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The Basics

The Committee on Social Media at Social Problems (SP) began its efforts with more questions than answers. What do we want to accomplish? Which goals are within reach in a year, two years, three? How could we advance the journal’s priorities, as well as those of the Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP)? What are the journal’s and S SSP’s priorities? Who is our audience? In which ways do we build a following from scratch? How can we diversify content to effectively speak across multiple audiences? What can we do to ensure this content speaks to SP research? And in which ways can we measure the effectiveness of these efforts?

One year later, we still do not have the answers. What we do have is a direction. Our team has formalized strategies for “doing” social media. This report outlines the plan, describes efforts of the past year, showcases some accomplishments, and proposes concrete goals for the upcoming year.

Who We Are

The organization for the Committee on Social Media is divided into two branches that consist of council and committee members. The former group is responsible for planning and strategizing which research articles and/or affiliates of the journal to promote. It consists of the Editor (Pamela Anne Quiroz), Chair of the Committee on Social Media (Kasey Henricks), and Liaison to the Committee (Deana Lewis). The latter group develops original content for the social media channels, and it consists of five committee members (Bianca González Sobrino, Devon Goss, Matthew Martinez, Nick Rochin, and Michael L. Rosino). Both groups meet every other two weeks for organizational purposes and professional development.
Who We Are

Committee on Social Media, Council Members

Pamela Anne Quiroz serves as Editor of Social Problems. She holds a PhD from the University of Chicago and is Professor of Sociology & Educational Policy Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago. Her research focuses on identity development in different social contexts: the impact of school organization on the development of student identities; how English-speaking Latinos navigate ethnic identity and authenticity; the intersecting identities of people who engage in personal advertising; and the identity development of transracially adopted children. She has published in the Journal of Family Issues, Journal of Research on Adolescence, Childhood, and Sociology of Education. Quiroz sits on the Board of Directors for the Council on Contemporary Families, a non-profit, non-partisan organization dedicated to providing the public with the latest research and best-practice findings about American families. She is also the North American Commissioning Editor for Children’s Geographies.

Kasey Henricks serves as Chair of the Committee on Social Media. He is a Law and Social Science Fellow at the American Bar Foundation and PhD Candidate at Loyola University Chicago. His interests lie in understanding how racial inequalities are reproduced over time though arrangements sponsored by tax policy. Kasey’s work has been recognized by The National Academies, Society for the Study of Social Problems, and Association of Black Sociologists, and it has been funded by the Law and Society Association as well as the National Science Foundation. More about his research program can be found at <kaseyhenricks.net>.

Deana Lewis serves as Liaison to the Committee on Social Media. She is a PhD Student at the University of Illinois at Chicago, and holds a bachelor’s degree from the University of Pennsylvania and a master’s from Stanford University. Her research interests include Black girlhood studies, school to prison nexus, and youth incarceration. More specifically, Deana is interested in Black girls’ experiences within the school to prison nexus and how their experiences have been left out of discourses about youth incarceration.
Who We Are

Committee on Social Media Members

**Bianca González Sobrino** is a PhD Student at the University of Connecticut, with a bachelor’s degree from the University of Puerto Rico, Rio Pierdras and a master’s degree from Mississippi State University. Her work mostly focuses on racism, race and ethnicity, in particular looking at the Puerto Rican diaspora and issues of racial identity and racial threat.

**Devon Goss** is a PhD Candidate at the University of Connecticut, with a master’s degree from Lewis and Clark University. Her research examines (1) the color line, particularly in relation to instances of boundary crossing in typically racialized institutions; and (2) the impact of racialization in family formation and processes, through an examination of transracial adoption.

**Matthew Martinez** is a PhD Candidate at the University of Texas at San Antonio, and will be a Postdoctoral Fellow at Brown University beginning Fall 2015. His dissertation focuses on the legacy of place as a new approach to study structural racism and educational outcomes. He explores the primary research aim of the effects of a neighborhood’s historic dropout rates on contemporary high school dropout behavior.

**Nick Rochin** is a PhD Student at the University of Illinois at Chicago. His research interests focus on post-civil rights racism, gender, mass racialized incarceration, and quantitative methods. In addition to other projects, he is preparing for his dissertation which will examine Latinos’ perceptions of the (il)legitimacy of the criminal legal system.

**Michael L. Rosino** is a PhD Student at the University of Connecticut with a focus on race, politics, mass media, social movements, and digital sociology. His previous research includes a study of social learning in an online community, race and gender diversity discourse in business media, and racial discourse in mass mediated policy debates.
What Does Social Media Look Like at SP?

And How Does this Compare to Other Journals?

Generally speaking, social media platforms fall into two categories (or a hybrid of the two). The first regards “push” platforms like Twitter and Facebook that redirect audiences to view material at other sites. The second regards “host” platforms like YouTube that directly share original content. During the beginning of the year, no social media presence existed for SP on either platform. Now we are established across most every social media venue available. That said, most our activity occurs on Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and most recently Academia.edu.

As of May 25, 2015:

• our Facebook channel has 1,118 “likes,”
• our Twitter channel has 872 “follows,”
• our YouTube channel has 1,008 “views,”
• and our Academia.edu has 23 “follows.”

How does this compare to other journals in sociology? It exceeds some but not others. The two journals identified as top competitors, as measured by their cited and citing relationship with SP, are the American Sociological Review (ASR) and American Journal of Sociology. Both these outlets lack an independent social media presence, though Sage does some promotional advertising via social media for ASR. Compared the other top generalist journal in the field, Social Forces (SF), SP has 1,108 more likes on Facebook and 431 more follows on Twitter. SF has yet to establish a YouTube presence, but has created some vodcasts hosted by Oxford’s general YouTube channel. SP surpasses other highly regarded generalist journals on most social media outlets as far as audience size is concerned. That said, the journal has less of a following than well-established specialty journals like Gender & Society and Du Bois Review.
Our Social Media Presence Compared to Other Notable Sociology Journals

*as of May 25, 2015*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Follows</th>
<th>Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Sociological Review</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Sociology</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Problems</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Forces</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sociological Quarterly</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Currents</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological Forum</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Sociology</td>
<td>3,084</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbolic Interaction</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender &amp; Society</td>
<td>2,263</td>
<td>4,505</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Du Bois Review</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>7,399</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n/a indicates no social media presence*
Who is Our Audience(s)?

Who is our audience? The short answer is we do not know. We assume our social media channels speak mostly to academics, students, and some journalists because our audience-building efforts have selectively targeted these groups. These groups have been targeted through listserv invitations sent by SSSP and its Divisions; plugs from other sociology journals like Social Forces, Du Bois Review, and the Irish Journal of Sociology; messages from like-minded organizations such as the Association of Humanist Sociology, the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction, and Council on Contemporary Families; cross-promotional strategies with SSSP, Oxford University Press, and academic weblogs like Racism Review; and solicitations through personal networks. We have yet to empirically verify, however, whether these presumptions about our audience are accurate.

Our social media channels do not collect socio-demographic information, with one exception. Facebook compiles basic information like sex category, age, location, and language. About 60 percent of our Facebook following are women, 36 percent are men, and the remaining four percent either did not report or answered outside the binary. Our largest age group of followers falls in the “25-34 years old” bracket. They comprise 33 percent of our audience. The second largest age bracket is “18-24 years old” (27 percent), and the third is “35-44 years old” (19 percent). In terms of location, most followers live in the United States (593). The next largest groups, perhaps surprisingly, live in Egypt (305) and Pakistan (25). At the city-level, most our followers live in Cairo (129), followed by Chicago (111) and Alexandria (26). We have no plausible explanation for why membership in these non-European spaces is so high, but the vast majority of our followers do speak English (835).
Facebook Numbers that Count

*as of May 25, 2015*

Our Following, Who Are They?

*as of May 25, 2015*

By Sex Category and Age Bracket:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>60% Your Fans</th>
<th>46% All Facebook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>36% Your Fans</th>
<th>54% All Facebook</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25-34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>45-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>55-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>65+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By Location:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Posts</th>
<th>People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Your Fans</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Your Fans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cairo, Cairo Governorate, a</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chippewa, IL</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
<td>835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, Alexandria Go…</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>English (UK)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangier, Tangier Gover…</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yangon, Myanmar</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>French (France)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Simplified Chinese (China)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>French (Canada)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Said, Port Said Gover…</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>English (Frasil)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our Facebook Following
Where Are They?

as of May 25, 2015

Across the Globe:

Across the United States:
What Our Audiences Like

Though we do not know much about our audiences’ socio-demographic characteristics, we are able to collect metrics for audience size as well as what is being consumed. Throughout the year we created a variety of original content. These included sharing recently published SP articles, highlighting key findings through visual representations, featuring mini-presentations and interviews with our authors, offering professional development advice, posting news articles that feature SP work (or those germane to the journal), and so on. Some items worked better than others. A common theme among our most trafficked posts regards those that were timely, relevant, and directly referenced people affiliated with the journal.

Facebook

Our top Facebook posts usually reached about 1,000 or more people. Of those that directly referenced a journal affiliate, the most trafficked post was one on “publishing advice” from Advisory Editor Tanya Golash-Boza. It reached 1,567 people.
generated 35 likes, comments, or shares, and received 148 post clicks. What likely made this content so popular was that it was shared by others in ways that built off already-established networks. Other top posts included: a) the 2014 SSSP award winners (1,025 people reached, 85 likes comments, or shares, and 338 post clicks), b) Associate Editor David G. Embrick for winning a mentorship award (1,023 people reached, 107 likes, comments, or shares, and 146 post clicks), c) Advisory Editor Eduardo Bonilla-Silva for providing "CNN" commentary (988 people reached, 18 likes, comments, or shares, and 85 post clicks), and d) a general announcement that SP had changed editorial hands (965 people reached, 26 likes, comments, or shares, and 61 post clicks).

Twitter

On Twitter, statistics were compiled on a monthly rather than annual basis. A typical month generated 3,000-4,000 impressions, 500 or so visits, and 50-75 follows. Our most successful month in terms of traffic was May 2015. Our tweets, which totaled 14 for the month, made 6,752 impressions. The account generated 859 visits, 71 new followers, and 4 mentions by others. Of all the tweets, the most popular highlighted Advisory Editor C.J. Pascoe’s tenure promotion, while the top mention highlighted Associate Editor David G. Embrick and Social Media Chair Kasey Henricks for winning the Kimberlé Crenshaw Outstanding Paper Award from SSSP’s Division on Racial and Ethnic Minorities. This tweet was shared and re-tweeted by Symbolic Interaction, the journal that published the article, and several of its editorial board members.

Twitter Activity for May 2015

as of May 27, 2015

14 Tweets  859 Visits  71 Follows  6,752 Impressions  4 Mentions
Our YouTube channel hosts eight videos. Most of these are installments of “The Authors’ Attic,” which is described in more detail below. Essentially these vodcasts serve as a platform for authors to disseminate research in streamlined and accessible ways, and they represent three of the top five most popular videos on YouTube. The most watched video (308 views) features an interview with Advisor Editor and Author Matthew Hughey. He discusses his recent book, *The White Savior Film: Content, Critics, and Consumption* (Temple University Press), which evolved out of a 2009 *SP* article entitled “Cinethetic Racism: White Redemption and Black Stereotypes in ‘Magical Negro’ Films.” The next two most popular installments of “The Authors’ Attic” feature mini-presentations by Authors Edward Orozco Flores and Jacob Rugh. Both these installments discuss the following articles: “Chicano Gang Members in Recovery: The Public Talk of Negotiating Chicano Masculinities” and “Race, Space, and Cumulative Disadvantage: A Case Study of the Subprime Lending Collapse.”

Other videos hosted at our YouTube channel include short-ordered segments of professional development. These offer light-hearted “best practices” advice to junior scholars and/or students. The second-most watched YouTube video (194 views), for example, regards a “top ten” list of “Things Not to Say to a Journal Editor.” Each of the items included on this list were compiled from current editors in the field, and read aloud by committee members. Another popular video (97 views) follows a similar “top ten” format, but compiles a list of “Things Not to Say to Your Professor.”
Top 5 Hits on YouTube

as of May 25, 2015

1. "The Authors’ Attic,” with Dr. Matthew W. Hughey (October 3, 2014)
   by Social Problems
   7 months ago • 908 views
   "The Authors’ Attic" is an installment of "Social Problems" – the official journal of the Society for the Study of Social Problems. It is a forum that provides authors an opportunity to discu...

2. Top 10 Things NOT to Say to a Journal Editor
   by Social Problems
   8 months ago • 194 views
   Top 10 Things NOT to Say to a Journal Editor, brought to you by the Social Media Committee of Social Problems.

3. "The Authors’ Attic,” with Dr. Edward Orozco Flores (October 24, 2014)
   by Social Problems
   7 months ago • 140 views
   "The Authors’ Attic" is an installment of "Social Problems" – the official journal of the Society for the Study of Social Problems. It is a forum that provides authors an opportunity to discu...

4. "The Authors’ Attic,” with Dr. Jacob S. Rugh (May, 2015)
   by Social Problems
   1 month ago • 132 views

5. Top 10 Things NOT to Say to Your Professor
   by Social Problems
   4 months ago • 97 views
   Top 10 Things NOT to Say to a Journal Editor, brought to you by the Social Media Committee of Social Problems.
“Social Problems has a long history of doing public sociology—well over 60 years, way before the concept of “public sociology” became popularized. It continues to be one of the most prominent sociology journals that persistently calls attention to the plight of the poor, the voiceless, the disenfranchised, and folks on the margins of society. It remains the ‘go-to’ journal for linking sociological research to public discourse and public policy.”

Rogelio Sáenz
Dean of College of Public Policy
Peter Flawn Professor of Demography
University of Texas at San Antonio

“Social Problems is a journal of an organization with a purpose, research in the interest of social justice. I think everyone who cares about sociological research that matters beyond the academy should read Social Problems. That’s why I do.”

Barbara Risman
Department Head and Professor of Sociology
University of Illinois at Chicago

Social Problems is a journal with a conscience. Whereas most social science journals just focus on describing the world, it is also concerned with prescription; with what ought to be done to achieve class, gender, and racial justice in an unjust world. Because of this, this journal is more pluralistic than most top-ranked journals and is read widely by people at all levels in all kind of institutions. Social Problems remains a top venue for critical sociological scholarship.”

Eduardo Bonilla-Silva
Department Chair and Professor of Sociology
Duke University
Media Attention

The committee is moving toward establishing ways to monitor when SP research is featured in the news. Over the past year, the work of SP authors and editors was featured in national outlets like The New York Times, “CNN,” The Baltimore Sun, The Huffington Post, and Slate, in addition to academic outlets like “Jstor Daily,” The Society Pages, “Left of Black,” and “OrgTheory.net.” Work covered by these outlets spoke to many social problems, like the events surrounding Freddie Gray in Baltimore, racist Greek life at the University of Oklahoma, global sex work, achievement gaps in education, and segregation in American cities, among others. Our knowledge of this coverage, however, is limited because it draws mainly from our own media consumption.

We are pursuing a few strategies to address the limitation. The first strategy involves more correspondence with authors. When papers are processed through the final stages of production for publication, all authors are now requested by the Managing Editor to self-report media attention. We then record this information, and blast it across our social media channels. The second strategy regards the distribution of press releases to public relations departments at the University of Illinois at Chicago and home institutions of SP authors. Universities often have resources and press networks at their disposal, and many are eager to assist in promoting the work of their faculty, and by extension, the journal. The third strategy involves establishing direct relationships with journalists, so that SP can be a resource to them for ongoing investigations. Our approach in establishing these relationships involves gatekeeper journalists who are introducing us to other professionals in their networks. It also involves “cold calling” those who cover beats interrelated with SP’s content and/or have featured the work of SP authors before. To keep track of which journalists report on what, the committee has begun building a database, or “digital Rolodex,” of names, their areas of expertise, and how to contact them.
Social Problems in Select Headline News

Kimberly Kay Hoang (University of Chicago)

“Flirting with Capital: Negotiating Perceptions of Pan-Asian Ascendancy and Western Decline in Global Sex Work” (2014) was featured in “The Society Pages” on April 29, 2015.

Maria Krysan (University of Illinois at Chicago)


Matthew Hughey (University of Connecticut)

Other Marks from High Places

*SP* research has received plugs from other noteworthy places. Jacob Rugh and his co-authors Len Albright and Douglas Massey were asked, in the midst of the so-called Baltimore riots, to present their May 2015 *SP* article to Senior Advisors at the White House. The paper’s title is “Race, Space, and Cumulative Disadvantage: A Case Study of the Subprime Lending Collapse.” At the presentation, Rugh contextualized the events of Freddie Gray within patterns of hypersegregation, rampant lending discrimination, and unequal consequences of racial wealth evaporation following the housing meltdown. A subsequent presentation was given by Len Albright to the Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Pictured in clockwise order: The White House, Len Albright (Northeastern University), and Jacob Rugh (Brigham Young University).
Elsewhere Edward Orozco Flores was honored with the 2014 Distinguished Contribution to Research Book Award by the Latin@ Section of ASA. The monograph is entitled *God’s Gangs: Barrio Ministry, Masculinity, and Gang Recovery* (New York University Press), and it expands a 2013 *SP* article (“Chicano Gang Members in Recovery: The Public Talk of Negotiating Chicano Masculinities”).

To increase accomplishments like these, and attempt to bolster the journal’s prestige, members of the Committee on Social Media plan to nominate recently published *SP* work for a variety of paper awards during the coming year. These nominations will follow the recommendations of Pamela Quiroz, and will be targeted at awards sponsored by relevant academic organizations like ASA, SSSP, Law and Society Association, and the American Studies Association. As it stands the committee has compiled a database of nearly 100 awards, which includes their basic information, nomination criteria, deadlines, and contact information for award committee members.
Goals

The goals of SP’s social media presence are ongoing discussion. This is intentional. Given the dynamics of social problems in general, as well as shifting audiences and emerging events, our committee has reflective monthly discussions to (re)evaluate our work. Keeping these fluidities in mind, and persistently discerning what SP wants to get out of social media, the council has formalized at least six objectives. We aim to achieve the following outcomes:

1. promote SP work, as well as the journal’s authors, editors, and other affiliates,
2. grow the readership, usage, and discoverability of the journal’s content,
3. bolster the prestige and status of SP,
4. gain more media and/or public attention for the journal,
5. offer pedagogical content to supplement the sociological classroom, and
6. support and feature ongoing activities of the SSSP.

To accomplish these goals, we plan to maintain all the aforementioned activities and pursue a new development we are labeling “article campaigns.” These refer to a three-prong approach of promotion of 1-2 select articles per issue. The selections are determined by the Editor, and selected on the likelihood that press attention will be generated. Our article campaign strategy relies upon the development of original content in the form of a) press releases, b) “Talking Points” memos, and c) “The Authors’ Attic” installments. Once these content items are developed, we coordinate their release dates across all our social media channels to coincide with the online release, or digital print, of the highlighted article from Oxford.

Press Releases

Our press releases are streamlined summaries of SP articles, and aimed specifically at members of the press. They follow what journalists call “the inverted pyramid.” This gets to the point by answering who, what, where, when, why, and how. The most important information is stated upfront, as well as who said it, followed by answering the question “so then what?” Paragraphs in press releases can, and often should, be just one sentence. Answering “why” and situating the argument in context should occur no later than the third paragraph. Incorporation of a compelling quotation, infographic, or statistic will make for more effective writing. Near the end, include a call to action. Tell readers whom they can call for more information, or which website address to visit. Include contact information at the top, and details about the journal at the bottom.
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Contact: Devon Goss, Student Advisory Editor at Social Problems
Email: devon.goss@uconn.edu

Race, Space, and Cumulative Disadvantage

How did the housing meltdown’s aftermath impact black households in Baltimore, Maryland? New research to be published in Social Problems, a flagship academic journal of sociology, shows that: 1) approximately $2.1 billion of wealth was lost to foreclosure, 2) about $2.0 billion of this wealth loss came from high-income black households, and 3) over 90 percent of all black wealth lost derived from majority black neighborhoods. Why were these losses of the housing collapse, which represents the greatest loss of wealth for black communities in American history, so high?

According the authors -- Jacob S. Rugh (Brigham Young University), Len Albright (Northeastern University), and Douglas S. Massey (Princeton University) -- the answer is cumulative discrimination. Using a novel dataset that fuses census information with individual-level lending records from Wells Fargo Bank, an institution that agreed to a $175 million settlement for allegations of subprime lending practices in 2012, the authors show how “African Americans were disproportionately likely to receive higher cost and higher risk loans, which in turn lowered their disposable incomes and put them at greater risk of foreclosure and repossessions.”

What is the specific price of discrimination in home lending? Compared to similarly situated whites, black borrowers in Baltimore annually pay an additional $497 of excess mortgage payments. This amounts to $14,904 over the life of a 30-year loan. The white/black mortgage gap increases for borrowers who earn an income of $50,000 or more. High income black households annually pay an extra $634 more than their white counterparts, which amounts to $19,026 over a 30-year loan. Comparing similar whites and blacks with subprime lending (private label securitization loan), black households annually paid an excess of $1,067 or $32,000 over 30 years.

These findings have long-term implications for the worse regarding a racial wealth gap that has recently been estimated at a 20:1 gap between whites and blacks. For further information, please contact Kasey Henricks at khenricks@abfn.org or the corresponding author Jacob S. Rugh at jacob_rugh@byu.edu. The forthcoming article is entitled, “Race, Space, and Cumulative Disadvantage: A Case Study of the Subprime Lending Collapse,” and it will appear in the May 2015 issue of Social Problems.

Social Problems is the official publication of The Society for the Study of Social Problems and one of the most widely respected and read professional journals in the social sciences. This quarterly journal presents accessible, relevant, and innovative articles that uphold critical perspectives on contemporary social issues. For additional commentary, you can follow the journal on Twitter at @socprobsjournal and on Facebook.

###
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Contact: Michael Rosino, Student Advisory Editor at Social Problems
Email: michael.rosino@uconn.edu

Racial Income Inequality and Public Sector Privatization

Public sector jobs, once the hope to close income disparity between blacks and whites, are now driving that wage divide farther apart, reports new research published in the May 2015 Issue of Social Problems. New data show that white males now make $3.90 more an hour than do their black counterparts, holding other factors constant.

Sociologists George Wilson (University of Miami), Vincent J. Roscigno (The Ohio State University), and Matt Huffman (University of California at Irvine) uncover how public employers such as schools, the armed services, correctional facilities, and other government services continue to adopt labor practices drafted from the bottom-line driven private sector, such as at-will employment rules and limiting employees’ power to contest firing our hour reduction. It’s those policies and practices cultivate racial bias and that are widening the wage gap between whites and blacks.

At a time when race and income inequality are gaining currency in the public eye, the trend could become a major source of controversy in the upcoming presidential primary season.

New research show that with former protections such as due process, these jobs had similar hourly wages for whites and blacks. But with current changes in policy to mimic the private sector, the wage gap in the public labor market caused white wages to increase and black wages to decreased. In fact, with current changes, white males make $3.90 more per hour compared to their black counterparts. This still pales in comparison to private sector jobs as white males make, on average, $6.40 more than black males. Much is currently being made about equal pay for equal work for women, yet the current racial gap in private and public sector jobs rivals the sex wage gap.

The authors worry because “the structural changes and inequalities we are discussing undoubtedly translate into a series of long-term disadvantages for African Americans.” They advise that policies be created to allow employees in the public sector procedures to contest managers’ discretion and employment practices.

For more information, the corresponding author, George Wilson, can be contacted at gwilson1@miami.edu. Social Problems is the official publication of The Society for the Study of Social Problems and one of the most widely respected and read professional journals in the social sciences. This quarterly journal presents accessible, relevant, and innovative articles that uphold critical perspectives on contemporary social issues. For additional commentary, you can follow the journal on Twitter at @socprobsjournal and on Facebook.

###
“Talking Points” Memos

“Talking Points” memos are infographics that visually represent key findings from SP research, or what journalists call “teasers.” They preview just enough material to stimulate readers’ interests and prompt them to read the full article. These infographics can feature direct quotations from authors, brief summaries of findings, statistical information, and corresponding images. This content is aimed at general audiences through our Twitter and Facebook outlets.

“Talking Points” Samples
“The Authors’ Attic”

“The Authors’ Attic” is a recurring vodcast that features recently published and forthcoming SP work. It offers authors an opportunity to present their research in their own words. These presentations contain a level of sophistication that should generate views from journalists and field specialists, but are accessible enough for students and classroom instruction. They can easily serve as conversation starters, and be paired with lectures or seminars. In addition to being blasted across our social media channels, these videos are hosted on YouTube and featured on the Oxford and SSSP websites.
Concrete Benchmarks for the Upcoming Year

Some of the concrete goals for next year include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Increase our Facebook likes from 1,118 to 2,500
  - Provide at least 5 new posts per week
- Increase our Twitter follows from 872 to 2,000
  - Provide at least 15 new tweets per month
- Increase our YouTube views from 1,008 to 3,000
  - Feature 1-2 new videos per quarter
- Triple our “digital Rolodex” from 50 to 150 journalists
  - Create and distribute 1-2 press releases per issue
- Nominate select SP papers for at least 20 awards