The crisis consists precisely in the fact that the old is dying and the new cannot be born; in this interregnum a great variety of morbid symptoms appear.

Antonio Gramsci, Selections from the Prison Notebooks

Aida Tomeh Distinguished Service Award
Susan Alexander

The Aida Tomeh Distinguished Service Award recognizes a member who has provided outstanding service to the NCSA typically through a variety of activities and roles over an extended period of time throughout his or her professional career. This year’s winner, Susan Alexander, Saint Mary’s College, exemplifies this dedication to the NCSA.

Susan has been a fixture at NCSA meetings since 1993. She has been an organizer and/or discussant of 23 NCSA sessions at meetings. She has served on several committees including the Scholarly Achievement Committee, the Program Committee, the Nominations Committee, the Publication Policy Committee, the Teaching Section, the Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award Committee, and the Student Awards Committee – which she chaired for three years.

Susan has been diligent in involving her own undergraduate students in NCSA meetings and many of them have won undergraduate paper awards over the years. She is a recipient of the Schnabel Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award and served as on the NCSA Council as Secretary for three years.

Currently Susan serves as the NCSA’s Public Relations Coordinator with responsibility for design and maintenance of our website, and editing our newsletter, the North Central Sociologist. Susan Alexander is a most deserving recipient of the 2012 Aida Tomeh Distinguished Service Award.

2012 NCSA ANNUAL MEETING IN PITTSBURGH

This year’s annual NCSA meeting in, was held from April 13-14, 2012.

The theme of the 2012 meeting was Renewing Sociology: Living Traditions and Creative Beginnings

Many individuals contributed to this successful meeting, but special thanks goes to the Conference Coordinator Joyce Lucke for all her hard work putting together the NCSA program with such a diversity of sessions.

J. Milton Yinger Distinguished Lifetime Career Award
Keith Roberts

The J. Milton Yinger Lifetime Distinguished Career Award in Sociology was named for Professor Yinger, whose career exemplified the three factors that are considered in selecting winners of the award: teaching, research, and public sociology.

The Committee responsible for reviewing nominations for the J. Milton Yinger Distinguished Career in Sociology Award is pleased to announce that Keith Roberts of Hanover College is this year’s recipient. Keith received his PhD from Boston University in 1976 and spent the next fifteen years teaching at Bowling Green State University’s Firelands Branch. Since 1991 he has been Professor of Sociology at Hanover College.

Keith has a distinguished record in the scholarship of pedagogy with ten editions of two text books, three handbooks for the American Sociological Association’s Teaching Resource Center, over thirty articles and book chapters, and more than eighty workshops and presentations at professional meetings. In addition he has received seven awards for teaching excellence and contributions in service to the profession.

Keith exemplifies the spirit of the award named in honor of J. Milton Yinger who spent his entire teaching career at Oberlin College. The North Central Sociological Association is proud to honor Keith for his many contributions to the profession.
The next year will undoubtedly be interesting and exciting for sociologists. A panoply of fascinating substantive problems (some domestic; some international; some micro; some macro) will engage us; in addition to careful analyses initiated via a variety of methodological approaches each will require sensitive theoretical understanding.

The theme of next year’s conference—In Defense of Theory—is designed to focus our attention on how crucial theory is in our understanding and explanation of our social world.

Will the U.S. have a new president or will President Obama be reelected? Will congress be able to reach any sort of bipartisan consensus on the major fiscal and monetary issues that face the country? How much influence will the new laws concerning campaign donations have on election outcomes? Will the outcome of the elections and subsequent legislation decrease the level of income inequality in the U.S.? How will gay marriage initiatives fare?

Will the great recession finally give way to an economic resurgence? What are the long-term effects of the Great Recession; will the baby boomers who are out of work be able to re-enter the labor force at a level comparable to their pre-recession status; will recent college graduates begin to re-coup their lost wages? How will the Great Recession affect the psychological well-being of those who are long out of work? Will there be significant pockets of innovation produced by economic adversity? Given our globalized world, will economic crises in Europe or economic slow-downs in China deepen the recession?

Which authoritarian governments in the Middle East will give way to the pressure of democracy movements? What will these democracies (and other newly installed government systems) look like and will they withstand the centrifugal pressures brought about by their destabilized economic and social systems? How many governments will fall to coups and war? Will youth in these countries develop distinctively different sense of identity from their involvement in these movements?

How will new communication technologies affect families, workers, and work itself? Will emerging trends in the world of work bring us closer to gender pay equity? Will men close the second-shift gap? Will the recession be found to have changed marriage patterns and, if yes, for whom?

Will the process of education (at all levels) change as communication and information become globally available? How well will the U.S. educational system compete with other countries who value (economically and culturally) education more highly? Will education reform close racial and ethnic gaps in high school and college completion? When all is said and done, how drastically will the economic well-being of racial and ethnic minorities have been affected by the great recession? How will changes in segregation and integration affect neighborhood dynamics?

As the incoming president of the NCSA I hope to see all of these questions and more addressed in high quality papers presented at next year’s NCSA conference. Please join us in Indianapolis on April 4 through April 7 for what will, I am sure, prove to be a stimulating conference.
On Saturday, April 13, 2012, NCSA President Larry Reynolds, gave his Presidential Address on “Renewing Sociology: Integral Science, Solidarity and Loving Kindness.” Nichols began with observations on sociological renewal. “Like all healthy ongoing enterprises, sociology must always be ‘ever old and ever new,’ that is to say; sociologists must value and cherish all that is good in previous work while seeking new insights and new directions.” Nichols noted that sociologists have often tended to undervalue and disparage tradition, and have inclined toward the formula that “change is always good.” But, as Nichols noted, every healthy group or movement, from Buddhism through radical Marxism, creates and sustains a tradition. At the same time, sociologists often get stuck in their own formulas, which impede further creativity. In social problems textbooks, for instance, whether these are based on the conflict paradigm or symbolic interactionism, the formula is so predictable that readers can correctly guess much of what they will encounter even before reading particular chapters.

The second key point Nichols made concerned a “summary vision” – in which Nichols summarized his own personal utopia for a renewed sociology based upon several ideals including: integral science, beauty, joyfulness, excellence, solidarity, spirituality, and loving kindness. Nichols explained integral science based upon the work of Pitirim A. Sorokin, who developed an “integral epistemology and value system that holds much promise for the future of sociology.” This approach strives for the unification of mind, heart, body and spirit through what Sorokin called the truths of faith, of reason, and of the senses.

For Nichols, an integral approach always seeks “the fullness of truth,” and is, therefore, not content with simplistic dichotomies (e.g., liberalism versus conservatism) or scientific truth that is merely rationalistic (e.g., in the manner of Enlightenment Positivism). Sociologists following an Integral approach would not rest content with historical narratives that provide only part of the total story. For instance, there are numerous accounts of the exclusion and suppression of women in the history of the field, and a major development of the past several decades has been the “writing of women back into” histories of sociology.

Another component of the integral approach is justice. For Nichols, “the highest value affirmed in much sociological work is that of social justice, especially with regard to the distributive aspect of justice (i.e., relative equality).” From an Integral perspective, Nichols contends, justice cannot be separated from a larger matrix of values that have traditionally been referred to as “virtues.” These virtues include tolerance, compassion, and love. Nichols argued, “a creative and successful future sociology needs to develop the ability to celebrate all that is good in contemporary social life. If there is nothing good in the world around us, then there is also no rational basis for hoping that the world will ever improve.” For Nichols, it is possible to be deeply concerned about human suffering and yet to rejoice in the good, for a field without joy is a field without a future.

This leads for another component in Nichols’ summary vision, solidarity. Nichols stated that “to be vibrant and successful in the decades ahead, sociology needs to be a field characterized by a high degree of solidarity among its practitioners.” He argued that “efforts to build separatist and segregationist metaphysical systems, epistemologies, methodologies, and pedagogies represent a serious threat to the development of collegiality and solidarity.” Furthermore, “sociology will also need to overcome the tendency in much contemporary work that defines the world very narrowly in terms of friends and enemies.” For instance, Nichols noted, the expression, “dead white males,” arguably embodies an intensely hostile attitude that inflicts deep wounds and unnecessarily divides colleagues in the field.

Finally, Nichols discussed the concept of spirituality by noting that “Sorokin’s Integralism emphasized the ‘supersensory and supra-rational’ aspect of human experience, and Sorokin believed in what he called ‘the spiritual unity of all mankind.’” Furthermore, a key feature of Sorokin’s Integral system of values was a focus on love, including the creation, maintenance and distribution of “love energy” in the social world.

Nichols concluded by suggesting a further step; from the sociology of love to doing Sociology “with” love. This new perspective can reshape our work in the classroom, in academic departments, in professional associations, and in the practice of public sociology.
movement itself may be new, Myers suggested that for the sociological argument “to be considered ‘new,’ that there must be a new theoretical relationship revealed, argued, or empirically demonstrated.” He concluded five years ago, that “this novelty search had been largely unsuccessful,” but Myers proposed that today something new is happening in three social movements - the Tea Party Movement, the Arab Spring, and the Occupy movement -- that could “produce some changes in our theoretical understanding of how protest and political activism – and thus democratic processes--actually work.”

Before identifying what is new about these three social movements, Myers first established what is not new about these movements – the six “red herrings” that “appear on the surface to be new, but further thought reveals that they are explained by prior theoretical connections, and are just differently scaled or slightly disguised reflections of existing theoretical apparatus.”

The first red herring is speed, notable the role of the Internet in transmitting information rapidly. For activists, information that once had to pass through word of mouth or through the “several layers of news media processing” is now available almost immediately. Myers contends, however, that speed can allow movement resources to accumulate more swiftly, “but the sources and the collection mechanisms, and the decision-making about how to expend the resources in pursuit of political change still exist and still must function through all of the steps that they did under slower communication technology.”

The second red herring is geographic reach; the Internet also allows information to be distributed more widely. The Internet has made activism across national borders easier and cheaper, but Myers contends that regardless of where one is when they receive information, “the reader must have the apparatus, resources, and will to select a plan of action and follow through.”

The third red herring is observing identity development; because of the Internet, “there is an unprecedented record of the give-and-taking, of the logic, the feeling, and the progress of identity development.”

The fourth red herring is the democratization of information, that new media such as Twitter would change the functioning of democracy. Myers noted, “it wasn't long until [traditional news outlets] began to dominate the web presence for news. CNN didn't stamp out alternative news, but alternative web media became like print alternative media and broadcast alternative media--complete with their limited impact on the political process and on the general public's understanding of the social and political world.”

The final red herring Myers discussed was a “leaderless movement” that is governed by some other organizational form than a traditional hierarchy. He noted that many past movements (e.g. feminism) have attempted to operate according to consensus-based decision-making.

Myers noted that despite these and other potential red herrings, there are some new things happening. The first centers on “boundaries, revisited,” using the Arab spring as an example. The Arab spring, Myers claims, is “not a movement so much as it is a collection of movements. And that collection of movements is what's interesting in this case and provides us a new line of thinking.”

Drawing upon the idea of “spillover” developed by David Meyer and Nancy Whittier (1994), Myers suggest the Arab spring is a different...
kind of spillover – “It’s not tactics moving from one industry to another, but rather the rhetoric, the energy, and the tactics spilling over, not movement industry boundaries, but rather nation-state boundaries.” For Myers, cross-national aggregation and diffusion “produces a qualitatively different mobilization and a different protest context than has previously existed.”

The second new thing happening is “repression: learning and coordination.” Myers notes that “social movements evolve in conjunction with repressive efforts,” but he wonders “if repressive capacity is changing in a way that will ultimately cause social movement cycles to occur in markedly different patterns.” For example, what if repressive abilities mobilize so quickly that the social movement cannot develop? Myers suggests that we consider “whether the mix of social movements that exist will change as a result of these kinds of state capacities. And if that distribution of kinds of movements does change, what will that mean for the political environment in which we live?”

The third area in which something new is happening is the “production of artificial density of grievances” – “movements have a greater tendency to emerge when those suffering from common conditions are placed in contact with each other.” The Internet allows people with common political or identity interests to find others, regardless of distance, with similar interests and to become part of an identity group. Myers argues that this kind of “production of the density of identity and ideology has great potential, not just to stimulate a movement here or there, but to change the distribution of different kinds of movements, and populate the field with many more small, extremely specialized interest, political, and activist groups.”

The fourth, and final, new thing in social movement theory is “applying theory more broadly.” Social movement theorists have “attempted to legitimate different types of protest acts as political behavior” using such theories as resource mobilization, political opportunities, or framing. Myers then asked, “But what about on the other end of the action spectrum?” For example, what about terrorism? Myers asked whether terrorism used the same mobilization processes, political opportunity structures, frame alignment, and identity development of more typical social movements? He believes the answer is yes, “even if it makes us uneasy to think that we can apply the theories that work so well on the March of Dimes to subway bombers. Honestly, I think we are collectively in denial about the connections between these kinds of activities and thus are thwarting our own ability to understand the underpinnings of terrorism.”

In conclusion, Myers said, “It is true that when we dive deep into those processes, we are going to discover places where my glib link to conventional social movement theory does not work so well...but that, my friends, is exactly where we want to be. Where it doesn’t work is where we need something new! That is what is exciting. That is where we can make some progress. That is where our intellectual renewal occurs!”

---

The North Central Sociological Association Scholarly Achievement Award is given annually in recognition of an outstanding work contributing to the discipline of sociology that has been published in the recent past. The award was first given in 1981 and has recognized outstanding scholars such as Patti and Peter Adler, Dwight Billings, Aldon Morris, and Suzanne Staggenborg to name a few.

The 2012 NCSA Scholarly Achievement Award for a significant contribution to the discipline of sociology has been awarded to Professor Sarah Damaske for her work *For the Family? How Class and Gender Shape Women’s Work* which was published in 2011 by Oxford University Press.

Professor Damaske is an assistant professor of Labor Studies & Employment Relations and Sociology at Penn State University. Her research investigates how race, class, and gender influence work and family transitions and dynamics. She has a Ph.D. and M.A. in Sociology from New York University and also served as a postdoctoral fellow in the Rice University Department of Sociology.
The recipient of the 2012 John F. Schnabel Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award is Rebecca Bordt, DePauw University. Rebecca is not only an outstanding teacher, but she is also a dedicated mentor to her colleagues and the graduate students in the Preparing Future Faculty exchange in which she participates. She has been an extremely active member of NCSA, having served in numerous leadership roles and is actively engaged in SoTL research. You can find her work in Teaching Sociology as well as numerous edited volumes.

Of particular note is how she is able to challenge her students as well as motivate them toward learning. One nominator writes, “I don’t know how she is able to so effectively teach an academically rigorous class that also not above the heads of her students, to get her students to understand why the material is important, and to get the very best out of her students. What I do know is that her enthusiasm about sociology and teaching is infectious. Student don’t just enjoy her classes, they love her classes.”

And as the supporting letters indicate, there are many others who agree that this year’s winner’s contributions are exceptional.

The 2011 recipient of the John F. Schnabel Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award Lynn Richey gave a featured talk on “Reflections on Teaching: Becoming a Student Whisperer.”

In the talk, Ritchey demonstrated the power of using a personal value card sort to tap into the values and likely behavior of students. She used the cards developed by Miller, C’deBaca, Matthews and Wilbourne at the University of New Mexico (2001). You can locate a pdf file of the cards at http://casaa.unm.edu/inst.html under assessments, values card sort. Volunteers participated in discussing how their own values have influenced their course design and how it might be used in a classroom setting.

By understanding the values a student deems important (autonomy, adventure, tradition, conformity, competition, etc.) we can move closer to becoming student whisperers. We have a multitude of resources available for student learning. As professors, we need to become facilitators of students learning. When we step back and allow the students to tell us how they are motivated to know, what makes them curious, we will no longer complain about students not following directions. Students who want to follow directions? We still have resources that allow them to showing how these values are the driver in each area of their life, not just the educational sphere.

These ideas are not new. We have a variety of workplace assessments that tap into these ideas and where you might be best suited. Marriage counselors use similar assessments. We need to recognize the importance for motivating students by tapping into their personal values and orientations.

A full text of Lynn Ritchey’s talk will appear in an upcoming issue of Sociological Focus.
Each year the NCSA sponsors a student paper competition for both graduate and undergraduate students. At the NCSA Awards Ceremony, the Student Awards Committee Chair, Carolette Norwood, University of Cincinnati, announced the undergraduate awards and the graduate awards.

### Undergraduate Division


### Graduate Division


Congratulations to all students who submitted papers for the NCSA paper competition!
The North Central Student Sociology Conference (NCSSC) gives undergraduate students the opportunity to present their research and to receive feedback from other students, professors, and professional sociologists. Students also have the opportunity to attend the many research and teaching sessions that are part of the NCSA’s annual conference. Students have the opportunity to present their research in a thematic session or poster session.

This year, we received 56 submissions from 60 students from 21 different universities and colleges. From these submissions, we formed 13 thematic sessions, including sessions on. The eleven poster presentations covered a wide range of topics, such as gender, sexuality, identity, education, and human-animal interaction, sustainability, cemetery demography, and music.


* These faculty members also served as moderators for student paper sessions.

JOIN US NEXT YEAR!

Look for a call for papers for the 2013 NCSSC in the fall 2012 issue of the North Central Sociologist

For more information, contact Gail McGuire
Indiana University – South Bend
GMcGuire@iusb.edu

We are looking for students interested in joining in the Student Section. Please send an inquiry email to:

Student Section Chair
Jen Carter
University of Cincinnati
NCSAStudentSectionChair@gmail.com

Please also join the NCSA Student Forum on Facebook at www.facebook.com/NCSAForum

Thanks to all the students who made the 2012 NCSA Conference in Pittsburgh a great success!

A special thanks to Routledge (Taylor and Francis Group) for sponsoring the Student Welcome Reception on Friday.
Editor Comment

According to a report by the Guttmacher Institute, “in the first three months of 2012, legislators in 45 of the 46 legislatures that have convened this year introduced 944 provisions related to reproductive health and rights. Half of these provisions would restrict abortion access. So far, 75 abortion restrictions have been approved by at least one legislative chamber, and nine have been enacted.” (http://www.guttmacher.org/media/infonews/2012/04/13/index.html).

Statistics such as these explain part of the reason so many women and men today believe that “the war on women” is really happening and that it is primarily male, Republican politicians who have declared this war.

While proposed/enacted legislative restrictions on women’s reproductive rights have been escalating in the past few years, women are experiencing many other incidents of sexual/gender inequality and discrimination in their lives. The articles here address some of those areas of inequality.

We begin with a commentary on the “war on women” that moves beyond issue of reproductive rights. Next are several articles focusing on specific populations of women experiencing gender inequalities: women in the army; women at a large Midwest university; the HIV/AIDS health disparity faced by African American women; and finally the educational disadvantage experienced by LGB women.

I hope this articles offer some insight regarding the continued gender / sexual inequality faced by many American women today.

Susan Alexander

“The War on Women:
A Commentary”
By Cheri Ellefson-Terhune
Ball State University

We cannot afford to leave the war on women conversation (though, it does not feel like a conversation when women are refused an opportunity to testify on women’s issues1) to television's media pundits and politicians simply eager to discredit their opposing parties' candidates. When Arizona Senator John McCain and conservative Fox host Sean Hannity both recently denied the existence of a war on women, we should arm ourselves with ammunition (as long as we're talking war, here) to refute the accusation that this “supposed” war was simply made up to distract the American people from a lagging economy at the heels of what will certainly prove to be a turbulent election.

Sociologists need to be in on the conversation, too. We should not be satisfied with women’s third-class citizenship. In the first and second waves of feminism, women were not satisfied until they secured the right to vote, own property, and divorce, among many other rights, and in *Roe vs. Wade*, the legal right to a safe abortion. Women’s rights are up for debate again, and amazingly, our rights are disappearing. Renowned sociologists Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, in *The Social Construction of Reality*, theorized, “As long as the routines of everyday life continue without interruption, they are apprehended as unproblematic.” Feminism was created to break up the “routines of everyday life” that limited women’s roles and rights as citizens. It’s happening again. The emerging laws and amendments that severely restrict women’s rights to their own bodies and access to health services are problematic to say the least.

It’s absurd that an ultrasound mandate even exists in seven states for women who desire an abortion. What’s possibly even more absurd, though, is that amendments like these, in attempts to control women’s bodies, are quickly passing, and women are told to simply, “Close your eyes” during the procedure, and it’s ok as long as it’s on the “interior and not the exterior.”2 The Blunt amendment nearly passed (defeated only by a slim margin of 51 to 48). Women are losing funding to health care providers like Planned Parenthood, which means a loss of cancer screenings and annual exams. Legislators and media personalities can talk all day (and recently, that’s exactly what’s happening) about the war on women and whether or not it truly exists. But this type of conversation is polarizing and isolating to the rest of the country—not to mention the “mommy” debates that are currently resurfacing.

The issues that should be discussed regarding women—mothers or not—are still left out. We know women’s rights are disappearing around us at a scary pace. As sociologists, we need add to the discussion as we remind ourselves and others around us that women, especially minority women, are most at risk to live in poverty today. These policies will only continue the vicious cycle of poverty as women’s rights to adequate healthcare is severely restricted with each passing amendment. Additionally, for most women, it’s not an issue of should-I-stay-at-home-or-not, but, where do I find affordable childcare? Where’s that debate? Let’s not forget, too, that as long as women’s bodies are objectified in the media, women’s rights over their own bodies will always be in jeopardy. The objectification of women’s bodies does not exist in a vacuum. It’s all connected, and we need to continue to make these connections in our every-day conversations.

References

1. Georgetown law student Sandra Fluke was refused a chance to testify at a House oversight committee hearing on the issue of birth control.
2. Pennsylvania Governor’s response to the state’s proposed bill mandating an invasive ultrasound procedure for women considering abortion.
3. The Blunt amendment would have allowed employers with moral objects to opt out of coverage requirements, not just for birth control but any health service.
In 1994, then Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin, distributed a memorandum with the intent to define combat conclusively and establish a decisive rule for the assignment of women in the Armed Forces. Unfortunately, the 1994 memo was not the definitive rule it set out to become. The issue between DoD and Army policy is that the terms are vague and interpretation varies among military personnel.

A RAND study found that female soldiers (in Iraq) were routinely involved in self-defense missions, which could be interpreted as combat (Harrell, et al., 2007). Another report originating from the U.S. Army War College, found that out of the 300 officers surveyed, 53 percent perceived that the policy prohibiting females from collocating with direct combat units is rarely or never enforced (Putko & Johnson, 2008). This means that the policy that was intended to keep females from being assigned to units where they are collocated (assigned to or work in proximity of combat units) is falling in the eyes of military officers. The study also found that 59 percent of those officers surveyed believed that the regulation against women being assigned to battalion sized or smaller units, whose mission involved direct combat, should be revised (Putko & Johnson, 2008). The written response analysis went further, calling for the DoD to stop gender discrimination (Putko & Johnson, 2008).

Ignoring a failed policy has serious consequences for women in service. First, women who find themselves in combat, but have not received full training for such missions, are at a marked disadvantage which could cost their and their fellow soldiers' lives. Second, combat service seems to be integral in promotions and awards within the U.S. Army. Since female soldiers are officially not allowed to be in combat, this policy gives male soldiers an advantage in promotions and awards.

The nature of the current battlefield makes it impossible to apply strictly the existing rules for excluding women from combat without serious decline in combat capabilities and producing a potentially serious reduction in overall readiness. The language of the official DoD policy needs to be consistent with the Army’s policy, and there should be little left to interpretation. A clear understanding of policy is essential in ensuring equal treatment and enforcement.
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The national face of the HIV/AIDS crisis in the United States has changed; it is distinctly feminized and African American. Today, African American women are essentially facing a health emergency when it comes to new HIV infection rates and AIDS mortality. According to the Center of Disease Control, African American women are 23 and 6 times at greater risk of contracting HIV, the virus that causes AIDS, than are White and Hispanic women, respectively. Additionally, AIDS is now a leading cause of death for Black women in reproductive age groups.

Why is this so? One primary reason has to do with the spatial and demographic dynamics of US black communities. More than any other racial or ethnic group, country wide, African Americans are most rigidly segregated. This segregation, as been well noted in sociological literature, has profound effects on education outcomes, personal networking and health (see Carr and Kutty 2009). Additionally, given the isolation and persistent economic disparities in many predominately US black communities, particularly the poorest communities; we find high incarceration rates among young African American men. These high incarceration rates have created a very noticeable sex-imbalance; whereby the number of women exceeds their male counterparts. These sex imbalances, which are particularly pronounced in urban settings, leave behind a small pool of sexual partners and what Wilson (1997) calls a marriageable pool of men. These conditions increase the potential of concurrent sexual partnership which undermines women’s ability to negotiate the sexual terms of their relationships thereby making them extremely vulnerable and susceptible to a range of STIs, including HIV/AIDS. Of course, it’s not all structural, there are also individual level factors to consider as well, like risk perception, knowledge and self-efficacy.

In fact, risk perception is another key factor that helps explain this health disparity. Despite the exceedingly high risk of infection, African Americans perception of risk is only narrowly different than other racial and ethnic groups. According to the CDC, when asked “what are your chances of getting infected with HIV, the virus that causes AIDS”, 63.2 percent of Blacks reported “none” compared to 68.4 percent of Whites, 65.1 percent of Hispanics and 67.8 percent of others (Data Source: National Center for Health Statistics 2004). These findings are also reflected in my own research among African American women college students. As many 60% report they believed they have “zero” risk of becoming infected with HIV; despite the fact that as many as 45% reported having had a prior STD (Norwood 2011).
The national (and community) response to this crisis has been slow and that concerns me. There needs to be a more deliberate and aggressive national campaign efforts to raise awareness and tangible solutions to mitigate new infections. In the 1990s, we’ve watched how the AIDS crisis mushroomed in Africa and how it became boldly gendered. Despite best efforts, we did too little and not quick enough to offset the emerging patterns that feminized the AIDS crisis. We have the power, and resources (intellectual and financial) to do it differently this time, but these “resources” must be match in will.

Today female students are a majority of undergraduate students on many campuses, and Central Michigan University (CMU) is no exception. The increase in the numbers of women pursuing post-secondary degrees can lead to the view that gender no longer affects students on our campuses. This report, by summarizing some key findings from 414 telephone interviews completed by a representative sample of undergraduate students at CMU in spring, 2011, highlights the negative climate that continues to exist for women on campus.

The survey found that hostile comments about women are widespread within the student body. The vast majority of students—80 percent of them—report that they have heard “a CMU student make derogatory or ‘negative’ comments about women” during the “current academic year,” and more than one half of students report hearing such comments three or more times.

A non-trivial number of students report the perception that some faculty members exhibit a gender bias in their interactions with students. More than 20 percent of students report that they have seen or heard a male faculty member treat male and female students differently, and almost 15 percent of students report seeing or hearing that same type of differential treatment from female faculty members. More than one quarter of female students report that they themselves have had at least a few negative experiences on campus “because of being a woman.”

Equal numbers of male and female students—about 20 percent—estimate that more than 50 sexual assaults take place on campus each year. These data suggest that the official statistics maintained by the institution on the number of sexual assaults grossly underestimate violence against women.

Classes and co-curricular activities focused on women and gender issues could assist students in understanding and resisting the negative climate they face on campus. However, the survey found that students are not taking full advantage of the diverse opportunities, both in classes and outside, to learn about such issues. While more than 70 percent of students report enrollment in at least one class that devoted one or more class periods to women or gender issues, less than one half of students report that they have taken or are taking a course that focuses primarily on women or gender. Similarly, most students do not attend CMU-sponsored events outside of class that highlight women or gender issues.

Data such as these should serve as a wake-up call to campuses that perhaps naively think that gender inequality is a campus problem that is behind us. Access to higher education and numbers of students on campus do not necessarily ensure that students reap equal benefits from their tuition dollars and that campuses have become a safe haven for female students.

There is reason to believe that LGB women will be more likely to complete a bachelor’s degree by virtue of their gender. What is termed the female advantage in education (Buchmann and DiPrete 2006) may not extend to all women equally. We know that women are more likely to earn bachelor’s degrees than men are. In fact, the ratio is nearing two to one. LGB men, likewise, appear to be succeeding academically as compared to heterosexual men. What little quantitative or descriptive work exists on LGB men’s relative levels of

**Penalized or Privileged? Sexual Minority Women and Higher Education**

by Leigh E. Fine

The Ohio State University

Little is known about the educational standing of lesbian, gay, and bisexual (LGB) Americans as compared to their heterosexual counterparts (Sanlo 2004). Education is associated with several positive life outcomes: marriage, political participation, and health, just to name a few (Pascarella and Terenzini 2005). Sociology has long examined educational differentials as a function of race, class, and gender. However, little attention has been paid to educational outcomes as affected by claiming a minority sexual identity. What will be found, then, when we begin to examine the relationship between sexual identity and educational attainment – whether one finishes college with a bachelor’s degree?

My research engages this question. I argue that the path between sexual identity and educational attainment may not be straightforward, as sexual identity’s effect on educational attainment is likely conditional on gender.

There is reason to believe that LGB women will be more likely to complete a bachelor’s degree by virtue of their gender. What is termed the female advantage in education (Buchmann and DiPrete 2006) may not extend to all women equally. We know that women are more likely to earn bachelor’s degrees than men are. In fact, the ratio is nearing two to one. LGB men, likewise, appear to be succeeding academically as compared to heterosexual men. What little quantitative or descriptive work exists on LGB men’s relative levels of
educational attainment indicate that LGB men tend to have higher levels of education than their heterosexual counterparts (Black et al. 2000).

What, then, of sexual minority women? Do the monolithic effects of “gender” and “sexuality” on educational attainment hold up, permitting a double-minority group to enjoy educational success? Prior literature indicates that both women and LGB men tend to obtain higher levels of education than those in the dominant group: heterosexual men – so we might assume that LGB women are also able to resist heterosexism and homophobia while enjoying the female advantage in college completion.

This would be a comforting sociological story – if we knew it to be true. Little work has been done to investigate whether these same educational benefits generally extend to LGB women, who lie at the intersection of gender and sexuality effects on education. The qualitative work that does exist indicates that LGB women may actually be educationally disadvantaged as compared to heterosexual women (Boatwright et al. 1996). Because of education’s importance in predicting future chances, sociology needs to turn the same attention it has paid to the educational obstacles faced by other marginalized groups to sexual minorities – and sexual minority women in particular. In response to the question I posed earlier, a far more vexing follow-up: does the intersection of gender and sexuality cause divergent outcomes for LGB men versus LGB women?
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Sociologists for Women in Society & Social Activism
By Kathryn Feltey
University of Akron

Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) was formally established in 1971, emerging from the challenge of the women’s caucus of the American Sociological Association to address the sexism in the discipline (Roby 1992; Feltey & Rushing, 1998). The founding members of SWS were sociologists by training and many were activists in the social reform and radical movements of the 1960s and 1970s. This activist experience was invaluable to the formation and development of SWS in the early days, as women brought the Women’s Movement into the discipline, making the professional political.

SWS has made significant changes in three arenas: the discipline of sociology; higher education; and in the larger society (Feltey & Rushing 1998). In the discipline, SWS has wrought organizational change as witnessed by the changing leadership of the American Sociological Association to include women, and specifically members of SWS, as well as increased representation on ASA committees (Ferree, et al 2007). In terms of scholarship, SWS has provided support and resources to scholars studying gender, as well as opportunities for challenging dominant theoretical and methodological paradigms in the discipline. The successful journal Gender & Society was launched by SWS when ASA rejected a request from the Section on Sex & Gender to sponsor a journal on this area.

In institutions of higher education, the influence of SWS affected practices from course offerings on sex and gender; specialty areas offered in graduate training; hiring of faculty; and tenure and promotion (Ferree 2007; Laube and Hess 2001). SWS has supported women in the academy through career development programs, networking opportunities, and coordinated mentoring.

The name, Sociologists for Women in Society, reflects the concern beyond women in sociology to the rights of all women in (global) society. SWS facilitates political activism by training sociologists to engage with publics beyond academia (e.g. media, legislators), producing “Fact Sheets” on relevant contemporary issues that can be broadly disseminated, and working in partnership with activist organizations (Sprague 1995; 2008).

Given the current political attack on women’s rights in the U.S. and the ongoing work advancing the status of women around the globe (see Lee, et al 2011), organizations like SWS become increasingly important to sociologists working to make a difference. Over the past 40 years, SWS has created “a space dedicated to improving women’s live and creating feminist social change” (Ore 2011, p.1). You can take your place in that SWS space at the national, regional (NCSA-SWS), or local level (join an existing local chapter or start your own!).
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Presented a paper at the NCSA conference? Completed an interesting study?

Submit your manuscript to Sociological Focus

Published continuously since 1968, the quarterly journal is international in scope, covering a full range of topics of current interest to sociology and related social science disciplines. The journal is peer reviewed and committed to publishing high quality research on substantive issues of importance to the study of society. The journal's mission is broad in scope, encompassing empirical works (both quantitative and qualitative in nature), as well as manuscripts presenting up to date literature review of any field of sociology.

A submission must include an electronic copy of the manuscript in word, including title page, abstract, text, notes (if absolutely necessary), references, tables, figures, and illustrations with captions. Manuscripts should be prepared following the American Sociological Association “Style Guide.” Manuscripts should be electronically submitted at http://www.sociologicalfocus.net

Gustavo S. Mesch, Editor
Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Haifa, Israel
socialfocus@hevra.haifa.ac.il
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In Memory
NCSA members have left our ranks

Barry Johnson (1942-2012)

Barry Johnston passed away at age 69, on November 5, 2011. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Notre Dame, was a full Professor at Indiana University Northwest, and retired after 34 years of service. He made many contributions to the field of sociology and academia as a Fulbright Scholar, the author of three books, hundreds of articles in his field, an expert on Pitirim Sorokin’s work and life and revered by Robert Merton, who inscribed on the inside covers of his books.

Barry’s involvement and service to the North Central Sociological Association is only one aspect of his brilliant career. Barry served the NCSA in many capacities. He was the recipient of the Aida Tomeh Award for Service (2007) and the Scholarly Achievement Award (1998). The loss of Barry has impacted the NCSA community and his spirit of achievement, service, mentorship and humor will continue in his memory. We will all miss Barry, a true inspiration.

Alex O. Thio (1937 -2011)
Professor Emeritus Alex Thio of Ohio University passed away in May 2011. Thio was born in Malaysia and immigrated to the United States following his secondary schooling in Indonesia.

He received a bachelor’s degree from Central Methodist College and PhD from SUNY Buffalo in 1969. He began teaching at Ohio University in 1969 and regularly taught courses in introductory sociology and deviance.

He spent his entire professional career at Ohio University and was the author of several textbooks. His book Deviant Behavior is in its eleventh edition and Sociology, A Brief Introduction is in its seventh edition.

At the time of his death, he was also completing work on a social problems text. Alex leaves his wife Jane and two daughters as well as a large number of former students to mourn him.

John Schnabel (1932-2005)

John F. Schnabel served for a quarter of a century in the Sociology Department at University of West Virginia. He was a major advocate for teaching undergraduates, both within the ASA and within the NCSA.

John was an early leader in the ASA’s early “Projects on Teaching” and in the Departmental Resources Group, conducting many workshops on innovative teaching. He was tireless in serving in various leadership roles and as a mentor to new faculty.

John was instrumental in founding of the NCSA Teaching Committee and served as its first Chair from 1985 to 1988. Prior to the founding of that committee, annual NCSA meetings typically had one or two teaching sessions (out of more than a hundred sessions). By the end of his three-year tenure as Chair, there were eight. Under his tutelage, subsequent committee chairs worked to expand the teaching program, and by the early 1990s, the NCSA would annually list more than twenty teaching sessions.

The criteria and the process for the NCSA’s Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award were crafted by John. He held many leadership positions in the NCSA Council and was always a solid source of advice and counsel. He was a tireless worker who energized all who knew him.

Crossing the Bar

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar,
When I put out to sea,
But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound and foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark!
And may there be no sadness of farewell,
When I embark;
For though from out our bourne of Time and Place
The flood may bear me far,
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crossed the bar.

-Lord Alfred Tennyson
CALL FOR ORGANIZERS

North Central Sociological Association
2013 Annual Conference
April 4-7, 2013
Indianapolis, IN

LOCATION: Crowne Plaza at Historic Union Station
123 West Louisiana Street, Indianapolis, IN 46225

On-line paper submissions: opens June 1, 2012
Visit the www.ncsanet.org web site for detailed information and to submit online
Go to: http://tinyurl.com/2013IndyNCSA

THEME:
In Defense of Theory

Our title, “In Defense of Theory,” is an attempt to push NCSA members to consider the central, overarching role that theory plays in defining and developing the field of Sociology in the human sciences. Over the last few decades, concerns have arisen regarding the declining significance of theory in the development and application of scholarly research as well as its role in sociological training for the coming generation of scholars that will shape Sociology and distinguish it from other fields of inquiry. Does theory need to be defended? And, if so, defended against what? This year we invite contributors to engage important questions regarding the state of sociology today and push the presence of theory beyond the first slide in the power point and the first page of the literature review.

Among the kinds of topics and questions we want to focus on during this conference are the following:

- What are the most important and exciting new directions in sociological theory?
- How can sociologists better engage with and build theory with their empirical work?
- How can sociologists best apply and approach, methodologically, broad approaches such as postmodernism, feminism, and symbolic interactionism?
- Integrated theory within subdisciplines.
- Bridging the gap between large traditions such as positivism and relativism.

We welcome contributors to this year’s conference to consider broadly the ways that sociological theory contributes to and shapes our discipline, specifically the way in which theory helps set sociology apart from other explorations of knowledge. While this year’s theme highlights theory we welcome a broad range of substantive, methodological, and applied sessions. We look forward to an exciting conference in Indianapolis and a stimulating group of discussions.

Crowne Plaza at Historic Union Station
123 West Louisiana Street, Indianapolis, IN 46225
Rooms: $129/night plus tax

Beginning November 15, 2012, hotel reservations will be available by calling 317-631-2221. Ask for the NCSA room block. Reservations must be made prior to 5:00pm EST, Thursday, March 7, 2013.
If you are interested in organizing a session, submit an on-line request for your session by **September 15, 2012**

Go to: [http://tinyurl.com/2013IndyNCSA](http://tinyurl.com/2013IndyNCSA)

**NOTE:** Special consideration will be given to sessions that address the 2013 theme “In Defense of Theory” as well as session topics that have not been on the conference program in the last 2 years.

If you have any questions about whether your session would be appropriate or would like to organize a session directly related to the conference theme of Pragmatism in Research and Education, please contact:

**Todd Callais**  
Program Chair  
tcallais@gmail.com

**Research Paper Sessions Organizer**

Todd Callais,  
NCSA Vice President  
and 2013 Program Chair  
tcallais@gmail.com

**Teaching Sessions Organizer**

Melinda Messineo,  
Ball State University  
messine@bsu.edu

**Panels and Workshops Organizer**

Rachel Kraus  
Ball State University  
rkraus@bsu.edu

**High School Workshop Co-organizers**

Kathy Rowell  
Sinclair Community College  
katherine.rowell@sinclair.edu

Debra Swanson  
Hope College  
swansond@hope.edu

Lissa Yogan  
Valparaiso University  
lissa.yogan@valpo.edu

**Local Arrangements and Presentations**

Aimee Zoeller  
Indiana University- Purdue University Indianapolis  
anzoelle@iupui.edu

**Preparing Future Faculty Panels**

Melinda Messineo,  
Ball State University  
messine@bsu.edu

**North Central Student Sociology Conference (NCSSC):**

Gail McGuire,  
Indiana University–SSouth Bend  
gmguire@iusb.edu

**Types of sessions**

- **Paper sessions:** Completed papers of scholarly work typically presented (not read) in a 15-20 minute presentation of key findings; the presentation of papers is followed by discussion from audience and/or discussant.

- **Panels:** Prepared presentations on thematic topics; 3-5 panelists followed by discussion with audience.

- **Workshops:** Designed and facilitated by one or two scholars with full active engagement by audience in discussion, activities, and products.

- **Roundtables:** Facilitated opportunities to share ideas on scholarly work not yet sufficiently developed for a paper, such as common challenges, idea sharing, teaching concerns, and sharing tips for effective teaching and scholarship.

- **Posters:** The poster sessions will be organized as an event and should model professional visual presentation. Contact Joyce Lucke, ncsa@paragonme.net for additional information.

Questions about the hotel, A/V, conference logistics, advertising, sponsorships, questions/problems with online submissions, contact:

**Joyce Lucke**  
NCSA Conference Coordinator  
812-390-6912  
info@paragonme.net

**GUIDELINES AND POLICIES FOR 2013 NCSA CALL FOR SESSION ORGANIZERS**

This is the official call for organizers for the 2013 NCSA Annual Conference. When you submit a proposal for a session, you and all presenters accepted into the session are agreeing to and will abide by the expectations and guidelines outlined below.

The program policies listed below apply to all organizers, paper authors, panelists, discussants, and other session participants.

Proposals for sessions and papers on any topic related to or any subfield of sociology are welcome. Special consideration will be given to sessions that address the 2013 theme “In Defense of Theory” as well as session topics that have not been on the conference program in the last 2 years. All information requested on the submission form must be completed to ensure thorough review by the 2013 Program Chair.

**All proposals must be submitted online by September 15, 2012.**

All proposals will receive an email acknowledgement of their submission.

Persons organizing a session are expected to serve as session moderators. This includes being in attendance at the session, moderate the session and keep all presenters within their time limit. Sessions organizers/ moderators
are responsible for starting and ending the session on time.

The lead organizer (the person submitting the proposal) will be notified if the session has been accepted and will be included in the call for papers. Notification will be sent via email.

You will need to provide an email address to submit your proposal. Please use the email address you check most often over the course of the week and plan to check over the course of Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 in particular. This will ensure you are made aware of meeting updates that may affect your travel or time at the conference. We will NOT be sending any meeting information via the mail, so a valid email address is of particular importance.

If you are submitting a closed session (you have recruited and confirmed presenters for your session), as the lead organizer it is your responsibility to forward conference information to all other persons participating in your session. Please read the acceptance information carefully to ensure everything is correct.

When you register for the conference, don’t forget to also join or renew your NCSA membership. All persons who appear on the conference program are to be NCSA members.

NOTE ON AUDIO/VISUAL SUPPORT: An overhead projector and a screen will be available in each session room (except for roundtable and poster sessions). Since roundtable and poster presentations are held simultaneously, no audio-visual equipment is supplied or permitted in those sessions. Other audio-visual equipment is available if ordered in advance. However, NCSA will NOT supply computers/data projectors for PowerPoint, or music/sound equipment. If you bring your own equipment, NCSA and the Crowne Plaza will not be responsible for the security of equipment unattended or set-up/trouble-shooting of non-venue equipment.

Research and Teaching sessions will have a 15 minute Q & A built into the session, intended for a general discussion at the end of the session.

Please be courteous to other by preparing your session and/or presentation accordingly. Be aware that the session following yours will begin promptly 15 minutes after the published end of your session. Please remove equipment you brought for your presentation and return the room to its original configuration quickly so the next presenters may set up and start their session at the scheduled time. Everyone at the conference will thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Panels, workshops and round table sessions will be allocated 90 minutes each. It is recommended that individuals limit their participation to no more than three (3) appearances in sessions submitted to the program. This should include all types of participation-except being listed as organizer of a session. A “participant” is anyone who is listed as a session organizer, paper or poster author, discussant, panelist, roundtable facilitator, workshop presenter, or any other substantive role on the program.

All session participants listed accepted onto the conference program must register prior to March 1, 2013 to be kept on the program. A preliminary program will be posted on the NCSA website after February 1.

NCSA will send meeting reminders and updates to all organizers and presenters via email.

If the title, presenter list, or description change is necessary, please contact Joyce at ncsa@paragonme.net. No title, presenter or description changes may be made to the conference printed program after March 15, 2013. Changes received between March 16 and March 30, 2013 will be included in a conference addendum sheet, and made available to all registered attendees.

As of March 15, 2013 the conference program will be final. Note: once the programs are final – session days or times will not be changed. Once a participant has registered as they have been accepted onto the program, no refunds will be given.

Before you go online to submit your proposal, make sure you have all necessary information on-hand. The following is what you will be asked to provide:

What type of session are you proposing? (select one)
- Research session
- Teaching session
- Roundtable
- Workshop
- Poster session

Lead Organizer Information
- Last name, First name
- Institution
- Email most often checked
- Day phone; Evening phone
- Mailing address: City/State/Zip

Co-Organizer(s) Information (if applicable)
- Co-Presenter #1, #2, ...
  - Last name, First name
  - Institution
  - Often checked Email

Session Title

Session Abstract General description of the kind of papers you are hoping to attract during the open call for papers (approximately 150 words or less). Also note whether this is an open or closed session

Is this an Open or Closed session?
- Open – I will accept papers from others;
- Closed – I have confirmed papers already lined up for this session.

If your session receives more than five (5) papers, are you willing to organize and moderate two sessions of no less than three (3) papers each?
- Yes
- No

Audio/visual needs (select one)
1. No A/V equipment needed
2. Slide projector and screen (for 35mm slides)
3. DVD player with TV screen
4. Overhead projector and screen (for transparencies)
NCSA 2013 Conference Deadlines

May, 2012
Call for Organizers circulated

June 1, 2012
Online organizer/session submission form opens

September 15, 2012
Session Organizers have session information to Conference Organizer

October 10, 2012
Call for Papers circulated

November 15, 2012
Hotel reservation line opens

December 15, 2012
Paper and Presenter information Due to Session Organizers

January 5, 2013
Organizer approval of papers due to Program Chair

January 15, 2013
Notification of Acceptance of Papers, Panels, and Workshops sent to primary author

March 7, 2013
Hotel Registration Deadline

March 20, 2013
Online conference pre-registration form closes

April 12-15, 2013
NCSA Conference in Indianapolis

NCSA Public Relations Coordinator
If you have ideas for articles in future issues of the North Central Sociologist, or suggestions on how to improve the NCSA web site, please contact Susan Alexander at salexand@saintmarys.edu

Many thanks to all the people who contribute to the publication of this newsletter.

NCSA “Dog Tags”
Dog tags are still available through mail order. The tags are light weight aluminum with 1 inch standard key ring. Great for members’ luggage, computer bags, etc. Faculty, give your students a dog tag as a remembrance of their presentation at the NCSA conference!

Checks made out to Joyce Lucke, mailing address below. Allow 7-10 for delivery.

Joyce Lucke, NCSA Conference Coordinator
Paragon Meeting and Events, LLC
445 Fifth Street, Suite A
Columbus, Indiana 47201
812-390-6912

NCSA 2013 Call for Organizers
North Central Sociological Association Conference
April 4-7, 2013
Indianapolis, IN