPIENT

- Attend the annual meeting to receive the award
- Submit a brief final report (3 pages maximum) on the work sponsored through the award, at the end of the award year
- Following year, present work (described above) at an appropriate division session. A $500 stipend will be available to each winner for this purpose.
- Following year serve on the Minority Scholarship Fund Committee and attend the scheduled meeting of the committee

STUDENT APPLICATION PROCESS

Eight complete application packets should be sent to the Committee Chair. Incomplete packets will not be reviewed. Each packet should be self-contained and include the following:

1) Minority Scholarship Application; 2) Transcript (one official copy and the rest copies); 3) Resume or Curriculum Vitae; 4) Three letters of recommendation, including one from the Graduate Program Director or Advisor (These letters can be in sealed and signed envelopes, if needed.); 5) Personal statement of commitment to a career of scholarly activism; 6) If the scholarship request is in support of dissertation research, the applicant should provide the research topic and summary of proposed research and approach.

Contact Michele Koonz, Administrative Officer to receive an application or visit our homepage http://www.it.utk.edu/sssp.

SSSP, 901 McClung Tower, University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-0490
W: (865) 974-3620; F: (865) 689-1534
Email: mkoontz3@utk.edu

EIGHT COMPLETE APPLICATION PACKETS SHOULD BE SENT TO:

Joyce Chinien, Chair
Minority Scholarship Fund Committee
96-129 Ala Ike
University of Hawaii-West Oahu
Pearl City, HI 96782
W: (808) 454-4720; F: (808) 453-6176
Email: chinien@hawaii.edu
MINORITY SCHOLARSHIP APPLICATION

Name:
(Last) (Middle) (First)

Current Mailing Address:
(Street) (City)
(State & Zip Code)

Phone:
(Area Code) (Home) (Work)

Social Security #: Email Address:

Address where you can be reached after the announcement date:
(Street) (City) (State & Zip Code)

Sex (Circle One): Male Female Date of Birth:

Racial/Ethnic Identification: (Applicant should be a citizen of the United States)
- Black/African American
- Alaskan Native
- Latino/Hispanic (please specify)
- American Indian--tribal affiliation
- Asian (please specify)
- Pacific Islander (please specify)
- Other (please specify)

Marital Status (Circle One): Single Married Divorced Widowed Separated

Number & Age of Dependent Children:

Do you have a physical or mental impairment that limits your activities? (Circle One) Yes No
If yes, please explain

Your Current Educational Status:
Degree Program: Year in Degree Program:

Your Education Background:
Institution Location Dates Attended Degree
Father’s Occupation (if deceased or retired, list his last occupation):
(Job title and brief description of his work)

Mother’s Occupation (if deceased or retired, list her last occupation):
(Job title and brief description of her work)

---

Mother’s Education (circle years completed):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate studies</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDENT APPLICATION PROCESS

Eight complete application packets should be sent to the Committee Chair. Incomplete packets will not be reviewed. Each packet should be self-contained and include the following:

(1) Minority Scholarship Application
(2) Transcript (one official copy and the rest copies)
(3) Resume or Curriculum Vitae
(4) Three letters of recommendation, including one from the Graduate Program Director or Advisor (These letters can be in sealed and signed envelopes, if needed.)
(5) Personal statement of commitment to a career of scholar activism
(6) If the scholarship request is in support of dissertation research, the applicant should provide the research topic and summary of proposed research and approach.

EIGHT COMPLETE APPLICATION PACKETS SHOULD BE SENT TO:

Joyce Chinen, Chair
Minority Scholarship Fund Committee
96-129 Ala Ike
University of Hawaii-West Oahu
Pearl City, HI 96782
W: (808) 454-4720; F: (808) 453-6176
Email: chinen@hawaii.edu
TRAVEL FUNDS AVAILABLE

THE LEE SCHOLAR-ACTIVIST SUPPORT FUND COMMITTEE ANNOUNCES:

Funds Available for Foreign Scholar-Activists

to Participate in the 2003 Annual Meeting, August 15-17, Atlanta, GA

The Society for the Study Social Problems established the Lee Scholar-Activist Support Fund to help bring foreign scholar-activists to the Annual Meeting. The specific purpose is to facilitate scholarly participation by persons engaged in labor, gender, racial-ethnic, third world and other struggles. More generally, the purpose of this fund is to foster cooperative relations among persons and organizations engaged in applying sociological findings to confront social problems and create social change. Consistent with past practice, some preference may be given to applicants from developing Third World countries where access to foreign exchange is often more limited.

Applications (see next page) should be sent no later than March 15, 2003 to:

Alfonso R. Latoni
Scientific Review Office, National Institute on Aging - NIH
7201 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 2C-212
Bethesda, MD 20892-9205
Work: (301) 496-9666; Fax: (301) 402-0006
Email: latonia@nia.nih.gov

Other Committee Members:
Talmadge Wright, Loyola University
Michael Coyle, Arizona State University

THE LEE STUDENT SUPPORT FUND COMMITTEE ANNOUNCES:

Funds Available for Graduate Students

to Participate in the 2003 Annual Meeting, August 15-17, Atlanta, GA

In recognition of Al Lee's commitment to social justice and his history of critical contributions to the Society for the Study of Social Problems, SSSP established the Lee Student Support Fund to facilitate conference participation by graduate students. For the 2003 Annual Meeting, the fund has resources which it can allocate in order to help defray the costs of meeting participation for those in need of financial assistance.

The applications will be reviewed by the committee charged with determining the amount and allocation of the awards. In making its decision, the committee may recognize among other factors, the Society's commitment to diversity, to a tradition of scholar-activism, and to interdisciplinary work.

Applications (see next page) should be sent no later than March 15, 2003 to:

JoAnn L. Miller
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
Purdue University, 1365 Stone Hall
West Lafayette, IN 47907
W: 765-494-4699; F: 765-496-1476
Email: millerj@soc.purdue.edu

Other Committee Members:
Kathryn Fox, University of Vermont
Jennifer Wesely, University of Central Florida
Lee Scholar-Activist Support Fund or the Lee Student Support Fund Application
APPLICATION DEADLINE—MARCH 15, 2003
(Applications postmarked/faxed after March 15 are ineligible for consideration.)

Please indicate which fund you are requesting assistance from: (You can only choose ONE. If you are a graduate student, you must apply to the Lee Student Support Fund.) All applicants must be current members when applying for assistance.

——— Lee Student Support Fund (In order to be considered, you must provide a photocopy of your current student ID.)

——— Lee Scholar-Activist Support Fund (In what way do you consider yourself to be a scholar-activist? Please respond briefly, in 2-3 sentences.)

Name: ____________________________________________
   (Last) (Middle) (First)

Current Mailing Address: ____________________________
   (Street) (City) (State & Zip Code)

Phone: ____________________________________________
   (include area code & country code when applicable) Email: ____________________________
   (Home) (Work)

Address where you can be reached after the May 15 announcement date:

   (Street) (City) (State & Zip Code)

Please indicate how you plan to travel to the meeting: SSSP will support estimated air coach fare; auto travel at $1.8/mile; and travel by bus or train ONLY.

Please provide a breakdown of your anticipated costs to attend the meeting. Registration fees and dues will not be funded, and not all of the expenses for attending the meeting can be paid from these funds. SSSP strongly suggests that other sources of funds be sought to supplement your participation. Pre-registration for the meeting must be paid before funds will be disbursed to the applicant. Persons unable to attend the meetings MUST return all monies to SSSP.

Travel Cost: ________________________________
   The committee will use the lowest available fare as the basis for its estimates of travel costs.

Room Cost: ________________________________
   SSSP will support a shared room (roommate matching service will be available). Our meeting room rate is: $145 plus 14% sales tax per night. Exceptions will be made if extraordinary personal circumstances justify an individual room.

Meal Cost: ________________________________
   SSSP will support up to $15 US/per day.

Grand Total: ________________________________

State your planned contributions to the meeting. ONLY members who have been accepted for program participation will be considered.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Applicants will receive an email confirming the receipt of their application. If you do not receive an email within two weeks of submitting your application, please contact the chair. Applicants will be notified by the chair if their application was accepted/rejected no later than May 15, 2003.
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

TRAVEL FUNDS AVAILABLE

The 2003 ERWIN O. SMIGEL FUND COMMITTEE ANNOUNCES:
Funds available for unemployed and underemployed sociologists
to participate at the 2003 Annual Meeting, August 15-17, Atlanta, GA.

The Erwin O. Smigel Fund was established in about 1975 to provide assistance to unemployed and underemployed sociologists (i.e., sociologists who have achieved an advanced degree and are not students and are working full or part time in any activity that would be of interest to one of the special problems divisions). Erwin Smigel was a professor and Chair of Sociology at New York University, and the author of THE WALL STREET LAWYER as well as other works. He was the second editor of SOCIAL PROBLEMS; serving from 1958-61. He was also a friendly and good humored man who supported colleagues exceptionally well. The fund was established in Erwin’s honor the year he passed away.

Erwin O. Smigel Fund guidelines: 1) the Smigel Fund monies are to be used to help pay for three or four unemployed or severely underemployed sociologists’ transportation to and registration fees for the SSSP meeting; 2) applicants must be presenting a paper at the main SSSP meeting (rather than at an adjacent workshop or meeting) or participating as a SSSP elected or appointed officer or committee member; 3) a maximum of $500 dollars is to be granted to any one recipient.

Applications (see next page) should be sent no later than March 15, 2003 to:

Patricia A. Morgan
School of Public Health
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
Work: (510) 642-4861; Home: (510) 843-3106; Fax: (510) 643-6981
Email: momorgan@uclink.berkeley.edu

OTHER COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
Daniel Egan, University of Massachusetts, Lowell
Barbara Warner, Eastern Kentucky University
Erwin O. Smigel Fund Application
APPLICATION DEADLINE--MARCH 15, 2003
(Applications postmarked/faxed after March 15 are ineligible for consideration.)

Name:

(Last) (First) (Middle)

Current Mailing Address:

(Street) (City) (State & Zip Code)

Phone:
(include area code)

(Home) (Work)

Address where you can be reached after the May 15 announcement date:

(Street) (City) (State & Zip Code)

Please indicate how you plan to travel to the meeting:

SSSP will support estimated air coach fare; auto travel at $.18/mile; and travel by bus or train ONLY.

Please provide a breakdown of your anticipated costs to attend the meeting. Registration fees will be funded. Not all of the expenses for attending the meeting can be paid from these funds. SSSP strongly suggests that other sources of funds be sought to supplement your participation. Persons unable to attend the meetings MUST return all monies to SSSP.

Travel Cost:

Room Cost:

SSSP will support a shared room (roommate matching service will be available). Our meeting room rate is: $145 plus 14% sales tax per night. Exceptions will be made if extraordinary personal circumstances justify an individual room.

Meal Cost: SSSP will support up to $15 US/per day.

Grand Total:

Please state why you consider yourself “underemployed,” if applicable.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Please state your planned contributions to the meeting. Only members who have been accepted for program participation or participating as an elected or appointed officer or committee member will be considered.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Applicants will receive an email confirming the receipt of their application. If you do not receive an email within two weeks of submitting your application, please contact the chair. Applicants will be notified by the chair if their application was accepted/rejected no later than May 15, 2003.
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

2003 SOCIAL ACTION AWARD

Nominations are open for the 2003 Social Action Award. Members are urged to submit names of organizations as nominees for this award.

The Social Action Award, established in 1991, is awarded to a not-for-profit organization in the city/area hosting the Annual Meeting. The award carries a stipend of $1,000.

The award is a fitting expression of the overall purpose of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, which is concerned with applying scientific methods and theories to the study of social problems. SSSP aims to bring together scholars, practitioners, and advocates to examine and understand social problems in order to further solutions and develop social policy based on knowledge.

When this award was established, SSSP described its purpose as follows:

The organization selected for this recognition should have a history of challenging social inequalities, promoting social change, and/or working toward the empowerment of marginalized peoples. Its work must demonstrate sensitivity to and respect for cultural diversity.

Preference is given to small, local agencies in the Atlanta area rather than large organizations or chapters of nationally-based organizations. The main criterion is the extent to which the organization reaches out to the disadvantaged in the community and uses innovative means for dealing with local social conditions.

The award will be presented on August 16, 2003 at the SSSP Awards Banquet in Atlanta, GA. Deadline for nominations is May 15, 2003.

PREVIOUS WINNERS INCLUDE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Organization Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Chicago Legal Advocacy for Incarcerated Mothers (CLAIM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Anaheim, CA</td>
<td>Immercity Struggle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Council of Latino Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>Rogers Park Community Action Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>People Organized to Win Employment Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Toronto, Canada</td>
<td>Heritage Skills Development Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>SACKI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
<td>Foundation for Youth at Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>Friends and Jr. Friends of the Southwest Branch Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Miami, FL</td>
<td>Coalition for Human Immigration Rights of LA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>Women Will Rebuild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>P.A.C.E Center for Girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Haitian Refugee Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh Jobs with Peace Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio Welfare Rights Organization Re Stoc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2003 SOCIAL ACTION AWARD NOMINATION FORM

(Please include the following information when making a nomination.)

Your name, address, phone number, and email address.
The name and address of the organization you wish to nominate.
The name, address, phone number, and email address of the organizational contact person.
Give an overview of the organization's work.
Indicate why you believe that the nominee merits the award.
Please submit any supportive materials you believe would be helpful to the committee.

Nominations should be sent no later than May 15, 2003 to:
Paula L. Dressel
Senior Fellow, The Annie E. Casey Foundation
701 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
W: 410-223-2909; F: 410-223-2927
Email: pdressel@acef.org
Sexualities Section Graduate Student Paper Award

This award is given to a paper authored by a student currently enrolled in a sociology graduate program. A paper may be co-authored by two or more students who would share the award (papers co-authored with faculty are not eligible). The predominant focus of the paper should be sexualities broadly defined. Papers should be manuscript length and no longer than 35 typed, double-spaced pages. An original and four copies of the paper should be sent by May 15, 2003 to Dr. Wendy Chapkis, Department of Sociology, University of Southern Maine, 96 Falmouth St., P.O. Box 9300, Portland, ME 04104-9300.

Rutgers University Institute for Health, Health Care Policy and Aging

Rutgers University Institute for Health, Health Care Policy and Aging research directed by David Mechanic, invites applications for postdoctoral fellowships in an interdisciplinary NIMH-funded research training program. The major areas of the program are mental health services research and psychosocial factors in mental health and illness. Participating disciplines include sociology, psychology, psychiatry, history, economics, anthropology, public policy and social work. Two-year appointments beginning June 2003. Stipends of $31,092 to $48,852 per year depending on date of Ph.D. Only citizens, non-citizen nationals, or persons lawfully admitted for permanent residence are eligible for these positions. Applicants should send CV, statement of research interests, and three letters of reference by March 1, 2003 to:
Allan V. Horwitz, Professor
Institute for Health, Health Care Policy, and Aging Research
Rutgers, The State University
30 College Avenue
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-1293

A nondiscriminatory affirmative action employer.
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: ____________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Phone:</th>
<th>Home Phone:</th>
<th>Email:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

*REGISTRATION FEES (US DOLLARS): Check one

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Preregistration (until July 15)</th>
<th>On-Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Member Registration Including Banquet</td>
<td>$135</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Registration Only</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Unemployed Member Registration Including Banquet</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Unemployed Member Registration Only</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member Registration (for non-exempt presenters who do not wish to become members)</td>
<td>$145</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Member Student Registration (for non-exempt student presenters who do not wish to become members)</td>
<td>$70</td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guest (name badge only)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guest Badge: ___________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBTOTAL

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL BANQUET TICKET/S: Saturday, August 16, 8:00pm - 10:00pm, $40 each</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check her for a vegan entree/s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 - 10:30pm, 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.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Members, Emeriti, before 1989</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;New&quot; Emeriti, beginning in 1989</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year Employment after Ph.D.</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Time Professional Member</td>
<td>$35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$24,999 and under</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 at the meetings, we offered a mentoring program for new members and graduate students and it was met with much success.

Would you like to participate in the Meeting Mentor Program? SSSP 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? SSSP 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 http://www.it.utk.edu/sssp (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.it.utk.edu/sssp

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 ssp2003@odu.edu or Nancy Wonders, Program Co-Chair ssp-p@jan.ucr.edu or Nancy Jurik, President nancy.jurik@asu.edu.
Wyndham Atlanta

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

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)

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