

April in Chicago: The Seductions of Sociological Learning Keynotes, Special Sessions, and Practical Stuff

BarBara Scott, Local Arrangements Committee Chair, and Chris Prendergast, Program Chair

Plans for the 2003 Annual Meeting near completion as this issue of *TMS* goes to press. The *Preliminary Program*—listing all the session titles, presenters, and times, plus the schedule of committee meetings—will be finished in mid-February. As soon as the *Preliminary Program* is finished, a Program Summary will be posted on the MSS web site (www.themss.org). The Program Summary will list all the sessions, committee meetings, and special events by day and time. You can then plan your stay in Chicago. The packet you received along with this issue of *TMS* includes the various hotel and meeting registration forms, employment forms, etc., that you will need to successfully register for the meetings. Be sure you reserve a room before our block of reservations reverts to Marriott.

The 2003 Annual Meeting will be held at the Chicago Marriott Downtown, 540 North Michigan Avenue, from mid-day Wednesday, April 16 through mid-day Saturday, April 19. As usual, we need to fill our block of rooms or suffer horrendous cash penalties. The room rate is \$114 a night, plus a 10% room tax. Basic hotel information and maps can be found at www.marriott-hotels.com. If someone in your party can hoof it .08 miles back to the hotel, the garage under Grant Park costs only \$19 a night (entrance on South Michigan Avenue). Valet parking will cost almost twice that.

Located just north of the Chicago River and south of Water Tower Place, munificent food, sights, and shopping radiate in every direction from the hotel, including up. Mayor Richard M. Daley's multi-billion dollar Millennium Park, a few blocks south of the river along Michigan Avenue, is now partially open to the public. Gary Alan Fine's comprehensive *Restaurant Guide*—

available only if you register!—is worth the meeting registration fee of \$40 all by itself.

Now, a few seductions of the intellectual sort:

Our keynote speakers this year will be

Alejandro Portes

(Wednesday evening) and *Saskia Sassen* (Friday mid-day). Alejandro Portes, of Princeton University, is the co-author of two recent ASA-award winning books, *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation* (2001) and *City on the Edge: The Transformation of Miami* (1993), several other books, and over 200 articles and book chapters. His specialties include economic sociology, immigration, urbanization, and national development. Saskia Sassen, of the University of Chicago, is just finishing a five-year project on governance and accountability in the global economy. She is the author of *The Global City* (2nd edition, 2001) and *Guests and Aliens* (1999), as well as other books and articles. With their common interests in globalization, urbanization, and immigration, our keynote speakers promise to unify the meetings thematically.

On Thursday, April 17, we will try to unify the meetings in a second way, by offering three “special sessions” of 65 minutes each starting at 12:00. No other sessions will compete with them. One, sponsored by the newly formed Carl Couch Center for Social and Internet Research, will feature *Lyn Lofland* (University of California, Davis). Professor Lofland, author of *A World Of Strangers* (1973), *Analyzing Social Settings* (3rd edition, 1995), and *The Public Realm* (1998), will

continued on page 3...

**WATCH FOR THE
PRELIMINARY
CONFERENCE
PROGRAM
COMING SOON!**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS ON PAGE 3
FOR MSS ELECTION RESULTS, SEE PAGE 3**

Editor:
Christine Wolfe

Executive Editor:
Kevin Leicht
Dept of Sociology
Seashore Hall
University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa
52242

Email:
midwest-sociologist@uiowa.edu

THE MIDWEST SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY

OFFICERS FOR 2002-2003

PRESIDENT:

Philip Olson
University of Missouri-Kansas City

PRESIDENT-ELECT/ PROGRAM CHAIR:

Chris Prendergast
Illinois Wesleyan University

PAST PRESIDENT/ASA REPRESENTATIVE:

Gary Alan Fine
Northwestern University

SECRETARY:

Peter Kivisto
Augustana College

TREASURER:

Sheryl Grana
University of Minnesota-Duluth

THE SOCIOLOGICAL QUARTERLY EDITOR:

Kevin Leicht
University of Iowa

STATE DIRECTORS:

ILLINOIS:

Susan Stall
Northeastern Illinois University

IOWA:

Lisa Troyer
University of Iowa

KANSAS:

Patrick Akard
Kansas State University

MINNESOTA:

Debra Peterson
Bemidji State University

MISSOURI:

Tola Olu Pearce
University of Missouri-Columbia

STUDENT DIRECTORS:

Rajan Pant (2001-2003)
University of Missouri-Kansas City

Samantha Helm (2002-2003)
Illinois Wesleyan University

Angela Glasker (2003-2004)
Illinois Wesleyan University

NEBRASKA:

Naomi L. Lacy
University of Nebraska Medical Ctr.

NORTH DAKOTA:

Richard W. Rathge
North Dakota State University

SOUTH DAKOTA:

Robert D. Friedenbach
University of South Dakota

WISCONSIN:

Wava J. Haney
University of Wisconsin-Richland

AT-LARGE DIRECTOR:

Timothy J. Owens
Purdue University

MEMBERSHIP AND DUES NOTICE: To avoid being dropped from the mailing list, membership dues should be up-to-date by January 1, 2003. You now can pay your membership by Visa or Master Card on the Web at <http://www.themss.org/member/forms.shtml>. Persons not having paid dues by January 15 have been dropped from the mailing lists of TSQ and TMS. Voting privilege in the Society are extended only to those whose membership is paid for the calendar year in which the voting takes place. It is also MSS policy that participants in the Annual Program be MSS members in good standing. Send dues to MSS, Dept. of Sociology, Drake University, Des Moines, IA 50311-4505.

STUDENT MEMBERSHIP: Generally, graduate and undergraduate students at any institution of higher learning are eligible for membership. However, persons gainfully employed as sociologists should not be student members in the Society. Students are eligible for any membership category by paying the appropriate dues.

SUSTAINING MEMBERSHIP: All present and prospective members are encouraged to become sustaining members of the Society. Sustaining memberships allows the Society to maintain low student membership rates.

NEWS DEADLINE: For the May/June 2003 issue of *The Midwest Sociologist*, departmental newsnotes, submissions and reports from officers and committees must be received by April 15, 2003. Send to Christine Wolfe, Department of Sociology, 140W Seashore Hall, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, 52242; email: midwest-sociologist@uiowa.edu

CHANGE OF ADDRESS: Midwest Sociological Society, Dept. of Sociology, Drake University, Des Moines, IA 50311-4505. It is now possible to join, renew, and change addresses all ON-LINE at <http://www.themss.org/member/forms.shtml>

...continued from page 1

address the role of real estate developers in shaping the urban environment. The second special session is sponsored by the MSS Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility, and Professional Concerns. It features an address by Professor *Lawrence Poston* of the University of Illinois, Chicago on the challenges to academic governance in higher education today. The last special session will really break the mold. Entitled "Activists Set the Agenda for Sociological Research," it consists of a panel of three Chicago-area labor and community activists who will tell us what we need to study if we wish to produce socially-relevant research. Since the three special sessions are scheduled over the lunch hour, no one will be offended if you bring your lunch.

Those are the highlights so far. Naturally, there will be tours. One, on historical sites of women's activism, is scheduled for Friday, April 18 from 8:30 to 12:00. A second tour, most likely to ethnic neighborhoods, is still in the planning stage. The Presidential Address by Phillip G. Olson—"Will the Real Urban Sociologists Please Stand Up?"—is scheduled for Thursday evening. Rockin' Gene Halton and his blues band will keep us hopping on Jazz Night (also Thursday).

All in all, at least a dozen good, highly seductive reasons to attend the Annual Meeting in April. So, join us, already!

RESULTS OF THE MSS ELECTIONS 2002-2003

PRESIDENT ELECT

Eleanor Miller

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

STATE DIRECTORS

NEBRASKA DIRECTOR

A Olu Oyinlade

University of Nebraska-Omaha

NORTH DAKOTA DIRECTOR

Richard Wilsnack

University of North Dakota

SOUTH DAKOTA DIRECTOR

Beth Tracton

Black Hills State University

WISCONSIN DIRECTOR

Carol Miller

University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse

Table of Contents

Contact
The Midwest Sociologist
at
midwest-sociologist
@uiowa.edu
with contributions,
announcements,
and articles.

April in Chicago	1
MSS Officers and State Directors	2
Results of MSS Elections	3
Thank You from the Wrights	4
Scholarship Development Committee Call	4
Featured Commentary:	
Assessing the State of the Academy	
Richard Fitz	5
Mary Burgan	5
Doris Ewing	8
Randy Stoecker	10
Kevin J. Payne	12
Carl Couch Center Announcements	16-18
Attractions for Students at MSS Meeting	19
2003-2004 MSS Committees	20-25
Couch Banquet	26
ASA Teaching Workshops	26
Social Science Research Training Fellowships	26
2003 Membership Form	27
Future Meeting Sites	Back
The Sociological Quarterly	Back

To The MSS Community From Sue and Dean Wright Re Thank You

We would like to thank each and every member of the Midwest Sociological Society for the tremendous honor you accorded us with the planting and dedication of a garden on the Drake University campus.

On September 27, we were honored by a dedication of what has been termed "The Wright Garden" here at Drake. This was the formal dedication of the garden that the Midwest Sociological Society had constructed in our honor. This was such a very unique and wonderfully thoughtful gift. Drake University entirely renovated the landscaping around Howard Hall, the building where the Department of Sociology is located.

It was a wonderful day with almost 100 friends from the MSS, Drake, and the community attending. We were so pleased that so many MSS members came so far for the event. President Phil Olson came up from Kansas City, Past President John Farley and his wife drove in from Edwardsville, and MSS members from around Iowa--Brent Bruton, Kevin Leicht, Lisa Troyer, Linda Evans, and Kent Sandstrom--all attended. It was a beautiful day as Drake's President David Maxwell and Provost Ron Troyer made gracious comments, Phil Olson spoke on behalf of the MSS and presented us with a plaque (which has been placed on a boulder at the edge of the garden). After the dedication we enjoyed refreshments and conversation with those who had attended the dedication, and later celebrated at dinner with the MSS members who had honored us with their presence. We toasted each other and the members and officers of the MSS who so graciously made this day possible. We also very much appreciated the letters and e-mails that many of you sent extending your best wishes for us.

For the two of us, it was a very memorable and humbling day. The more than 22 years that we spent involved with the MSS Board and in various positions of the Midwest Sociological Society gave us some of the most important, pleasant, and lasting memories of our professional careers. We thank each and every one of you who made the day possible and, through your actions, created a lasting memorial on the Drake University campus.

Scholarship Development Committee--Call for Papers

The Midwest Sociological Society's Scholarship Development Committee offers small grants to support innovative research and theoretical inquiry. We encourage proposals for these Scholarships from graduate students and junior faculty members who are members of MSS and who are engaged in research projects that are demonstrably in the early stage of conceptualization. Preference will be given to those persons who have not received the Scholarship in the past two years. Recipients of the Scholarships are required to submit a report of the outcome of their research at the MSS Scholarship Development Committee meeting during the 2004 meetings.

Proposals (of up to 1200 words) are due by **March 1, 2003**, and must include the following: A statement of the research problem, a summary of methodology and research design, and an itemized budget. The budget can include a variety of types of research-related expenses, including supplies, travel, and a stipend for the researcher that enables her or him to spend more time on the project. Attachments to the proposal should include a CV and a list of references. Send proposals to Dr. Shirley Hill, University of Kansas, Department of Sociology, 722 Fraser Hall, Lawrence, Kansas 66045. Direct questions to: hill@ku.edu.

Featured Commentary:

Assessing the State of the Academy

ASSESSING THE STATE OF THE ACADEMY – AN INTRODUCTION

Richard Fritz

Last Spring, the MSS Committee on Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Professional Concerns invited Dr. Mary Burgan, General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors, to speak to members about the corporatization of higher education and concomitant threats to academic freedom. Our invitation was the direct result of an earlier survey of the society's members about issues of academic freedom and professional life. Some members (about 10%) stated that they had experienced direct threats to tenure and/or academic freedom. Many other respondents indicated that, although they had not experienced direct assaults on freedom or tenure, they were concerned with issues that have now become all too familiar: exploitation of adjuncts, administrative intrusions into faculty governance, disrespect for faculty, forced retirements, punitive post-tenure review practices, profit-driven administrative policies, and so on. Dr. Burgan's role was to identify the full range of threats to the academy as we know it. In a seminar-like open forum, several members responded thoughtfully and eloquently to Dr. Burgan's remarks. I subsequently asked three MSS members, Doris Ewing, Randy Stoeker, and Kevin Payne, to write brief responses to Dr. Burgan's comments. I hope you take a moment to read their comments and add your voice to the growing conversation about the future of academic freedom in higher education.

MEASURING THE ACADEMY: EIGHT SOURCES OF ASSESSMENT

Mary Burgan

American Association of University Professors

Asking an English professor to talk to sociologists about assessment is taking a great risk! I begin by confessing my uneasiness with quantification—with numbers, graphs, formulae and the like. I will therefore take the liberty of using a more qualitative approach to my topic. In doing so I want to suggest some powerful motivations behind assessment—motivations that are not always measurable. And so my first question has to do with the forces involved: “Who is intent on assessing higher education these days?” And my second question has to do with motivation: “To what ends; for what interests?”

To make this analysis as complete as possible, I have identified eight sources for the current emphasis on assessment—national politicians, state lawmakers, state and federal agencies, accrediting agencies, managerial assumptions on our campuses and elsewhere, the new education industry, conservative canon warriors, and The US News and World Re-

port. These have influenced both policy and perception about higher education in the past decade.

Clearly, from the rhetoric we hear in every election, national politicians believe that testing students will provide the key for excellence in education. Almost every campaign speech promises that students (and, through them, schools) will be assessed whether they like it or not, and that they will be rewarded or not rewarded (read “punished”) according to the results. The faith in testing and measuring is a sacred belief in some parts of our culture: if you can measure something, you can control it.

In our current idolization of the entrepreneurial spirit as quintessentially American, rigid assessment seems to have become a patriotic necessity as well as a tool for change. This trend began under Bill Clinton, who as governor of Arkansas used testing to justify reform of his state's lagging public schools. He brought something of the same philosophy of testing as an agent of change to Washington, but he wanted to solve two other problems as well—access for minority and poor students and the integration of technology into their training. I don't think that Clinton's emphasis on measuring the gains of education was as punitive as the current testing craze may be; for better or worse, he did believe that “accountability” in education would open up opportunities for

Featured Commentary

everyone like the ones he had gained as a gifted student from an obscure family in a small state.

Clinton was also hooked on computers and felt strongly that, if students got hold of computers, they would inevitably learn to survive in a newly technologized society. There were benefits to this view, but the downside was a resolute vocationalization of higher education—an identification of college with jobs. The means for education was technology; the end of education was finding a job in the new economy. It goes without saying that in such a view, the traditional liberal arts would become something of a waste of time.

Taking the lead from national political discourse, state lawmakers have also entered into the assessment era. Assessment has been used to sort out the competition for funding among aspiring state campuses, but right now, it is also an instrument in the scramble to deal with pervading fiscal crises in the states. There is lip service to providing access to higher education for all citizens, but such goals must vie with efforts to make up for (and sometimes even to extend) the tax cuts of the past several years. In the context of a weak economy, negative assessments can be used to justify harsh budgetary cuts, for any measure that can show any failure in higher education can be handy in explaining why the allowance for higher education is no longer affordable.

Somewhat outside of politics, but highly influenced by them in the emphasis on assessment, are the agencies of government—both the U.S. Office of Education and the various higher education commissions in the states. On both the federal the state levels, the devising of assessment systems for college, program, and faculty effectiveness meshes with efforts to develop measurable evidence that might sort out and prioritize demands from multiple campuses. “Performance indicators” have been in development for programs and for individual faculty efforts. Although formulae are suggested, faculty members complain that, in practice, judgments tend to be made subjectively by individual administrators. Since most of the officials who devise such indicators, formulae, or judgments are primarily interested in efficiency and productivity, they are impatient with faculty conservatism. Old notions of the need for core curricula, especially for a liberal arts foundation or general education on every campus, have been put into competition with

claims that market forces are the most reliable standards for judgment. Given the managerial bias in state legislatures, on boards of trustees, and within the general public, assessment has become a tool for downsizing, outsourcing, and radically redefining education according to the market place.

The power of such narrowing tendencies has in the past been countered by the traditional accrediting agencies—those regional bodies that certify institutions. Accrediting agencies like the Middle-States Commission on Higher Education or the North Central Association have been around a long time, and they have enabled a credible system of peer review that most of us have submitted to with relative good humor. Given the diversity of American higher education, the accreditation system has helped to assure basic standards. The voluntary nature of these regional bodies—sponsored by the very colleges and universities that are their subjects—have given their assessments a kind of validity that is unique in the United States. This system has always been loosely structured; it is now lightly held together by CHEA, the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

During the nineties, however, the independence of the accrediting bodies came under pressure from two major sources—proprietary schools and distance education enterprises. The proprietary schools are now ready to profit from the notion that advanced education will be the key to economic security here and abroad. Indeed, so profitable is the promise of providing courses for global needs that commercial enterprises promise accreditation as a selling feature and accuse any refusal to accredit as a restraint of trade. More specialized bodies—those that concentrate on professional schools—have found themselves under threat of lawsuits from proprietary schools for monopolistic practices. And there is concern that international free trade agreements may undercut the process of accreditation as an exercise in restraint of trade.

Another challenge to traditional accreditation practices has come from the technology marketers who envisage large profits to be gained by putting college courses and degrees on line. Traditional accreditation has tried to assess faculty expertise, curricular coherence, library and other support, and student communities, but these attributes do not seem relevant in distance education schemes. Under pressure both from

Assessing the State of the Academy

proprietary schools and distance education, major accrediting agencies have made accommodations. Just about every one of them now claims to de-emphasize the assessment of “inputs”—the number and nature of the faculty, the soundness of the physical plant, and the quality of the student body—and look at the “outputs.” Although those measures are not yet defined in usable ways, the result has been a greater tolerance of the claims (and the demands) of such enterprises as the University of Phoenix or Jones International University.

A word about the effect of the doctrine of measuring outputs rather than input is in order here. Under this presiding mantra, it doesn’t matter how many of the faculty have doctorates, or how many teach full time, or how many are protected by tenure so long as students say they are satisfied and passed standardized tests. Indeed, teaching is seen as somewhat inessential, and in efforts to emphasize the student’s contribution as more essential than the teacher’s, the very word “teaching” has been “disappeared,” or at least it must have the “learning” tag attached: We engage in the “learning process.” Our students are “learners.” And what we do in the classroom is to “facilitate learning.”

I believe that behind the shift in methodology and aims among the accrediting agencies there is a more pervasive force in the assessment of our work in education; I am referring to the managerial assumptions that now seem to influence every feature of academic life—from curriculum to planning to budget to personnel decisions. These can be discerned in the reports issued by some of the higher education associations that dwell in Washington, DC. Echoing the mantras of the best-selling management books of the past decade, the corporate ethos that has taken over higher education calls universities to meet the needs of the student/customer, to change speedily to match market shifts, to streamline decision-making, and to make the faculty more flexible through unbundling their work—out sourcing part of it and bringing in part-timers to do the basic teaching (and hold down costs). The faculty culture of academe has been the favorite target of this managerial ideology; one official “report” after another has attacked tenure and shared governance as medieval privileges that impede efficiency. It is interesting to note that, despite the sins that have flourished within the corporate model of governance, managerial “expertise” is still invoked as goals for our institutions

by legislatures, administrators, boards, and even some of higher education’s putative friends in Washington.

The effort to impose a corporate model has been reinforced by critiques from two main sources in the past several years. These sources, the new “education industry” and the “conservative canon warriors” (left over from Alan Bloom’s attack on the academy in The Closing of the American Mind) are alike in their access to money, publicity, and the dark suspicions that many Americans foster about academic life. Their attacks on higher education tend to invoke such assessment instruments as poll numbers, cognitive research, and survey data, but I find their methodology so suspect that I urge social science experts to take a closer look.

A typical example of the attack on traditional higher education as “lacking standards” may be found in an article entitled “Five Dirty Little Secrets in Higher Education,” published last year in an issue of the journal Educause by Laura Palmer Noone and Craig Swenson (President and Vice President of the University of Phoenix). Their sweeping generalizations about the decline of higher education, and the faculty’s purblind complicity in it, sums up the pedagogical assessment of conventional higher education by the education business. Here is the bill of particulars:

- 1) Research has little to do with good teaching;
- 2) Faculty don’t know how to teach;
- 3) Faculty know even less about learning than they do about teaching;
- 4) Part-time faculty teach as well as full-time;
- 5) Seat-Time measures don’t measure seat time.

This list is not negligible; indeed, it includes problems that most faculty would admit to be major ones. But the indictment is presented as the whole truth about traditional higher education, with the implication that such radical failures demand a business approach for real reform. If Noone and Swenson’s list were unique, it would not bear repeating here. But it distills many of the favorite biases from the managerial and pedagogical “reforms” of the past decade. The tenor of public critiques of faculty as pedagogical know-nothings lost in their ivory towers indicates how effective stereotyping can be in undermining an entire profession.

And the other source of suspicion about faculty comes from the growing surveillance from the right. Most recently active in this regard is ACTA—the American Council of Trustees and Alumni. This group was formed by Lynne Cheney (wife of the current Vice President) and Senator Joe Lieberman (though

Featured Commentary

Lieberman has since withdrawn sponsorship). The central notion promulgated by ACTA is that the faculty in American higher education is vaguely unpatriotic because of its liberal bias in politics; its failure to promulgate a core curriculum of “classic” texts; its neglect of the civic virtue illustrated in American history; its love of speech codes that protect deviance; and its defense of affirmative action. Such assessments have been based on in-house surveys and questionable generalizations from limited samples of faculty: as a matter of fact, ACTA used data so loosely in a post-9/11 report on campus reactions that some of its interpretations had to be redrawn. Nevertheless, there has been a recent burgeoning of organizations bent on measuring the ideological rectitude of our institutions, and punishing those that do not meet the test.

I end this account of our assessors with the granddaddy of them all—the One Big Annual Assessment that we all claim to distrust, even as we rush to find out which rung our own institution sits on. I am talking about the U.S. News and World Report’s annual ranking of colleges and universities. Despite the managerial notion of higher education as a product rather than a process, the influence of the U.S. News and World Report in calculating the value of campus cultures has remained powerful. And the limitations of its techniques—the gathering of a bit of hard data and a lot of hearsay—have not undermined its power. There seems to be an American mania to rank things; and such numberings have become best sellers for magazines—certainly a mainstay for U.S. News and World Report. Whether there is much difference between this kind of popularity measurement and that of the more staid Carnegie Classification of institutions is a genuine question, one that Carnegie tried to dodge in its last round. But the fact remains that we are wedded to rankings, and we tend to care less what the criteria are than whether we have outside permission to brag about ourselves. The survey of “the best” colleges and universities has led to surveys of the best party schools, the best business schools, and schools with the “best” football, co-eds, oceanography programs, campus ice cream. This tendency is reinforced by college sports competition: the NCAA basketball rankings for the aptly named March Madness actually make a difference in student enrollments.

My eight sources of assessment may seem to blend

the trivial with the serious, but I have come to believe that even the slightest of them can have profound effects upon the course of our lives and work as faculty members. How to answer distorted generalizations with the truth of our own efforts and success? I would suggest that our only way of answering bad assessments is to engage in serious reflection upon and judgments about our work on our own. And to write about them: we need to assess ourselves in public if we are to remain viable. But to defend ourselves legitimately, we must avoid the central flaw of the eight sources of assessment I have analyzed here. We must not define education as a product rather than a process; we must not commit the attendant fallacy of believing that a complex process like education can be easily anatomized and measured. Most important, we must resist our own complicity in the various games. After all, we are the ones who grade everything—papers, colleagues, books, research, students. If our assessments are based upon a narrow definition of education, how can we expect more enlightened treatment from others?

THE STATE OF THE ACADEMY Reactions to Mary Burgan

Doris Ewing

While tenure and faculty governance continue to be strongly supported, the original intent of these principles have been called into question. Few faculty have ever experienced direct administrative interference in teaching or research and a recent survey of the MSS membership done by the Committee on Academic Responsibility and Freedom showed that academic freedom as traditionally defined was not considered a pressing issue by most faculty. Are tenure and faculty governance really nothing more than how the public perceives it -- an elitist call for protectionism?

As Mary Burgan pointed out, the major problems facing faculty are due to changes in the structure of academia and in the function of universities. A corporate management model has replaced faculty governance and faculty control over the curriculum. Faculty Senate decisions are ignored, important issues have

Assessing the State of the Academy

difficulty getting on the agenda, and the Senate is often called on to ratify decisions already made by the administration. Appeal and grievance procedures are cumbersome and often ineffective. Professional administrators and a 9-5 support staff, not involved in scholarly pursuits, have been added to create an institutional bureaucracy not responsive to faculty concerns. Financial pressures such as student recruitment and retention, credit hour production, cost containment, fund-raising and public relations, drive this bureaucracy. The academic purposes of the university, administered by a community of scholars, have been separated from the corporate goals of money and efficient management. Further, external groups such as the Board of Trustees and their handpicked President, various accrediting boards, and the state legislature are dictating policy decisions that were formerly made by faculty. Faculty are losing their influence over higher education.

From an administrative point of view, shared governance with faculty is often viewed as an obstacle, which must be overcome to fully implement an efficient corporate management model. Tenured faculty who “think they have rights” and job security are more likely to resist administrative pressures. Control is increased when faculty are insecure, in competition for scarce resources, and when tenure decisions are reduced to petty infighting. Underlying these tensions is a basic difference in goals: strengthening organizational efficiency and viability with external demands versus protecting the academic integrity of higher education. Academic freedom in the twenty-first century is different in nature from that of the past, presenting new issues, and a need to modify old strategies.

While lacking control over university priorities and resources, faculty governance is used to determine those not deserving of rewards. The faculty and decisions made by faculty committees set criteria for merit pay, sabbaticals, tenure and promotion, and other academic “perks”. The Faculty Senate is asked to participate in financial contingency plans and to choose which aspects of academia it would be most willing to sacrifice. Individual and department competition for scarce resources divides the faculty and makes them easier to control. As faculty governance becomes more powerless, ambitious faculty form alliances with administrators to advance their own inter-

ests. Thus, much of the perceived injustice seems to come from other faculty and anger is directed at peers. One must ask who this system really benefits.

The issue Burgan does not discuss is the way that the corporate management model in higher education during the past twenty-five years has changed the faculty. Large professional and business schools have a vocational focus and may be oriented toward external values and criteria for success. The reward system has changed the way faculty teach and the way departments operate. “Consumer satisfaction,” as measured by student recruitment and retention, has led to grade inflation, the inclusion of courses and programs of questionable academic merit, and the ever-powerful student course evaluations as a way of justifying faculty personnel decisions. Competition for tenure and scarce resources has led to the isolation of individuals and disciplines, each perusing their own self-interest. We can no longer assume faculty unity toward common values and purposes. Academic reorganization plans come from the top down and are based on student credit hour production per faculty, drawing resources away from traditional liberal arts disciplines and toward applied vocational fields.

It must be remembered that younger faculty are themselves a product of the corporate model of higher education. Many faculty would reject Burgan’s assertion that the primary reason for higher education is the statement by Socrates that “the unexamined life is a life not worth living.” Many emphasize training in practical skills over traditional liberal arts, and are relatively unconcerned that general education goals, so audibly stated in the university bulletin, are seldom met in practice. If asked, it would be interesting to know how many faculty would self-identify as “an intellectual.” While Burgan’s analysis of problems is accurate, her solution of returning to a long-gone, ideal-age of academia is unworkable.

Faculty morale studies show that many feel disillusioned and alienated. Faculty have become managed professionals with little control over their work or ownership of the end product. Academic careers are turned into “a job” which pays reasonably well and can be done at a minimal level with considerable free time. For some, boring and unsatisfying routine work is supplemented with outside interests, creating the “deadwood” administrators seek to eliminate with post-tenure reviews. However, as sociologists, we

Featured Commentary

know that whenever large numbers of like situated individuals become alienated, the problem is in the institutional structure of work. The lack of solidarity among the faculty and the ineffectiveness of faculty governance in dealing with pressing issues undermines a sense of collegiality and commitment.

Burgan recognizes that solidarity among faculty (including part time and adjunct faculty, graduate assistants, and professional support staff) is the only way to create a power base sufficient to resist the corporate model. This solidarity is needed to serve as a balance on administrative authority and to reclaim control over the educational process. She correctly identifies professional elitism and competition as barriers to collective action, but is less clear about the conditions and shared intentions necessary for unity.

It is the work of faculty governance to protect the academic integrity of higher education. Senates must make decisions based on higher principles, and be able to say no to questionable policies and academic programs proposed by faculty. If they never say “no”, it is unlikely that the administration will take seriously their “yes”. University structure must be changed to reward cooperation and unity over competition and separation. When individual faculty see the administration as a more consistent and fair channel for decision making, faculty governance becomes form without meaning. Even collegiality offers little satisfaction in an environment of competition between individuals and disciplines.

Questioning administrative policies and directives requires the job security of tenure, a clear understanding of goals, and the commitment and solidarity of the faculty. The tenure process at many institutions is divisive and it undermines faculty solidarity. It is in the best interests of all faculty to create a tenure process that is fair and supportive to the applicant. It should be assumed at hiring that the candidate is tenurable, and confirmed by the first three years of reappointment. A negative tenure decision is evidence of failure on the part of the chair and the department faculty. Such failure may be in the form of unclear expectations, a lack of needed support, poor collegiality, or a politicalized decision-making process. Criteria for tenure should be appropriate to the institution. While original research and prestigious publications may be appropriate for a few universities, good teaching, service to the university and the community, and applied scholarship are more appropriate criteria for most. High expectations

increase competition but often do not increase benefits. The institution must reward what it says it values. Too often, discrepancies between administrative directives and criteria for tenure create a double bind for untenured faculty. Junior faculty are pressed to do tasks refused by senior faculty, later finding that they lack the time and energy to do what is expected for tenure. It is the responsibility of all to mentor junior faculty through the tenure process and to resist administrative directives that divide faculty and penalize those who are most vulnerable. Rewards for selling out to administrative pressures are usually minimal while long-term costs are significant. Indeed, what is really at stake is the integrity of higher education and the elimination of the sense of powerlessness, competition and social isolation, which has produced so much alienation among faculty.

The corporate model has reduced faculty to workers, and many are attracted by the honesty of labor unions that clearly state that their purpose is to protect worker rights and interests. If the AAUP is to provide a realistic alternative to unionization, it must better articulate a common ground between faculty. Sound reasons must be provided why individuals and departments should sacrifice their immediate interests for a larger good.

THE DREAM OF DEMOCRATIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Randy Stoecker

This past spring, after a session with the AAUP’s Mary Burgan, Richard Fritz asked me to write up my thoughts on higher-ed governance that I had so mercilessly subjected everyone to during the discussion. I agreed with some trepidation. Because most of you aren’t gonna like it. Because there’s no precedent in higher ed for what I will propose. Because when I listen to myself talk about this I sound ridiculous. But I’ve never let that stop me before, so in the words of the elected but unseated President of the United States, I’ll “just let it rip.”¹

¹ Al Gore in a June 29, 2002, breakfast speech. June 30, 2002, *NY Times*, *Perhaps Looking Ahead, Gore Reflects With Regret*, by Richard A. Oppel Jr.

Assessing the State of the Academy

The Problem

Most of you know the problem. Our institutions of higher education have been taken over by suits. Knowledge has become a commodity, faculty have become its wage slaves, and students have become its consumers. Decision-making shifts ever upward to the suits as faculty governance mechanisms take on the same sham qualities as student government. Every position taken by the people who do the work of the institution—the faculty, students, and staff—is merely advisory to the suits who do none of the work but make all of the decisions. Think about it. What would happen if one day all the faculty didn't show up for work? What would happen if the people who cooked the food, cleaned the classrooms, fixed what broke, and filled out the forms didn't show up for work? What would happen if the students didn't show up for classes? Now, what would happen if the administrators didn't show up? Interesting, isn't it? I wonder how long it would take for us to miss them—months, years, never?

It is ironic in this condition that Campus Compact—a club of non-elected university and college presidents—would be promoting institutions of higher education as the locus for a renewed “civic engagement.” Where better to rebuild democracy than in an institutional setting where the people who make the decisions are appointed from the top rather than elected from the bottom? Now there's a model democracy for you. Institutions of higher education, which supposedly are on the cutting edge of knowledge and information, are some of the most backward, reactionary, and conservative organizations in the country. They are no place to try and rebuild civic engagement.

We have to remember that the problem is not just administrative structures and roles, however. Faculty, who may vote more liberal than any other group in the nation, are intensely Libertarian when it comes to our own work. As administrators removed whatever collective control existed in higher education, we limited ourselves to rabidly guarding our classroom and scholarly autonomy, much the way the department secretary (who never had any autonomy to begin with) guards the paper clip stock. We are the rulers of our classrooms, choosing what students will read, what they will write, and often what they will say. It is fascinating how many faculty diatribe against the dictatorial demands of administrators but, when asked by students for some flexibility in the course requirements, act like

some lower life form has soiled our shoes.

The problem, then, is that institutions of higher education are anti-democratic.

A Solution

The problem is deeply-rooted, so any solution must be radical. Anti-democratic administrative structures must be removed. Un-elected administrative positions must be eliminated. Administrative positions that do none of the institution's real work must be abolished. At my university, that means everything above the department chair through the Board of Trustees must go. I know it sounds off the wall but remember, since none of these positions do any real work, they are easy to eliminate without disrupting the day-to-day operations of the institution.

The only gap we will create is a decision-making process. But in many cases that will not even be a problem. Most administrators already have advisory committees—sometimes with a real commitment to making informed decisions and sometimes just for pretend. Without administrators taking the decision-making power, committees will actually decide rather than just advise. And the administrative staff—the people who actually do the paperwork required to make the institution run—could remain in place to help implement the decisions.

Those committees, however, also suffer from the top-down appointment process. So we need to fully consider how a higher ed institution could be run as a democracy. It's not actually that difficult. There are plenty of co-op business structures from which we can draw. Many of us already have elected toy student governments and toy faculty senates that could be turned into real decision-making bodies. If we create a similar body for staff, we have some form of a tri-cameral legislative structure. We could add an elected executive branch and Voila—democracy. Imagine the vibrancy of an institution run by its real constituencies. We could all learn democracy together. The faculty could stop complaining about students not paying attention and our students could stop complaining about the faculty being out of touch because we would both be engaged in the real running of a real institution. Both would likely be equally educated by the participation of the people who do the invisible work of the institution and know how much the wild ideas of students and faculty would cost and how much work they would take.

Featured Commentary

Is Change Possible?

Probably not. Forget about the administrators, who seem to spend half their waking hours developing justifications for why they should get paid so much more than everyone else for doing so much less real work. With good organizing we could overcome them, transforming our sorry excuse for unionization, which has limited itself to money rather than power, into a real movement to take back our institutions. More difficult, I fear, is convincing and re-educating faculty to value and practice democracy. But there are signs of hope, as faculty who have taken seriously the call for “civic engagement” are becoming more democratic in their classroom practices, are inviting community members to direct and collaborate with their scholarship, and are designing new forms of professional activity that invite and promote democracy. And, however unrealistic the goal of democratic higher education, there are six things we can do now:

1. If you have freshmen orientation courses, volunteer to teach a section and engage the students in a study of the institutional power structure and a participatory visioning of what a democratic institution might look like.
2. Read Paulo Freire and begin building democracy into your classes.
3. Find out about and do community-based research with community organizations attempting to build democracy, and involve your students.
4. If you are an AAUP member (or, I suppose, even if you’re not), bother them about their lack of attention to building power and democracy in higher education.
5. Publicly refuse to serve on institutional committees that are merely “advisory” to non-elected administrators.
6. Organize a participatory (not a top-down talking heads) session on democracy in higher education at the next conference you attend.

Margaret Mead said “Never doubt that a small group of dedicated individuals can change the world.... indeed, it’s the only thing that ever has.” Well, so far there isn’t even a small group ready to take this one on. When there is, there will be hope.

RESPONSE TO BURGAN

Kevin J. Payne

In many ways I feel I am typical of the young academic journey person seeking to find a foothold in today’s academy, so a word about my circumstances is probably in order. I am about to defend my dissertation at a large, public doctoral-extensive university. As with most departments at this time, we are understaffed due to retirements and budget crunches. We are also within a short distance of about half-a-dozen small colleges of one sort or another that increasingly make due with one or two full-time sociologists and a pack of rotating academic day laborers to help shoulder the load. Many graduate students at the university thus not only undertake increased teaching responsibilities on campus, but also turn to supplementing their incomes and expanding their vitas by teaching at one or more of the nearby colleges.

Of course, this becomes a Catch-22 for all parties involved. For the graduate student or recent Ph.D., there is no doubt that it results in substantial time committed to prepping new courses, teaching, and holding office hours. But the more we come to represent the face of the academy to our students, the more we are also asked to participate in advising, committees, external reviews, club and activity sponsorship, letters of recommendation, and other sundry acts of departmental and school service. As we spend more time in unpaid supporting roles, further expectations for our continued participation develop, and most of us acquiesce to those requests, because we care about our students and educational communities, because we are eager to participate in the lives of our institutions of higher learning (that is, after all, the goal to which we have spent long years training and aspiring), and because it provides us with valuable and much-needed experience before the pressure of the tenure clock commences. We take on more of the full-fledged professional countenance without any of the commensurate security, prestige, benefits, or income that the position has traditionally returned. Because we present this public face, it is easy for everyone involved to politely ignore that it is just that — a genteel façade behind which an increasingly bifurcated academic class system is emerging.

Assessing the State of the Academy

Yet teaching is the primary goal of the institution in the public's eyes, and that work must be attended in order to enable the academy's many other functions. But those who have taught for a few years know that preparing and teaching a course for the first time is no small matter. And, since most of us care a great deal to provide the best learning experience possible, it is a constant stream of continued work to follow the latest findings and to develop new exercises, tests, and supplemental materials simply to keep the topic fresh for ourselves and each new batch of students. Those contractually obligated "37.5 hours of classroom contact" comprising a course easily treble or quadruple, even after many repeat performances.

Success also breeds success. And when we demonstrate mastery (or, at least, willingness) in leading a course, the request often follows to take on just "one more" section or just "one more" prep. We are flattered at the acknowledgement that we have attained the coveted status of "teacher" and, besides, we don't want to let down our side. In a more cynical vein, there is also the (unspoken) implication that our structural position is, after all, only cheaply purchased in two- to five-month increments and there are many, many other hungry young academics filling the pipeline of an overcrowded labor market, eager to make their transition to the other side of the lectern.

The tenuousness of this livelihood is never very far and acceptance of increasing demands, no matter how gently or collegially broached, rapidly habituates. I believe my experience typical of many others at this stage — in the five years I have taught at the undergraduate and master's levels, I have taught almost seventy sections of ten different preps (while attempting to juggle all of the normal commitments of graduate school and life). I (usually) eagerly took on each new challenge in order to hone my pedagogical tools — and, of course, hard currency is the only real hedge against the monthly barrage of insistent creditors.

We early-career academics also realize that we are faced with a job market — just beginning to brighten over the past few hiring seasons — that has very suddenly taken a dismal turn. For example, the job service at the Annual ASA meetings this year listed only eighty positions, about fifty fewer than the previous year and little more than half the number listed in 2000. Similarly this September's ASA Job Bulletin contains announcements from about 170 potential academic employers, while those for the same time the previous two years contained about two hundred

each (many of which had to be rescinded in the spring of this past hiring cycle as fiscal difficulties became notoriously evident).

Nevertheless, it is easy to get caught up in the ever-present and scheduled demands of a day-to-day teaching load while the more nebulous and distant (though ultimately more professionally essential) goal of submitting chapter after revised chapter to patient dissertation committees falls ever further in arrears. It is no wonder that some recent data suggests the graduate student attrition rate between completion of comprehensive exams and the dissertation may currently be rising from the long-term rate of about fifty percent (itself a shocking base rate).

And here, of course, is that infamous catch: early-career academics are faced with a tenuous job market and must often resort to participating in short-term employment arrangements that may ultimately damage everyone's long-term career interests.

But there is no easy villain in this piece. Decrying the lack of fiscal support for the discipline, while accurate, does not offer real hope for a solution. Departmental administrators and senior academics daily put forward their best cases for additional resources that simply are not there — or are, for various reasons, directed toward different ends. There may be room for modest gains down this road (and they should be vigorously pursued), but it is only one of many avenues of action. Despite the lack of funds, classes still must convene and students still must be taught, whether the tenure-lines can be filled or not. Clever grant writing, politicking for external funds, and creative budgeting can stretch those limited resources of a tight economy only so far.

Similarly, unionization (for graduate students and adjuncts, alike) is another tool that must continue to be employed — whether as an end to itself or as a goad toward coercing additional concessions from higher administrations, such as a living wage or humane benefits. But again, this is only one of many avenues, and it does not address the fundamental question of tightened overall academic purse strings.

Part of the latent problem is that the academy has bought into the idea that it is (and should be seen as) nothing more than a sector of the economy serving a clientele. This is the shallowest perspective one can take on higher education and should be robustly disabused at every turn. An economic market is all about meeting the preferences of its consumers, but there is an inherently normative dimension to what

Featured Commentary

we do. Much of what we teach is about developing people into citizens who can develop their own positions and thus participate knowledgeably and critically in a global society. It is about instilling the values of the examined life — despite the desire to “put in their time” for a mere credential many (but by no means all) students enter college with. There is an inherent status inequality between student and teacher that has never set well with sociologists. And there is an inherent danger to treating education as a mere commodity that sociologists are well prepared to critique.

Further, since the inception of the GI Bill in 1944, higher education has seen an increasing influx of people from all walks of life, eager to use education as the tool for bettering their life chances. As the population expanded with the “Baby Boom,” educational institutions expanded to meet the demand. But with the aging of that generation, new developments were necessary to sustain this expansion (although no one has ever explained to me exactly why expansion, *per se*, is an intrinsic good). Institutions of higher education developing correspondence and continuing education programs fed this growth. Rampant credentialization and outreach to “non-traditional” students insured continued increasing demand. Today the headlong push toward distance education marks the latest iteration of this old wine in a new, digitized bottle. Few of us in the academy would argue against more education for more people, but, as sociologists, we must question to what end and in what service?

Educational institutions, as almost every other institutional form in Western society, have come to be predicated on expansion — but what are we to do, especially after the heady boom of the 1990s, when that expansion cools? Sociologists are, again, in a peculiar position to shed light on these aspects of the debate over what form this dizzying plethora of recent adaptations in the academy will eventually coalesce into. We are also in a position to interject critical analyses of the underlying socio-cultural and organizational forces driving these changes.

To that end, I offer a few modest and unoriginal suggestions regarding what we can do in the discipline to head off the permanent institutionalization of a chronically exploited academic underclass — especially when that underclass forms the training grounds for the future leaders in the field.

First, we must become more honest about the prospects of secure lifetime employment in an academic position. Although the problem is not (yet) as acute in sociology as it is in the humanities, there are, quite frankly,

not enough professorships to go around — it is even questionable whether such a position is long for the late modern academy. Prospective graduate students need to be made forcefully aware of this prospect. We cannot rely on the old saw of expansionism, either. Especially considering demographic trends in developed nations, it is ludicrous to believe that continued expansion in any job market (especially one so specialized) will be the long-term norm. We must have the courage to openly debate the morality of asking more students to commit many years and many more thousands of dollars in student loans toward what may be a risky end. We should, of course, encourage everyone with the drive, desire, and capacity to join us in the field — but they should do so under full disclosure. Unfortunately, there are strong institutional motivations for having an eager, cheap labor force at our disposal. Fewer graduate students mean fewer low-paid split-shift workers to plug the holes in already stretched curricular offerings, but internal changes in the structure of the academy may offer better, long-term solutions.

Second, we must legitimate alternative goals for those with the doctoral degree. Sociology attracts an eclectic population for an equally diverse array of reasons. This should be our strength. Instead, graduate programs are, by and large and (I think) unconsciously, dedicated to stamping out young research sociologists. Many of us came into graduate school wholly embracing this goal, but others find themselves forced into the uncomfortable position of paying lip service for fear of lost support, attention, or a not-so-subtly encouraged dismissal from their program. This is not so strange, those who teach in doctoral-granting programs are usually themselves active researchers and so naturally want to produce others like themselves. Graduate education may well be one of the last strongholds of the medieval patronage system, and the strong support of a gifted (and well-connected) advisor can make all the difference in a graduate student’s career. But while we publicly tow the sociological party line that teaching, sociologically-informed activism, and public intellectualism are worthy goals, there is little action in the discipline to support such ends, and much to dissuade them.

Third, in order to truly foster a more honestly diverse population of graduate students, we must both provide for their support and change the disciplinary culture. Sociology departments should reach out to

Assessing the State of the Academy

organizations in their local and global communities that address important social concerns in order to develop paid internship or practicum opportunities for graduate students that are so inclined — effectively opening up a third avenue of graduate funding in addition to the traditional research and teaching assistantships. Existing departmental funds for teaching and research support could be commensurately larger in order to better compensate for increased work expectations and would allow graduate students to spend more time on the real business of finishing dissertations to move forward with careers.

More students would be funded at decent levels by looking toward new partnerships for support. We must also acknowledge that the discipline of sociology encompasses a broad continuum of worthwhile forms: from research, traditional collegiate teaching, graduate training, outreach to non-traditional students and to communities, social application and engineering, and outright activism.

Fourth, “public intellectual” need not be a dirty word. I know many junior academics who secretly harbor a desire to meaningfully contribute to public discourse but refrain because they lack institutional protection and fear the condescension of their colleagues. And yet academics often bemoan their marginalization, while simultaneously encouraging few, if any, rewards for engaged practice of the discipline. If sociology is to generate more majors (or, at least, more demand for its offerings in the university), then people outside the discipline must understand what we do and how it is useful to society. If we can generate that public perception, then more funding will surely follow. But that requires the discipline’s active support for those on the front lines of public debate.

And fifth, we should develop alternatives to tenure solely (or even primarily) based on research output. More research is simply not necessarily better. Quality of output must become a concern over and above the raw count of who got published how many times in what “A-list” journals. But even more importantly, we should examine the possibility of dedicating faculty slots toward the specific ends of research, teaching, outreach, and administration. And we should learn to value each contribution equally. This need not preclude anyone from engaging in all of these activities — nor should it — but by making this move, we could dedicate some faculty members who demonstrate the talents and proclivities toward each of these essential academic functions, and reward them for their valuable and unique contributions. Gifted teachers can then address a larger share of the instructional duties without fear that reduced research output

will find them looking for a new job once the tenure clock tolls. Innovative researchers can focus on quality of research that has real consequences for the field and for society. Activists can generate better and richer ties with their communities that result in good will for the discipline, a significant public voice, more undergraduate majors, and greater resources dedicated to our cause. And then we come to administration — the often-overlooked specialization within sociology departments. Successful academic administration takes a rare blend of savvy and disciplinary training, coupled with a real dedication to what is normally a thankless job. This should also be a separate path toward tenure, rewarding the careful management of scarce resources, identification and allocation of individual talents, and the forging of healthy institutional relations in a sociologically informed manner.

These suggestions may help the problem of a growing academic underclass in at least five ways.

Obviously, the vigorous pursuit of all traditional funding sources must, of course, be redoubled, just as demonstrated avenues for improving workers’ conditions, such as unionization and collective bargaining, must also be actively pursued. But these, at best, only reapportion the existing pie and ultimately fail to address the root issues. As sociologists, our second contribution should be increasing awareness that the most subtle and profound exercise of power is to set the limits and categories of a debate — our contribution to this conversation over the future of the academy should be questioning those first principles and envisioning alternative scenarios. Third, we should seriously consider the ethical well-being of future potential graduate students and constrict the supply of incoming teachers by both making entrants more aware of their real prospects and providing alternate career streams so that they do not feel compelled to take these sorts of jobs. The natural response to labor shortages has historically been to make service more enticing through increased pay and benefits — there is no indication that this case would be any different. Fourth, sociology must work to connect with the public in useful and meaningful ways. Most people cannot define what a sociologist does, so why should they support us? These richer connections should translate to many forms of increased provisions. And finally, we need to seriously consider restructuring the tenure and promotion system in ways that still protect academic freedom while better organizing our human resources to meet rapidly changing disciplinary, academic, and community needs.

ALEXANDER WON 2002 DENZIN AWARD

The Carl Couch Center for Social and Internet Research (CCCSIR) is pleased to announce the winner of 2002 Norman K. Denzin Qualitative Research Award.

Bryant Keith Alexander, Associate Professor of Performance and Pedagogical Studies in the Department of Communication Studies, California State University, Los Angeles, won the 2002 Denzin Award with his paper, "(Re)Visioning the Ethnographic Site: Interpretive Ethnography as a Method of Pedagogical Reflexivity and Scholarly Production." Alexander's paper uses and advocates the use of interpretive ethnography, as a method of pedagogical reflexivity and scholarly production. In particular, it seeks to further the discussion of the classroom as a cultural site, which places the teacher as both participant and observer in the intense cultural negotiation of lived experience, curriculum and the politics of education. Using the constructive metaphor of pedagogy as drag, the project also suggests that like drag (and the performance of gender), pedagogy is about what we as teachers reveal and what we conceal in the classroom and why.

Alexander presented his award winning paper in the 2002 Annual Convention of the National Communication Association (November 21-24, New Orleans), and received a Denzin Award plaque.

The Carl Couch Center would like to thank all that applied for the 2002 Denzin Award. Special thanks goes to the Review Committee of the Denzin Award—Arthur Bochner (University of South Florida), Carolyn Ellis (University of South Florida), Patricia Clough (City University of New York), and Michal McCall-Meshejian (Macalester College).

HARRIS WON 2002 DAVID R. MAINES AWARD

The Carl Couch Center for Social and Internet Research (CCCSIR) is pleased to announce the winner of 2002 David R. Maines Narrative Research Award. Scott R. Harris, Assistant Professor of the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice in St. Louis University won the 2002 Maines Award with his paper, "Naturalist and Constructionist Approaches to Equality in Marriage." Harris' paper compares naturalist and constructionist approaches to the qualitative study of equality and inequality, and encourages more ethnographers to adopt the latter. Focusing on the subfield of marital equality, three areas of divergence are explored: sampling, interviewing, and the analysis and presentation of data. In each area, naturalists tend to obscure the diversity and complexity of respondents' interpretations. The constructionist alternative is to make storytelling paramount by treating equality and inequality as situated narrative accomplishments. A constructionist approach focuses on respondents' own ethnographic skills while still fitting "the data" into a larger analytic story about equality. Harris will present his award winning paper in the 2003 Midwest Sociological Meetings (April 16-19, Chicago), and receive a Maines Award plaque during the Meetings as well.

The Carl Couch Center would like to thank all that applied for the 2002 Maines Award. Special thanks goes to the Review Committee of Maines Award—William Rawlins (Purdue University), Jim Thomas (Northern Illinois University), Jeff Ulmer (Pennsylvania State University), and Elaine Jenks (West Chester University).

The Maines Award competition is open to both students and the faculty who submit papers that (1) interpret or address Maines' pragmatist approaches, (2) apply Maines' narrative concepts to a social/communication event, (3) develop aspects of Maines' scholarship in new directions, or (4) integrate the humanistic development of narrative and Maines' pragmatist conceptual and theoretical direction. For more information about Maines Award, please visit the Couch Center website at www.cccsir.org.

COUCH AWARD WINNERS ANNOUNCED

The Carl Couch Center for Social and Internet Research (CCCSIR) is pleased to announce the winners of the first annual Carl J. Couch Internet Research competition for students.

Top Paper honors go to Kurt Reymers, a Ph.D. candidate at the University at Buffalo (SUNY), for his submission, "Identity and the Internet: A Symbolic Interactionist Perspective on Computer-Mediated Social Networks." Runner-up is Nick Huber, a graduate student at Minnesota State University-Mankato, for his paper, "Surfing for Sports." Third Place honors were earned by Andrea Nugent, a student at Goucher College (Maryland), for her paper, "Database as Cultural Form."

The top three papers were presented at the 2002 International Conference of the Association of Internet Researchers (AoIR) at the University of Maastricht (the Netherlands), International Institute of Infonomics. In addition, the winners received Couch Award certificates and cash prizes at Maastricht conference, October 13-16, 2002. Information about the Couch award can be accessed at <http://www.cccsir.org/>.

CALL FOR AWARD APPLICATIONS
Clifford G. Christians Ethics Research Award
Sponsored by Carl Couch Center for Social and Internet Research
<http://www.cccsir.org/>

The Carl Couch Center issues an annual call for research papers and published works (i.e., books or articles) to be considered for Clifford G. Christians Ethics Research Award. To be considered for the Christians Award, submissions should interpret or address important theoretical issues in the areas of ethics, mass communication theory, and the relationship between media and technology and culture; interpret and apply concepts employed in Christians' work in new and insightful ways. Submissions will be evaluated based on the quality of (1) mastery of Christians' approaches and concepts, (2) originality, (3) organization, (4) presentation, and (5) advancement of knowledge. Evaluation will be administered by a Review Committee of four: Dr. Lee Wilkins, University of Missouri; Dr. Robert Fortner, Calvin College; Dr. Deni Elliott, University of Montana; Dr. Ronald Arnett, Duquesne University

Both single and co-authored works are accepted. The Award winner will receive a Christians Award plaque to be presented in the 2003 Annual Convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) in Kansas City, or the National Communication Association (NCA) in Miami Beach.

Those interested please send six copies of the research papers or published works (if the publication is a book, six copies of the table of contents and of one chapter is sufficient) with a 100-word abstract to: Shing-Ling S. Chen, Dept. of Communication Studies, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA 50614. Tel: 319-273-6021. E-mail: chen@cccsir.org

Application deadline is February 1, 2003. Notification of award application will be sent out by April 1, 2003. Questions and comments about award application, please contact: Shing-Ling S. Chen, Dept. of Communication Studies, Univ. of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA 50614. Tel: 319-273-6021. E-mail: chen@cccsir.org

CALL FOR AWARD APPLICATIONS
Norman K. Denzin Qualitative Research Award
Sponsored by Carl Couch Center for Social and Internet Research
<http://www.cccsir.org/>

The Carl Couch Center issues an annual call for papers to be considered for Norman K. Denzin Qualitative Research Award. The Couch Center welcomes papers that (1) interpret or address Denzin's theoretical or interpretive approaches, (2) demonstrate creative narrative ethnographies/autoethnographies as advocated by Denzin, (3) apply Denzinian concepts to a communication event, be it social or mediated, etc., (4) synthesize Denzinian ideas with other lines of scholarship, or (5) develop aspects of Denzinian scholarship in new directions, to be considered for Denzin Award. Papers will be evaluated based on the quality of (1) mastery of Denzinian approaches and concepts, (2) originality, (3) organization, (4) presentation, and (5) advancement of knowledge. Evaluation will be administered by a Review Committee of four:

Dr. Arthur Bochner, University of South Florida; Dr. Carolyn Ellis, University of South Florida; Dr.

Patricia Clough, City University of New York; and Dr. Michal McCall-Meshejian, Macalester College

Poetic, narrative, critical, cultural, autoethnographic, and performative texts are welcomed. Both single and co-authored works are accepted. Works that are published or accepted for publication are not eligible for award consideration. The top paper will receive the Denzin Award plaque to be presented in 2003 Annual Convention of the National Communication Association (NCA).

Those interested should send a copy of their paper with a 100-word abstract, electronically to Shing-Ling Chen at chen@cccsir.org. Paper length is limited to 30 pages plus references. Application deadline is May 1, 2003. Notification of award application will be sent out by August 1, 2003. Questions and comments about Denzin Award application, please contact: Shing-Ling S. Chen, Dept. of Communication Studies, University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA 50614. Tel: 319-273-6021. E-mail: chen@cccsir.org

CALL FOR AWARD APPLICATIONS
Carl J. Couch Internet Research Award
Sponsored by the Carl Couch Center for Social and Internet Research
<http://www.cccsir.org/>

The Carl Couch Center issues an annual call for student-authored papers to be considered for the Carl J. Couch Internet Research Award. The Couch Center welcomes both theoretical and empirical papers that: (1) apply symbolic interactionist approaches to Internet studies; (2) demonstrate interactive relationships between social interaction and communication technologies as advocated by Couch; and/or (3) develop symbolic interactionist concepts in new directions. Papers will be evaluated based on the quality of: (1) mastery of Symbolic Interactionist approaches and concepts and Couch's theses; (2) originality; (3) organization; (4) presentation; and (5) advancement of knowledge. Evaluation will be administered by a Review Committee of four: Dr. Mark D. Johns, Luther College; Dr. Katherine M. Clegg, University of Illinois, Chicago; Dr. Lori Kendall, SUNY-Purchase; Dr. Shing-Ling S. Chen, University of Northern Iowa

Competition is open to graduate or undergraduate students of all disciplines. Works that are published or accepted for publication are not eligible for award consideration. The top three papers will receive Couch Awards to be presented at the 2003 International Conference of the Association of Internet Researchers in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. The top paper will be awarded a certificate and a cash prize of \$150, runner up will receive a certificate and a cash prize of \$100, and a third paper will receive a certificate and a cash prize of \$50. All three authors will be invited to present their work at a session of the A.o.I.R. conference, October 16-19, 2003.

Those interested should send a copy of their paper, with a 100-word abstract, electronically to Mark Johns at johnsmar@luther.edu. Application deadline is May 1, 2003. Notification of award will be sent by June 15. Those with questions or comments about the Couch Award application, please contact: Mark D. Johns, Dept. of Communication/Linguistics, Luther College, Decorah, IA 52101. Tel: (563) 387-1347. E-mail: johnsmar@luther.edu

Lofland to Speak in Peter M. Hall Lecture Series

Prof. Lyn Lofland of the University of California-Davis will speak in the Peter M. Hall Lecture Series during the 2003 Midwest Sociological Society Meetings on Thursday, April 17 at 12:00 to 1:05 p.m. Reception follows lecture presentation.

In Fall 2002, the Carl Couch Center for Social and Internet Research (CCCSIR, www.cccsir.org) established the Peter M. Hall Lecture Series to be presented in the annual Midwest Sociological Society Meetings. The lecture series is designed to bring leading sociologists to the annual Midwest Sociological Society Meetings to present lectures and continue the nurturing and mentoring young sociologists tradition.

The theme of Peter M. Hall Lecture Series in the next few years is "Symbolic Interaction, Sociology, and Changing Society: Critical Issues and New Directions." The "changing society" denotes that the society is changing and/or that we are interested in changing it ourselves.

For the inaugural lecture of the series, Professor Lyn Lofland will speak about her latest research in land developers and the built environment on Thursday, April 17 at 12:00 to 1:05 p.m. A reception will be held after the lecture presentation to allow the audience members to continue their discussion and interaction with Professor Lofland.

This event is organized and sponsored by the Carl Couch Center. For questions and comments about this event, please contact Shing-Ling Chen at chen@cccsir.org.

Student Directors Rajan Pant (rp46b@umkc.edu) and Samantha Helm(Saman03@aol.com)

ATTRACTIONS for STUDENTS at the Annual MSS Meetings at Chicago

Spend a Night On Us!

Are you a MSS student member and presenting a paper or participating in a committee at the 2003 Chicago meetings? If so, you are eligible for a \$100 scholarship to help facilitate your participation. In its enduring commitment to students, the Midwest Sociological Society has made 60 scholarships (increased from last year's 30 scholarships) available on a lottery basis. To apply you must:

Be a current member of MSS in good standing;

Be presenting a paper or participating in a committee at the meetings; and

Contact Rajan Pant (Student Director and the Chair of the Student Issue Committee) via email at rp46b@umkc.edu and provide information about your current membership, and the session or committee in which you will be participating. All applicants received *before March 15th* will be included in a lottery for the 60 scholarships. Each recipient will receive a check for \$100 when s/he signs in at the registration desk.

Lunch On Us!

Who: The first 350 students who pre-register for the annual meetings. So, hurry up and pre-register!

What: A free \$10 lunch coupon for the lunch cart

When: At the MSS Annual Meeting April 16 to April 19, 2003

Where: The Marriott Hotel in Downtown Chicago, Illinois

Why: Because the MSS knows that students by definition are poor and are enticed by the words "free food"!

Watch for information on **MSS Students' Night Out, Friday, April 18**. For more info and ideas, contact Student Director **Samantha Helm (Saman03@aol.com)**

Top 10 Reasons Why You Should Visit The Student Hospitality Suite at the Annual Meeting...

10. Your professors will not be there!
9. You can take a nap in this room!
8. You can use the room to dump your extra belongings (i.e. backpacks)!
7. You can talk to fellow sociologists about the last panel discussion you attended!
6. You can find out about the latest issues in the field of sociology!
5. You can meet up with old sociology buddies, the ones you only see once a year!
4. You can catch up on the most recent gossip!
3. You can find out where students are heading for a night out in Chicago!
2. You have the opportunity to meet a bunch of new people!
1. There will be free stuff waiting for you!

If you have any questions regarding the students' stuff, please feel free to contact Rajan Pant (Student Director and the Chair of the Student Issue Committee) via email at rp46b@umkc.edu. See ya'll there!

2003-2004 MSS Committees

Following are the 2003-04 rosters for standing committees of the Midwest Sociological Society. Terms of office are from the annual meeting in the year of initial appointment through the Annual MSS Business Meeting in the year designated beside each name. All persons listed on the committee roster, including outgoing 2003 members, are expected to attend the scheduled committee meeting in April 2003 in Chicago. The schedule of Committee Meetings will appear in the Preliminary Program. Committee Chairs will be in contact with Committee members prior to the April meeting.

Academic Freedom, Responsibility and Professional Concerns Committee and Standards, Training, and Employment Committee

Chair Academic Freedom (02-04): Richard Fritz, *Saint Xavier University* (04)

Chair Stds and Training (01-03): Kevin Leicht, *University of Iowa* (04)

Patrick Fontane, *Saint Louis College of Pharmacy* (04) (Academic Freedom)

Denise Copelton, *Augustana College* (05) (Academic Freedom)

Ophra Leyser, *University of Kansas* (04) (Stds and Training)

Laura Chambers, *University of Illinois-Champaign* (04) (Stds and Training)

Doris Ewing, *Southwest Missouri State University* (03) (Academic Freedom)

Tim Knapp, *Southwest Missouri State University* (03) (Stds and Training)

David Schweingruber, *Iowa State University* (03) (Stds and Training)

Endowment Committee

Chair (01-03): Zoann Snyder, *Western Michigan University* (04)

Chair (03-05): Frieda Fowler, *University of Nebraska-Lincoln* (05)

Helena Lopata, *Loyola University-Chicago* (03)

Chris Prendergast, *Illinois Wesleyan University* (04)

Dan Krier, *College of William and Mary* (05)

Mary Zimmerman, *University of Kansas* (05)

Julie Harms Cannon, *Texas Tech University* (06)

Browyn Conrad, *Pittsburgh State University* (06)

Ex-officio:

Jean Karlen, *Wayne State College*, Chair-Long Range Planning Committee

Sheryl Grana, *University of Minnesota-Duluth*, Treasurer

Executive Committee

Chris Prendergast, *Illinois Wesleyan University*, President 2003

Ellie Miller, *University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee*, President-Elect 2004

Phil Olson, *University of Missouri-Kansas City*, Immediate Past President 2002

Kent Sandstrom, *University of Northern Iowa*, Executive Officer

Peter Kivisto, *Augustana College*, Secretary

Sheryl Grana, *University of Minnesota-Duluth*, Treasurer

Exhibits and Advertising Committee

Chair (01-04): Allan McCutcheon, *University of Nebraska-Lincoln* (04)

Chair (04-07): BarBara Scott, *Northeastern Illinois University* (07)

Pat Lutt, *Wayne State College* (05)

Linda Breyspraak, *University of Missouri-Kansas City* (04)

Ex-officio:

Richard Schaefer, *DePaul University*, Chair-Future Sites and Arrangements Committee

Finance Committee

Chair (02-05): Zoann Snyder, *Western Michigan University* (05)
 Larry Landis, *Black Hills State University* (03)
 Kathleen Crittenden, *University of Illinois-Chicago* (04)
 Shirley Scritchfield, *Creighton University* (05)
 Donna Hess, *South Dakota State University* (08)
 Phil Olson, *University of Missouri-KC* (08)

Ex-officio:

Sheryl Grana, *University of Minnesota-Duluth*, Treasurer
 Kent Sandstrom, *University of Northern Iowa*, Executive Officer

Future Sites and Arrangements Committee

Chair (00-04): Richard Schaefer, *DePaul University* (04)
 Rajan Pant, *University of Missouri-Kansas City* (03), Student Director
 Samantha Helm, *Illinois Wesleyan University* (03), Student Director
 Angela Glasker, *Illinois Wesleyan University* (04), Student Director
 BarBara Scott, *Northeastern Illinois University* (Chicago 03 Local) (05)
 Diane Kholos Wysocki, *University of Nebraska-Kearney* (05)
 Linda Breytspraak, *University of Missouri-Kansas City* (Kansas City 04 Local) (06)
 Theresa Guess, *University of Missouri-St. Louis* (06)
 Diane Pike, *Augsburg College* (Minneapolis 05 Local) (07)

Ex-officio:

Ellie Miller, *University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee* (Milwaukee Local 02), and President-Elect 2004
 Sheryl Grana, *University of Minnesota-Duluth*, Treasurer
 Zoann Snyder, *Western Michigan University*, Treasurer-Designate
 Allan McCutcheon, *University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, Chair-Exhibits and Advertising Committee

Long-Range Planning Committee

Chair (01-04): Jean Karlen, *Wayne State College* (05)

Chair (04-06): William Staudenmeier, *Eureka College* (07)

Patti Adler, *University of Colorado* (03)
 Richard Wilsnack, *University of North Dakota* (03)
 Robert Wazienski, *Illinois State University* (03)
 Betty Havens, *University of Manitoba-Winnipeg* (04)
 Lewis Mennerick, *University of Kansas* (05)
 Barbara Heyl, *Illinois State University* (06)
 Lisa Ann Geason, *Michigan State University* (06)
 Linda Lindsey, *Maryville University* (07)
 Randy Stoecker, *University of Toledo* (07)
 Gerry Cox, *University of Wisconsin-La Crosse* (08)
 Tony Orum, *University of Illinois-Chicago* (08)
 Teodora Amoloza, *Illinois Wesleyan University* (08)
 Kamel Ghozzi, *Central Missouri State University* (08)

Ex-officio:

Ellie Miller, *University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee*, President-Elect 2004
 Chris Prendergast, *Illinois Wesleyan University*, President 2003
 Phil Olson, *University of Missouri-Kansas City*, Past President 2002
 Peter Kivisto, *Augustana College*, Secretary
 Sheryl Grana, *University of Minnesota-Duluth*, Treasurer
 Zoann Snyder, *Western Michigan University*, Treasurer-Designate
 Frieda Fowler, *University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, Chair-Endowment Committee
 Kent Sandstrom, *University of Northern Iowa*, Executive Officer

Membership Committee

- Chair (02-05):** Mary Kelly, *Central Missouri State University* (05)
 Naomi Lacy, *University of Nebraska Medical Center* (03)
 Timothy Owens, *Purdue University* (03)
 Richard Rathge, *North Dakota State University* (03)
 Robert Friedenbach, *University of South Dakota* (03)
 Wava Haney, *University of Wisconsin-Richland* (03)
 Rajan Pant, *University of Missouri-Kansas City* (03), Student Director
 Samantha Helm, *Illinois Wesleyan University* (03), Student Director
 Angela Glasker, *Illinois Wesleyan University* (04), Student Director
 Susan Stall, *Northeastern Illinois University* (04)
 Lisa Troyer, *University of Iowa* (04)
 Patrick Akard, *Kansas State University* (04)
 Debra Peterson, *Bemidji State University* (04)
 Tola Olu Pearce, *University of Missouri-Columbia* (04)
 New student director (TBA) (05)
 A. Olu Oyinlade, *University of Nebraska-Omaha* (06)
 Richard Wilsnack, *University of North Dakota* (06)
 Beth Tracton, *Black Hills State University* (06)
 Carol Miller, *University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse* (06)
 Anne Eisenberg, *SUNY-Geneseo* (06)

Ex-officio:

- Peter Kivisto, *Augustana College*, Secretary
 Ellie Miller, *University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee*, President-Elect 2004
 Kevin Leicht, *University of Iowa*, Editor of *TMS* and *TSQ*
 Linda Evans, *Drake University*, Assistant Executive Officer MSS

Minority Scholars Committee

- Chair (02-03):** Antonio Jimenez, *Northwestern University* (04)
Chair (03-04): Eduardo Perez, *University of Central Arkansas* (04)
 Teodora Amoloza, *Illinois Wesleyan University* (03)
 Jan Fiola, *Moorhead State University* (03)
 Emily Kearns, *Clarke College* (03)
 Gina Petonito, *Western Illinois University* (03)
 Abdi Kusow, *Oakland University* (03)
 Carla Goar, *Northern Illinois University* (06)
 Kyoung-Ho Shin, *Northwest Missouri State University* (06)
 Keith Parker, *University of Nebraska-Lincoln* (06)
 Afroza Anwary, *Minnesota State University-Mankato* (06)

Nominations and Elections Committee

- Chair (02-03):** George Youngs, *North Dakota State University* (04)
Chair (03-04): Elaine McDuff, *Iowa State University* (04)
 Dan Peterson, *Black Hills State University* (03)
 Gerry Cox, *University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse* (03)
 William Arnold, *University of Kansas* (04)
 Burt Halpert, *University of Missouri-Kansas City* (04)
 David Olday, *Minnesota State University-Moorhead* (04)
 Andrea Fontana, *University of Nevada* (03)
 Helen Moore, *University of Nebraska-Lincoln* (05)

Don Arwood, *South Dakota State University* (05)
 Charles Gallmeier, *Indiana University-Northwest* (05)
 Boyd Littrell, *University of Nebraska-Lincoln* (05)
 Carol Miller, *University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse* (05)

Ex-officio:

Peter Kivisto, *Augustana College*, Secretary

Publications Committee

Chair (02-04) David Bills, *University of Iowa* (04)
 Mike Lacy, *Colorado State University* (03)
 Peter Kivisto, *Augustana College* (03)
 Eric Hanley, *University of Kansas* (05)
 Diane Taub, *Southern Illinois University-Carbondale* (05)
 Scott Hunt, *University of Kentucky* (04)
 Gloria Jones-Johnson, *Iowa State University* (06)
 Dan Myers, *University of Notre Dame* (06)

Ex-officio:

Sheryl Grana, *University of Minnesota-Duluth*, Treasurer
 Kevin Leicht, *University of Iowa*, Editor of *TMS* and *TSQ*
 Kent Sandstrom, *University of Northern Iowa*, Executive Officer

Scholarship Development Committee

Chair (02-03): Shirley Hill, *University of Kansas* (04)
Chair (03-04): Marsha Smith, *Augustana College* (05)
 Colleen Greer, *Bemidji State University* (03)
 Kevin Anderson, *Northern Illinois University* (03)
 Larry Neuman, *University of Wisconsin-Whitewater* (03)
 Linda Havir, *Saint Cloud State University* (04)
 Gail Wallace, *Iowa State University* (05)
 Jesse Garcia, *Morton College* (06)
 Joanna Farmer Matthews, *University of Missouri-Columbia* (06)
 Margaret Villanueva, *Saint Cloud State University* (06)

Social Action Committee

Chair (03-04): David Olday, *Minnesota State University-Moorhead* (04)
 Annette Kuhlmann, *University of Wisconsin-Baraboo* (03)
 Mohammad Chaichian, *Mount Mercy College* (03)
 Teresa Guess, *University of Missouri-Saint Louis* (04)
 Olu Oyinlade, *University of Nebraska-Omaha* (05)
 Tim Gongaware, *University of Wisconsin-La Crosse* (05)
 Ligaya McGovern, *University of Indiana-Kokomo* (06)
 Georgeann Rundblad, *Illinois-Wesleyan University* (06)
 Polly Fassinger, *Concordia College* (06)
 Jenna Nargang, *Loyola University-Chicago* (06)
 Stephen Muzzatti, *University of Northern Iowa* (06)

Sociological Practice Committee

- Chair (01-03):** Marlynn May, *Texas A&M University* (03)
Chair (03-05): Kent Bausman, *Maryville University-Saint Louis* (05)
 Dean Wright, *Drake University* (03)
 Naomi Lacy, *University of Nebraska Medical Center* (03)
 Susan Stall, *Northeastern Illinois University* (04)
 Wayne White, *Kansas Legal Services* (05)
 Gary David, *Bentley College* (05)
 Jim Stimpson, *University of Nebraska-Lincoln* (05)
 Terry Canaday, *Southern Rural Development Center* (06)
 Melody Lehnerer, *Southwest Missouri State University* (06)

Technology Issues Committee

- Chair (02-03):** Robert Fernquist, *Central Missouri State University* (03)
Chair (03-04): Daryl Kelley, *University of Nebraska-Kearney* (05)
 Robert Wazienski, *Illinois State University* (03)
 Rhonda Riebeling, *Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville* (03)
 Lisa Troyer, *University of Iowa* (03)
 Shing-Ling Chen, *University of Northern Iowa* (04)
 George Youngs, *North Dakota State University* (04)
 David Berger, *Inver Hills Community College* (05)
 Eric Reed, *University of Iowa* (06)
 Shelby Krzyzak, *ITT Technical Institute* (06)
 Glenn Muschert, *Purdue University* (06)

Ex-officio:

- Kent Sandstrom, *University of Northern Iowa*, Executive Officer
 Mike Lacy, *Colorado State University*, Publications Chair (03)
 David Bills, *University of Iowa*, Publications Chair (04)

Committee on Teaching and Learning

- Chair (02-03):** Tracy Ore, *Saint Cloud State University* (03)
Chair (03-04): Peter Parilla, *University of Saint Thomas* (04)
 Kathleen Lowney, *Valdosta State University* (03)
 Betsy Lucal, *Indiana University-South Bend* (03)
 Sid Goss, *SD School of Mines & Technology* (03)
 Herbert Haines, *State University of New York-Cortland* (03)
 Kathleen McKinney, *Illinois State University* (03)
 Mehrangiz Najafizadeh, *University of Kansas* (04)
 Anne Eisenberg, *SUNY-Geneseo* (04)
 Agnes Caldwell, *Adrian College* (04)
 Kathleen Kaufelt, *Waukesha County Technical College* (05)
 Tim Knapp, *Southwest Missouri State University* (05)
 Fernando Rivera, *University of Nebraska-Lincoln* (05)
 Bob Greene, *Greenfiled High School, Madison, WI* (06)
 Tim Pippert, *Augsburg College* (06)
 Manjur Karim, *Culver-Stockton College* (06)
 Kristin Mack, *University of Northern Iowa* (06)

Committee on Women in the Profession

- Chair (02-03):** Carol Miller, *University of Wisconsin-La Crosse* (03)
- Chair (03-04):** Diane Kholos Wysocki, *University of Nebraska-Kearney* (04)
 Diane Taub, *Southern Illinois University-Carbondale* (03)
 Michelle Hughes Miller, *Southern Illinois University-Carbondale* (03)
 Janice Milner, *University of Saint Thomas* (03)
 Karen Branden, *South Dakota State University* (04)
 Susan Humphers-Ginther, *Minnesota State University-Moorhead* (04)
 Lisa Amoroso, *Northwestern University* (05)
 Enilda Delgado, *University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse* (05)
 Joan Gilbreath, *Nebraska Wesleyan University* (06)
 Jennifer Wingren, *University of Wisconsin-Whitewater* (06)
 Brian Donovan, *University of Kansas* (06)
 Wamucii Njogu, *Northeastern Illinois University* (06)

Student Issues

- Chair (02-03):** Rajan Pant, *University of Missouri-Kansas City* (03)
- Chair (03-04):** Angela Glasker, *Illinois Wesleyan University* (04)
 Samantha Helm, *Illinois Wesleyan University* (03)
 Rajan Pant, *University of Missouri-Kansas City* (03)
 Fernando Rivera, *University of Nebraska-Lincoln* (03)
 Deborah Kemp, *University of Missouri-Kansas City* (05)
 Olasoji Fagbola, *University of Ibadan-Nigeria* (05)
 Shyam K.C., *Iowa State University* (05)
 Lenora Hudson, *South Dakota State University* (05)
 New Student Director (TBA) (05)

Ex-officio:

- Kent Sandstrom, *University of Northern Iowa*, Executive Officer
 Chris Prendergast, *Illinois Wesleyan University*, President 2003

2003 Program Committee

- Chair:** Chris Prendergast, *Illinois Wesleyan College*
 Patty Adler, *University of Colorado*
 Terry Besser, *Iowa State University*
 David K. Brown, *Illinois State University*
 James Chriss, *Cleveland State University*
 Gerry Cox, *University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse*
 John Farley, *Southern Illinois University-Edwardsville*
 Mark Gottdiener, *SUNY-Buffalo*
 Ligaya McGovern, *Indiana University-Kokomo*
 Virginia Olesen, *University of California-San Francisco*
 Fran Pestello, *University of Dayton*
 Diane Pike, *Augsburg College*
 Harland Prechel, *Texas A&M University*
 John Stolte, *Northern Illinois University*
 Jim Thomas, *Northern Illinois University*
 Kathryn Ward, *Southern Illinois University-Carbondale*

House of Blues to Host Couch Banquet You Are Invited...

House of Blues will host the annual Carl Couch Banquet during the 2003 Midwest Sociological Society Meetings (April 16-19, 2003) in Chicago. Everyone (symbolic interactionists, non-interactionists, sociologists, and non-sociologists) is invited to attend this event for a wonderful evening of food, fun, and entertainment. (Special thanks to Jodi White and Steve Jones of University of Illinois-Chicago for the restaurant information.) Carl Couch Banquet is scheduled on Friday, April 18, 2003 at House of Blues in Chicago. House of Blues is located at 329 N. Dearborn Street, 3.5 blocks from Marriott; expense is around \$20-30 per person.

Place: House of Blues

Date: Friday, April 18, 2003

**Time/Event: 6-7 pm Social 7-9 pm Dinner
(Performance starts at 10 pm)**

If you would like to attend this event, reservation is required. *Please RSVP by March 1, 2003* to Shing-Ling Chen at chen@cccsir.org. This event is organized by the Carl Couch Center for Social and Internet Research (www.cccsir.org). Questions and comments about this event, please contact Shing-Ling Chen, chen@cccsir.org.

Teaching Workshops Set for April 17, 18

The American Sociological Association (ASA) will sponsor two free workshops on teaching sociology at the MSS annual meeting in Chicago.

“Undergraduate Research Experiences: Early and Often” is scheduled for **Thursday, April 17, from 1:15 to 5:00 p.m.** The workshop will share ideas on how to integrate data analysis into undergraduate research assignments. Workshop leaders are Kerry Strand (Hood College) and Carla B. Howery (ASA). To register, email your contact information to apap@asanet.org.

“Teaching Sociology in High School” is scheduled for **Friday, April 18, from 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon.** Workshop leaders are Anne Boyle Cross (University of Wisconsin-Stout), Bob Greene (Greenfield High School), Carla B. Howery (ASA), and Barbara Schneider (University of Chicago). Oriented to high school teachers of sociology, the workshop will focus on course design and model curricula. To register, email your contact information to apap@asanet.org.

Social Science Research Training Fellowship for Junior Faculty

Applications are being solicited from junior faculty for a unique research training program aimed at fostering the next generation of social scientists addressing societal considerations of natural hazards and extreme events. This program, “Enabling the Next Generation of Hazard Researchers,” is funded by the National Science Foundation and is being undertaken by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in collaboration with faculty from seven other universities. The program will consist of a two-year series of workshops, tutorials, and discussions focusing on practical advice about research initiation and research proposal development for social science research addressing hazards and extreme events. This is a unique opportunity for junior faculty who are early in their research careers. Participants will receive an honorarium and travel expenses to workshops and meetings with senior faculty mentors.

Deadline for applications: March 1, 2003.

For more details, please visit our website at <http://www.unc.edu/depts/curs/enabling/index.html> Please contact Leanna Hush (hush@email.unc.edu) or Dr. Raymond Burby (burby@email.unc.edu) for more information.

**Midwest
Sociological
Society
Annual Meetings**

**2003 Chicago, Illinois
April 16-19**

**"Social and Cultural Dynamics:
From Social Relationships through
the World System"**

**PRELIMINARY PROGRAM
COMING SOON!**

**Also, check the MSS website
www.themss.org**

**2004 Kansas City, Missouri
April 15-18**

**2005 Minneapolis, Minnesota
March 31-April 3**

The Sociological Quarterly
Vol. 44, No. 1, Winter

Dust: A Study in Sociological Miniaturization
Fine and Hallett

CLASS, SEGREGATION AND CULTURE
The Effects of Occupational Segregation
Across Race and Gender *Cotter & Vannaman*

How Important is Social Class in Taiwan?
Marsch

The Emergence of Trendsetters for Fashions and
Fad: Kogaro in 1990s Japan *Suzuki & Best*

ACTION, IDENTITY, AND RESISTANCE
Pragmatic Conventions: An Intelligible and
Empirically Viable Frame for a Theory of Action
and Interaction *Handel*

Natural Health's Narratives of Health and the
Therapeutic Production of Consumer Resistance
Toward Medico-Administrative Identities
Thompson

Living Alone in Old Age: Institutionalized Discourse
And Women's Knowledge *Luken & Vaughn*

The Midwest Sociologist is available on-line at www.themss.org

The Midwest Sociological Society
Department of Sociology
Drake University
2507 University
Des Moines, IA 50311-4505