LGBTI in CUSS: New Directions for Our Subfield
Japonica Brown-Saracino
Loyola University, Chicago

This year I sent my first book manuscript to the publisher and began preparations for a comparative study of four U.S. towns with a growing or emerging population of lesbian and bisexual women. Writing the first book, based on my comparative ethnographic study of four gentrifying communities – two of which contain a large population of gays and lesbians – I assumed that community and urban sociology scholarship on gays and lesbians was somewhat comprehensive. However, very early in preparations for my new study, I realized that I had overestimated the literature’s attention to queer individuals. This mistake was easy enough for a gentrification scholar to make, for it seems that the bulk of community and urban sociology’s attention to contemporary gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender persons (and here attention is primarily to gay men) is limited to their role in gentrification. Outside of gentrification research I found few studies of the place of queer people in our cities and towns. Where, I began to wonder, are studies of those who live and work in cities that do not possess popularly renowned gay enclaves? Why do we CONTNUED, Page 4
Greetings from Southern California, where the sun does shine most of the time and the earth trembles discernibly only on occasion. One of those occasions was a few days before this year’s Boston ASA meetings. It happened during a dissertation proposal defense on the 4th floor of the UCI Social Science building that houses sociology. Midway through the meeting the building began to sway, prompting an abrupt halt to the meeting as we all headed for the door jams in hopes of gaining some measure of protection in case this was “a big one.” Fortunately, the rolling waves dissipated and we resumed the meeting within 15 minutes, our rubbery legs notwithstanding.

This fleeting earthquake interlude made me think, among other things, that while many of the world’s urban areas are located in relatively high risk, disaster impact areas, relatively little has been written about the intersection of disaster and cities. So after I issued a call for CUSS session proposals for the 2009 ASA meetings in San Francisco, which has experienced more than its fair share of occasional trembles, I was pleased to receive a session proposal seeking papers that examine various questions regarding the intersection of disaster and urban life. But discussion of the plans for the 2009 meetings is getting ahead of myself, since I organized and was announced via a listserve message on October 15. Again, we will should recap the Boston meetings first.

All things considered, the Boston meeting struck me as a good one for CUSS. Not only did we have five sessions, one more than our allotment because the co-sponsor (Collective Behavior and Social Movement Section) of the session on Urban Mobilization and Movements agreed to count the session against its allotment, but the sessions were reasonably well attended, ranging from a low of 20 to a high of around 80 plus for the open paper sessions and around 100 for the roundtables. Again, I want to acknowledge and thank Max Herman, Mark Hutter, Tony Orum, and Robert Smith for organizing four excellent open sessions, and Pamela Davidson and Yuki Kato for doing a superb job organizing the roundtables.

In addition to these sessions, there were two other noteworthy highlights at the Boston meetings: the formal presentation of the 2008 Awards and the CUSS reception. The award winners were: John Logan, recipient of the Robert and Helen Lyn Award for lifetime achievement and service; Mary Pattillo, recipient of the Robert Park Award for the best book; Kevin Fox Gotham, recipient of the Jane Adams Award for the best article; and L Owen Kirkpatrick, recipient of the Paper Award for the best paper/article by a graduate student. Following the presentation of these awards, Tony Orum and Zach Neal were honored in a special ceremony acknowledging the terrific job they have done (Tony as the Editor and Zach as the Managing Editor) in guiding and editing City & Community from its initial issue in 2002 to their final edition in August, 2009.

Turning to the CUSS reception, it was held during what was once called the “cocktail hour” at the Frank Gehry designed Stata Center at MIT. Co-sponsored by CUSS and MIT, and co-organized by Anne Shaly and Xav Briggs, the reception was a delightful event that was a pleasant contrast to our more traditional brew pub reception, to which we will probably return in San Francisco.

Speaking of next year’s San Francisco meetings, the session program is have five sessions – four open paper sessions and the roundtables. Although our ASA allotment is four sessions, we have another joint session which the co-sponsor (the Immigration Section) has agreed to count as one of its own, thus giving us five sessions. The listing of CUSS sessions for the 2009 meetings is reprinted in
the newsletter. Remember to submit your papers via the ASA online submission system.

In order to try to get us beyond the allotted four sessions as well as expand our membership for other reasons, I have organized a Membership Committee chaired by Rachael A. Woldoff of West Virginia University. See Rachael’s statement and call for ideas and strategies in the newsletter.

The final piece of news concerns the selection of Hilary Silver of Brown University as the next editor of *City & Community*. The selection process was a thorough one involving, at various stages the Search Committee chaired by Sharon Zukin, the Publication Committee chaired by Barry Wellman, and the current CUSS Council and elected officers. The final decision was made by the CUSS Council in accordance with the bylaws for the governance of *City & Community*. I extend my congratulations to Hilary, as do the other section members involved in the process, and we all look forward to her building on Tony Orum’s excellent editorship.

I look forward to serving as your section chair for the remainder of this academic year and the following one, and I want to thank my predecessor, Anne Shaly, for her spirited and committed leadership during the past two years, and Barry Wellman for his diligent leadership of the Publication Committee. I also want to thank Lincoln Quillian for agreeing to serve as the new chair of the Publications Committee, and welcome aboard the new members of that committee (Chris Browning and Juan Sandoval) and the Council (Mary Fisher and Monica McDermott).

I hope you all are having a productive and enjoyable fall term, and that the new year is a good one for you, the new President of the U.S., and the world.

---

**EDITOR’S NOTE**

William G Holt  
Vermont Law School

After completing another edition, I want to encourage members to consider submitting proposals for articles and new ideas for future *CUSS Newsletter* editions. We publish two editions each year. I look forward to hearing from you. Feel free to send me your proposals to wholt@vermontlaw.edu.
SECTION LAUNCHES
MEMBERSHIP DRIVE
Rachael A. Woldoff
West Virginia University

Though CUSS’s numbers are strong, we want them to grow. I would like to introduce you to myself and the membership committee. We are eager to help make CUSS an even larger and more involved section. I am Rachael Woldoff, an assistant professor of sociology at West Virginia University. My very energetic membership committee includes Pamela Davidson (Sociology/Public Policy & Public Administration, George Washington University), Michael Borer (Sociology, University of Nevada, Las Vegas), and Jennifer Darrah (Sociology, Brown University).

We plan to be busy in 2009 as we work to renew old members and attract new members (especially graduate students) into CUSS. We hope these efforts will bring fresh new perspectives, increase our scholarly networks and resources, and heighten CUSS’s presence at the ASA annual conference. In the coming months, we will set goals as well as plan and implement strategies that will move us forward.

As most of you know, in recent years, CUSS has encouraged members to reach out to help enroll students and colleagues. In the coming year, we would like to encourage ASA and non-ASA members not currently part of CUSS, but who have a substantive interest in a sociological perspective on urban and community issues to join. I’m sure that once they learn about how fun and interesting we are, they will be glad they joined! We all value CUSS and the service it provides to our members, so please feel free to contact me with any ideas and strategies you have for recruitment and increasing membership.

New Directions
Continued from Page 1

I have come to conclude that gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender individuals have only a small place in community and urban sociology. While there are fine studies of the places queer individuals live, they are largely the product of other subfields – such as the sociology of gender and sexuality – and of other disciplines, such as Geography, Queer Studies, and History (see Binnie 1995).2 To date no one has chosen to publish an article in City and Community, our subfield’s journal, that takes as its primary subject a neighborhood or town with a large queer population.3

This oversight is of serious consequence for our subfield for at least two reasons. First, we risk painting a portrait of cities and towns that largely omits those who are not heterosexual or attends to them only in the context of gentrification or “gay ghettos.” As a result, we present an image of the social world

1 See discussion of this in Forsyth (2001). See also Brekhus on gay men in suburbia (2003).


3 An article I published in the journal in 2004 considers two sites with a large population of gays and lesbians (Brown-Saracino 2004) and Michel (2002) and Florida (2003) address gay and lesbian neighborhoods in more general terms. Several other authors mention gay, lesbian or bisexual individuals in their work without taking them as their focus (see Paulsen 2004, Vromen 2003, Wagner 2004, Berrey 2005, Spain 2002). Individuals with sociological training and/or who have taught in sociology departments have published work on queers and the city. However, most such scholarship has been published in journals devoted to planning, geography, gender, or queer theory.
that does not accurately reflect its organization and heterogeneity. Second, studies of gay and lesbian communities conducted beyond the parameters of community and urban sociology have not had the benefit of the set of analytic and methodological tools that are at the heart of our subfield. For instance, too often such work only attends to social actors on the stage of a neighborhood and not to the neighborhood or city itself; it fails to explore how political-economic and other place characteristics shape the lives and identities of those who reside in them. Or, studies depict gays and lesbians in a previous decade or century, leaving us without a portrait of contemporary queer lives and of the places where they are lived.

Some might suggest that community and urban sociologists have overlooked gays and lesbians because queer individuals constitute only a minority of the U.S. population. Indeed, while scholars disagree about the precise proportion of the population that identifies as gay, lesbian, or bisexual, all concur that queers compose a small minority (Laumann et al 1994, Gates & Ost 2004). However, this does not fully explain the omission, for we recognize that those on the periphery can teach us about the center. Many highly acclaimed (and rightly so) community and urban studies attend to small groups: neo-bohemians (Lloyd 2005), blues fans and musicians (Grazian 2003), loft dwellers (Zukin 1982), street corner men (Anderson 1978), and sidewalk vendors (Duneier 1999). Thus, population size does not explain our neglect of queer individuals. I suggest below that a better explanation for this omission rests, counter intuitively, in the ways our subfield has represented gays and lesbians, namely by primarily regarding them as economic and sexual actors who populate gentrifying neighborhoods in large metropolises.

What does community and urban sociology scholarship tell us about gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender individuals and their relationship to community forms? Our knowledge falls into three overlapping classes. First, there is a literature on gays’ participation in gentrification, particularly about their role as first-wave gentrifiers (Castells 1983, Lauria & Knopp 1985, Knopp 1990, Florida 2003, Brown-Saracino 2004, 2007 & forthcoming). In this sense, the literature presents queer individuals as economic actors, or, more precisely, as actors with the capital or agency to serve as the harbingers of urban “renewal.” Second, there is scholarship on gay “ghettos” in major metropolises like New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco (Levine 1979, Castells 1983, Winchester & White 1988; Sennett 1991, Forest 1995, Adler & Brenner 1992), specifically on their economic and cultural contributions to the larger metropolis (Philipp 1999, Florida 2003, Clark 2004, Florida & Gates 2004). These first two areas of scholarship collectively suggest that people and places whose tastes and choices are of economic consequence for the broader metropolis pique our interest. Third, we have some knowledge of gays and lesbians as sexual actors and of how cities structure and sustain their sexual lives (Laumann 2004, Humphreys 1975, Sennett 1991). Thus, community and urban sociology presents a portrait of non-heterosexual Americans that emphasizes gays’ and, to a lesser degree, lesbians’ roles.

---

4 Also, as Jon Binnie writes, “What is genuinely lacking within urban social theory is any analysis of how these ‘other’ people of the city shape the urban landscape” (1995: 183). See also Binnie & Valentine (1999).

5 Ann Forsyth also argues that “most attention on gay and lesbian neighborhoods focused on issues of gentrification and urban redevelopment” (2001: 344).

6 For a similar discussion see Forsyth (2001).

as economic and sexual actors who people relatively homogeneous “ghettos” in large cities. These foci produce an inaccurate if not stilted image of queer individuals and of the places where they live. First, they incorrectly suggest that most queers reside in neighborhoods in large cities that are relatively sexually-homogeneous. This is striking given that even our most celebrated gay enclaves are far more sexually-heterogeneous than we imagine them to be. For instance, Gary Gates and Jason Ost write that in Provincetown – the “gayest town” in the U.S (2004: 27) – just “over one in eight households is a gay or lesbian couple” (ibid). This suggests that even our understanding of gay ghettos as resolutely-gay is fairly superficial, and, just as importantly, that we risk overlooking a plethora of places in which gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender individuals reside that do not sport gay resorts and beaches or even bars (see Brekhus 2003). Second, our nearly singular attention to gay and lesbian population concentrations in large cities has contributed to a lack of attention to a large contingent of queer individuals. Specifically, we have largely overlooked queer women, for, despite prevailing theories (modeled on gay men) that suggest that gay and lesbian youth move from rural to urban locales in search of anonymity, this is not the dominant pattern for lesbians. Instead, many lesbians reside in small cities, towns, and even rural areas (Gates & Ost 2004, Valentine 2000: 3, Millward 2007: 436, Krieger 1983, Lockard 1985, Forsyth 1997, Smith & Holt 2005, Kennedy & Davis 1993). Indeed, “partnered lesbian migration is oriented toward less populous regions that have a large partnered lesbian population” (Cooke & Rapino 2007: 295). Likewise, some scholarship suggests that male-to-female transsexuals are also more likely to live outside of the central city than in it, with many favoring residence in a suburb (Doan 2007: 65). Thus, by repeatedly studying the same community form – symbolically demarcated gay neighborhoods within large cities – we have attended primarily to white, relatively affluent gay men, and have overlooked lesbian, bisexual and transgender individuals and queer persons of color, all of whom may find central city “gayborhoods” unaffordable (Cooke & Rapino 2007), unwelcoming (Podmore 2006, Pritchard et al 2002), or inhospitable for their families (Doan 2007).9

Third, by treating queer individuals as first and foremost economic, and, secondarily, sexual actors, we neglect crucial dimensions of queer cultures and communities. Specifically, we miss the cultural, social, and political dimensions of individual and collective lives and of the places in which people live them. This interest in economics is both cause and product of our attention to gentrifying places. We devote attention to the cultures of gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender individuals and groups only to explain the relationship between gay men and revitalization processes (Florida 2003), or sexual practices (Laumann 2004), and therefore know little about dimensions of community life – such as work, neighboring, childrearing, and organizing – to which community studies traditionally attend (e.g., Kornblum 1975, Bell 1995, Pattillo 1999, Kefalas 2003). This, combined with sociologists’ traditional view of men as economic actors, has contributed to the particularly glaring omission from the literature of queer individuals with less capital, such as lesbians (Cooke & Rapino 2007). More generally, it has inaccurately presented those whom such work attends to – gay men – as homogeneous. As urban planning scholar Ann Forsyth writes, “Although white, male owners of beautifully decorated houses are a very visible part of the population, recent census

---


9 This is also related to the fact that urban and community studies are less attentive to women than to men (Lofland 1975, Spain 2002).
and survey data indicate a more economically and ethnically diverse group” (2001: 340; see also Binnie 1995).

How have we perpetuated this narrow view of gays and lesbians and of the places where they reside? While homophobia is likely a contributing factor, our narrow attention to queers as economic and sexual actors who people homogeneous enclaves in major cities reflects broader omissions in contemporary community and urban sociology. Arguably, our disregard for queer residents, particularly for those who reside outside of the urban “ghetto”, is but one example of the consequences of our collective neglect of places outside of major metropolitan areas, as well as our devotion to political-economic trends at the expense of social and cultural dynamics that accompany and sometimes produce them (Borer 2006).

I propose that what we don’t know about gays and lesbians is indicative of much broader gaps in our knowledge of cities, suburbs, and towns and of the processes that take place in them. For this reason, I call us to attend to queer individuals outside of the context of gentrifying urban centers, and, more generally, to consider smaller cities, suburbs, rural areas, and the relationship between place and people in terms that encompass but also extend beyond the economic. We might take an acknowledgement of our neglect of queer residents as an opportunity to expand our subfield’s traditional lines of inquiry, for a more expansive approach to community and urban sociology promises to reveal a variety of neglected people, places, and processes, and to increase the comprehensiveness of our scholarship.10

---

10 The author thanks Wendy Griswold, Terence McDonnell, Lida Maxwell, Jon Norman, and Angela Steward for helpful comments on the essay.

---
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Biographical Note: Brown-Saracino is Assistant Professor of Sociology at Loyola University Chicago. Her book, Social Preservation: Gentrification and the Quest for Authentic People, Place and Community, is in press with the Fieldwork Encounters and Discoveries Series of the University of Chicago Press(expected publication date in 2009). Brown-Saracino’s articles on gentrification and social preservation have appeared in City and Community and Theory and Society. With co-authors she has written on social movements and culture, the practice of ethnography, and on newspaper coverage of gentrification. She is currently conducting an ethnographic study of four U.S. towns with a growing or emerging population of lesbian and bi-sexual women.
The ASA Annual Meeting will be held in San Francisco from Saturday, August 8 to Tuesday, August 11, 2009. This year CUSS will offer four open paper sessions as well as the referred roundtables. All CUSS panels and roundtables are scheduled for Monday, August 10. All submissions should be sent electronically through the ASA’s automated registration system by Wednesday, January 14, 2009.

CUSS Open Paper Sessions

• **Session One:**
  Cities, Communities, and Immigration (This session is sponsored jointly by CUSS and the Immigration Section)

  **Section Description:** The topic of cities, communities, and immigration has been of major interest to generations of sociologists. Recent developments such as growing racial and ethnic diversity among immigrants, emergence of high-tech industries, and the consolidation of trans-national linkages among immigrants have challenged our conventional understanding of how immigration shapes urban structures and processes as well as how existing urban structures and processes affect the integration of immigrants. This session seeks to assemble papers that will shed new light on the new dynamics between immigration and urban and community structures and processes. We expect the session to specifically explore new urban forms, such as multi-group residential patterns and suburban immigrant clustering, as well as new urban processes, such as immigrant adaptation in small towns and middle class immigrant communities.

  **Organizer:**
  Eric Fong
  Department of Sociology
  University of Toronto
  725 Spadina Avenue
  Toronto, Ontario M5S 2J4
  fong@chass.utoronto.ca

• **Session Two:**
  Cities, Communities, and Disaster

  **Section Description:** Disasters happen when hazardous events, natural or man-made, cross path with vulnerable populations. Throughout recent years, economic and spatial inequalities in the United States have intensified. Globally, climate change has been linked to an increase in extreme weather patterns; pollution and industrialization threaten our remaining natural resources; and many world regions continue to suffer from political instability. The combination of these and other trends arguably contributes to an increase in the frequency and intensity of disasters, in the United States and abroad. Scholars of communities and environments (whether urban, suburban, or rural) can provide key insights to investigations of hazards. A comprehensive account of communities and environments is crucial to fully understand, and hopefully mitigate the impacts of disasters. Many important questions can be asked about cities, communities and disasters. How do social environments interact with natural and built environments? How do community resources affect levels of vulnerability and resilience among their members? Which roles do communities play during post-disaster recovery? How are urban and community environments redeveloped and changed following a disaster? This session invites papers that empirically and conceptually investigate these and other questions at the intersection of disasters, cities and communities.

  CONTINUED, Page 11
• Session Three: Formal Organizations and Urban Transformations

Session Description: In recent years, there has been a resurgence in urban sociologists' interest in the role of formal organizations in cities. In contrast to William Julius Wilson's much-cited thesis that cities, especially their poor neighborhoods, have become characterized by a vast lack of formal organizational resources, in the last ten years a growing number of urban sociologists has produced empirical work that takes formal organizations as their central object of inquiry. This work has included ethnographic studies of organizations in urban environments (e.g., McRoberts 2004, Marwell 2007), quantitative analyses of the variations in organizational density across neighborhoods (e.g., Rankin & Quane 2000, Small 2006), and historical discussions of urban organizational environments (e.g., McQuarrie 2007). Organizations are key holders and distributors of resources to individuals, families, and communities. Organizations also participate in the structuring of opportunity at the meso and macro levels, through their interactions with other organizations in neighborhoods, cities, and beyond. For both these reasons, urban scholars are increasingly documenting the role that organizations play in urban economic, political, and social realms. This session aims at bringing together a set of papers by scholars doing cutting-edge research on the intersection of organizations and various urban issues and transformations.

• Session Four: Leisure Practices and Urban Community Building

Session Description: While cities have historically been viewed as places for work and commerce, they are also places for leisure and recreation. Urban sociologists, recognizing cities as both places of production and as places of consumption, have recently sought to uncover the symbolic economy of cities by looking toward cultural amenities such as art galleries, sports arenas, and nightclubs. The social significance of leisure necessarily moves our attention toward the realm of civic culture and community relations. The papers sought for this session will analyze and elucidate the connection between leisure activities and community-building practices. What roles does leisure play in the hard work of building urban communities? Does focusing on or attending to leisure take away from persons’ abilities to foster healthy communities or can leisure be a catalyst for the construction of strong social relations? Are some leisure activities more conducive to community-building than others, and, if so, why? These questions are increasingly important as cities remain playgrounds for some and detention halls for others. The purpose of this session, then, CONTINUED, Page 12
is to explore the varied ways that leisure practices are related to the development and sustainability of urban communities.

Organizer:
Michael Ian Borer
Department of Sociology,
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Las Vegas, NV 89154
michael.borer@unlv.edu

• Referred Roundtables
Organizers:
Melinda Milligan
Department of Sociology
Sonoma State University
Rohnert Park, CA 94928
melinda.milligan@sonoma.edu

Simon Weffer-Elizondo
School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts
University of California, Merced
Merced, CA 95344
sweffer@ucmerced.edu

Suggested roundtables: These are based on proposals by CUSS members. The purpose of listing them here is to signal section members of the possibility of having roundtable paper or panel discussions on these topics if there is sufficient interest in them by other section members. These include:

• Dynamics of Urban Neighborhood Change: Emerging Patterns (Discussion of current understanding of neighborhood change in American cities)
  Rachael Woldoff
  West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26506 Rachael.woldoff@mail.wvu.edu

• Market-centered Growth and the Right to the City (Discussion of the contemporary trend towards ‘marked-centered’ urban development, including its economic dynamics, social impacts, and new political responses to it)
  Miriam Greenberg
  Department of Sociology
  University of California, Santa Cruz
  Santa Cruz, CA 95064 miriam@ucsc.edu

• The Gentrifier in the Mirror (Discussion of urban researchers position in their neighborhoods and how that influences or reflects on their work and the broader gentrification literature)
  John Joe Schlichtman
  Department of Sociology
  University of San Diego
  San Diego, CA 92110
  jjschlichtman@sandiego.edu
  Jason Patch
  Feinstein College of Arts and Sciences
  Roger Williams University
  Bristol, RI 02809
  jpatch@rwu.edu

• Place, Space and Political Belonging (Discussion of how place and space shape political community, political behavior, mobilization, and political coalition formation.)
  Sookhee Oh
  Sociology Department
  University of Missouri, Kansas City
  Kansas City, MO
  ohso@umkc.edu
  Jennifer Darrah
  Department of Sociology
  Brown University
  Providence, RI
  Jennifer_Darrah@brown.edu

• The Ghetto and Social Exclusion (Ongoing discussion of “the ghetto” and the knowledge base for relevant theorization)
  Ray Hutchison
  Urban and Regional Studies University of Wisconsin-Green Bay
  Green Bay, WI 54311
  hutchr@uwgb.edu
2009
CUSS Awards
Call for Submissions

Each year CUSS recognizes outstanding contributions through the section awards. Listed below are the information and committee contacts for our section awards. The deadline for the 2009 award submissions is March 1, 2009.

• Robert and Helen Lynd Award
  (Lifetime Achievement and Service)

  Committee
  Barry Wellman (Chair)
  University of Toronto,
  wellman@chass.utoronto.ca
  Sharon Zukin
  City University of New York, Graduate Center
  szukin@gc.cuny.edu.
  Mark LaGory
  University of Alabama, Birmingham,
  mlagory@uab.edu

• Robert Park Award
  (Best Book)

  Committee
  Bruce Phillips (Chair)
  Hebrew Union College, Los Angeles
  bphillips@huc.edu
  Mary Pattillo
  Northwestern University
  m-pattillo@northwestern.edu
  Bruce Haynes
  University of California, Davis
  bdhaynes@ucdavis.edu

• Jane Addams Award
  (Best Article)

  Committee
  Susan Brown (Chair)
  University of California, Irvine
  skbrown@uci.edu
  Matthew Marr
  Florida International University
  mmarr@fiu.edu
  Todd Goodsell
  Brigham Young University
  goodsell@byu.edu

• Student Paper Award
  (Best paper/article by a graduate student)

  Committee
  Maggie Kasenbach (Chair)
  University of South Florida
  mkusenba@cas.usf.edu
  Robert Grantham
  University of Massachusetts, Lowell
  Robert_Grantham@uml.edu
  Yuki Kato
  Tulane University
  ykato@tulane.edu
ANNOUNCEMENTS

Race, Ethnicity, and (New) Media Symposium
Texas A & M University
April 30-May 2, 2009

The Race & Ethnic Studies Institute at Texas A & M University convenes a symposium every other year. The proposed theme for the 2008-2009 year is Shifting Terrains: Inequalities in the 21st Century. The symposium itself is to focus on Race, Ethnicity, and (New) Media. This symposium will be held on April 30-May 2, 2009.

The explosion of work on New Media (including the Internet, mobile devices, Web 2.0) and the juxtaposition and overlap between 'old' media (radio, television, film, and mass-print media) and New Media is a rich field of cultural production and scholarly research in which scholars of race and ethnicity have not been particularly well-represented. However, there are cutting edge scholars who do indeed explore various aspects of race/ethnicity and (New) Media (including audience/fan studies, representations of racial and ethnic identities in a variety of media, identity-focused online communities, etc.).

We invite such scholars to submit papers with the intention of presenting work that deals with these topics during a two and a half day interdisciplinary symposium, with several keynote speakers, including Dr. Lisa Nakamura and Dr. Henry Bial. We intend that a number of these papers will be compiled into an edited volume intended for publication, and that all papers and participants will have the opportunity to upload their papers on our developing interactive website for scholarly exchange on working papers.

Submissions should be 500 word abstracts or full papers of no more than 8000 words (including notes and references). They should be submitted to: gatson@tamu.edu and resi@tamu.edu by December 31, 2008. Submissions will be reviewed by an organizing committee, and authors will be notified of acceptance/rejection by March 15, 2009.

Space & Place Network

The Space & Place Network of the ASA Sociology of Culture Section is looking for new members. This network provides an opportunity for sociologists who work between the boundaries of urban and cultural issues to meet. Each year we host a roundtable at the ASA Culture Day. We are in the process of organizing our roundtable for the 2009 ASA Meetings in San Francisco. If you are interested in joining the Space & Place Network, please contact William Holt at wholt@vermontlaw.edu.

MEMBER NEWS & NOTES

• Timothy J. Haney, doctoral candidate in sociology at the University of Oregon, received a Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). His dissertation, titled Off to the (Labor) Market: Women, Work, and Welfare Reform in 21st Century American Cities utilizes innovative longitudinal survey data, coupled with spatial data, to advance sociological understanding of the opportunities and constraints that disadvantaged urban women are now facing in the labor market as recent welfare reforms unfold into the 21st century.

• Shirley A. Jackson, Southern Connecticut State University, received Honorable Mention in the 2008 CSA Sociological Abstracts Discovery Prize contest for her submission “Making Research Real.” The project involved connecting students to the research...
process by using the CSA Sociological Abstracts database and the Newspaper Abstracts database.

She received a Campus Compact Mini-Grant for Civic Engagement for a project this fall for a research project in my social problems course. The project: Taking it To the Streets: From Social Problems to Service Learning involves placing my students in various agencies around New Haven in order to learn how the community and its agencies attempt to solve or address different types of social problems. It is also a way to connect students to the community and as a result, some of them are planning to continue their involvement in community agencies.

Also, El Mercurio, a newspaper in Santiago, Chile interviewed Jackson for two articles: "Obama pone tema racial al centro del debate" [Obama puts the subject of race at the center of the debate] by Jean Palou Egoaguirre, June 29, 2008 and “Los medios de comunicacion "negros" alineados con Obama” [The “black” mass media aligns with Obama] by Gonzalo Vedga Sfrasani, August 3, 2008.

The 2008 Outstanding Book Award of the Global Division of the Society for the Study of Social Problems was awarded to Michael Peter Smith and Matt Bakker, University of California, Davis for their book Citizenship Across Borders: The Political Transnationalism of El Migrante (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2008). The goal of the award is to encourage critical scholarship in the areas of global studies and social problems. The Book Award Committee characterized Citizenship Across Borders as follows in its award announcement: “At a time when many theories of contemporary globalization predict the increasing hollowing out of states and consequent erosion of citizen rights, Smith and Bakker point to a politically intriguing and empirically grounded new discourse on citizenship that is transnationalist in conception, and that locates empowering identities and practices among a diverse range of actors. ...Their analysis highlights the continuing significance of territorial identifications and state policies...in cultivating and sustaining transnational connections and practices.”

Jody Agius Vallejo (Ph.D. University of California, Irvine 08) accepted a tenure-track assistant professor position in the Department of Sociology at the University of Southern California. She will spend the next academic year as a postdoctoral fellow at the Center for Comparative Immigration Studies and U.S.-Mexican Studies at University of California, San Diego. Her dissertation, "Brown Picket Fences: Patterns of Giving Back, Ethnic Identity and Professional Associations" is a study of the Mexican-origin middle class.


Rural Retirement Migration
Springer, 2008
David L. Brown, Cornell University
Nina Glasgow, Cornell University

This book examines the migration of older persons to rural retirement destinations in the United States. While the majority of older persons are residentially stable, those who migrate are disproportionately likely to move to a rural community. Moreover, with the aging of the baby boom generation, particular rural communities can expect to continue attracting older in-migrants during the next 25 years. The book explores rural retirement migration from the older in-migrants’ perspective and from that of the destination communities to which they move. Using an integrated micro-macro
approach, the authors view older in-migrants as embedded in particular types of environments that facilitate and/or constrain their opportunities for productive aging. They also look at the positive and negative effects of older in-migration for destination communities. The authors use a multiple methods approach featuring a panel survey of older in-migrants and longer-term older residents, in-depth case studies and county-level census data analysis to produce a grounded study of population aging in the context of rural society.

The analysis describes the challenges and opportunities presented by migration at older ages both for successful aging and for community development. The book discusses the process through which older in-migrants become socially integrated in their new communities, and it details the social relationships they form, the nature of their civic engagement, and the positive and negative reactions they elicit from longer-term residents. The volume concludes with a discussion of policy lessons learned from the research, and with an examination of high priority research needs on retirement migration.

The first expansion of the model is the inclusion of attitudes. Using data from Fannie Mae, I examine the preferences of members of different minority groups to ascertain what each desires from its housing.

Next, I go beyond the traditional outcomes of homeownership and suburbanization by analyzing detailed measures of residential attainment, including unit size, quality, and amenities and neighborhood quality.

Third, I add context, including housing market segment, regional location, and metropolitan area. Since conditions at each of these levels can influence the effect of race and nativity on the outcomes of individual households, adding these contexts helps determine the extent to which they affect individual residential outcomes of members of different racial and ethnic groups.

Finally, I examine residential mobility to determine whether households are able to improve their living situations through a move. I examine shifts in tenure and housing type, as well as measures of relative satisfaction, to see how a move shapes residential attainment.

Matthew Marlay recently completed his Ph.D. in Sociology and Demography at the Pennsylvania State University. He is now employed as a Survey Statistician at the U.S. Census Bureau.
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My dissertation examines residential preferences and attainment among minority and immigrant groups in the metropolitan United States, using the residential attainment framework and expanding it in several key ways. This model has traditionally relied on homeownership and suburbanization; if the ownership rate and suburban proportion of minorities is approximately equal to that of whites, then the minority group has supposedly attained residential equality.