

THE PACIFIC

Sociologist

SEPTEMBER 2011: VOLUME 19, NUMBER 3
the Pacific Sociological Association

Dear PSA Members and Colleagues,

Please join us for the 83rd annual meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association, March 22-25, 2012. The conference site is the Sheraton San Diego Hotel and Marina on Harbor Island. PSA has a tower exclusively for our use, and the rooms have views of the marina or San Diego Bay. Many restaurants are close by as is the Gaslamp District (2.5 miles) and Little Italy (1.8 miles). As always, San Diego offers PSA members, friends, and families a wide array of cultural and recreational attractions, and almost always, wonderful weather.

The conference theme, “*Intersectionalities and Inequalities: Knowledge and Power for the 21st Century*” is intended to be engaging to those of us both in and outside of academia, all-encompassing in its theoretical reach and empirical demonstrations. It provides multiple opportunities to examine a concept – intersectionality – and come to understand its history, its strengths and weaknesses, and its elaborations in knowledge production in the social sciences and humanities and in its applications for social change.

The 2012 meeting, most particularly in some of the Presidential and thematic sessions, will focus on how intersectional approaches have been marshaled in various subfields of sociology and attempt to measure their success; how quantitative and qualitative methodologies have been enhanced and challenged by an intersectional perspective; how and why some axes of power been more fully explored than others; to what extent analyses of specific policy domains, such as immigration, crime, educational access, HIV/AIDS, civil rights, have usefully employed its insights.

The 2012 conference program will also include the full array of sessions devoted to culture, crime, organizations, gender, environment, deviance, race, methods and statistics, social psychology, religion, and health issues. The program committee plans some terrific “Author Meets Commentators” sessions

and workshops on how to get federal funding, how to write for the journal *Contexts* (offered by past PSA President and new Editor of that journal), and how to get published. Reaching back into the past, several special sessions comprised of Past Presidents of the PSA will explore how sociology has and has not changed. Sessions for graduate students will discuss the job market; sessions for senior scholars will discuss the dynamics of retirement for academics. The Student Committee is planning an orientation for students who may be attending the conference for the first time.

This Call for Papers invites you to be part of the program. Share your ideas and research with other sociologists. Reconnect with students, mentors, and peers. Browse the Call for Papers, find a session of interest, and contact the organizer if you have questions. If no session matches your interests, contact Program Chair, Mary Virnoche at (Mary.Virnoche@humboldt.edu) Make your submissions online. Go to the web site (pacificsoc.org) for the form and procedure. **All abstract or paper submissions are due to organizers by Friday, October 15, 2011.**

Please support the PSA by booking at the conference hotel, the Sheraton San Diego Hotel and Marina. This will assure that we meet our room contract and will help keep the conference costs low, since thousands of dollars in meeting room rentals will not have to be paid to the Sheraton. To make a reservation at the low conference rate of \$149 plus tax, for a single or double, call 1-877-734-2726 or book online at: <http://tinyurl.com/PSA-Sheraton-SanDiego>. **To get this group rate, all reservations must be made by February 15, 2012.**

Beth E. Schneider
University of California, Santa Barbara
President, Pacific Sociological Association

Talking Circles

Coming to PSA 2012



Saturday Scheduling

A three-part conversation series supporting networking and problem solving among students, faculty & professional sociologists of color.

Come and share your thoughts, knowledge and concerns in a safe and creative environment.

Sponsored by the
Committee on the Status of
Racial and Ethnic Minorities

Call for Papers Submitting a Paper for the 2012 San Diego Conference

PSA 2012 San Diego – Public Call Closes October 15

An "at a glance," up-to-date listing of the PSA 2012 public panels, discussions and poster sessions can be found at:



www.meetingsavvy.com/psasubmit/_admin/frm-Reports.aspx?Report=PublicCall

To submit a paper or poster proposal, or in some cases to propose your participation on a discussion panel, go to the online meeting database proposal portal and follow the directions:

www.meetingsavvy.com/psasubmit/frmaltpresentation.aspx

PSA Members' New Books

If you would like your book listed in THE PACIFIC SOCIOLOGIST, please send a copy of the book, along with a brief description (half page, single-spaced, 12 font, Times New Roman) to the PSA office.

**Global Connectivity and Local Transformation:
A Micro Approach to Studying the Effect of Globalization
on Shanghai (University Press of American: 2008)**
by *Jiaming Sun, Texas A-M University, Commerce*

This book looks at the social and cultural change that took place in Shanghai during the globalization period. The micro sociological perspective is utilized to explain the effects of globalization and global connectivity on Shanghai. Three aspects were found to be important in explaining global connectivity and the local transformation that occurred in Shanghai: 1) long distance overseas travel; 2) Internet communication; and 3) global social ties. Though a macro perspectives is useful in looking at the effects of contemporary globalization, this book utilizes the micro perspective by looking at personal global connections as the central mechanism in globalization. This book emphasizes the effects of new and more advanced technologies that are able to connect people from all across the world with the click of a mouse or the touch of a phone.

Child Protective Services Survival Manual for Parents (Walden Press, Inc.: 2010) by *Carolyn Lewis, Metropolitan State College of Denver*

This book gives a look into the thought processes and experiences of a Child Protective Services worker who spent 25 years in the field. Based on each section of the California Criminal Code dealing with child abuse, it gives advice and tips that any parent, childcare worker, or teacher could benefit from having.

The subject of the book – the pitfalls parents face and how they might come up against Child Protective Services – is as timely as the daily news. The book provides a useful tool for those parents and mandated reporters to prepare them for problems that arise. Parents will learn what to expect and the best ways to deal with problems. Teachers and other mandated reporters will learn what signs to look for and what they might mean.

This handbook offers very concrete information in a vast array of real life case situations that CPS workers around the country encounter everyday. This text will serve as a useful study guide for even the most experienced social workers. It will find an audience with sociology students, both undergrad and grad; an excellent textbook, just the exact supplemental reading instructors seek.

Hotel Information for 2012 Meeting:

Sheraton San Diego Hotel & Marina on Harbor Island

The 2012 PSA Annual Meeting will take place at Sheraton San Diego Hotel & Marina on Harbor Island, 1380 Harbor Island Drive on March 22-25. The PSA will be meeting in the Bay Tower of the complex and we will have this facility pretty much to ourselves. Most sleeping and meeting rooms of the hotel have views of San Diego Bay or the marina. There are a host of good restaurants on Harbor Island within walking distance. The Gaslamp Quarter is only 2.5 miles from the hotel and Little Italy is less than 1.8 miles from the hotel. Put on your walking shoes and stroll along the bayfront Embarcadero from the hotel to the Gaslamp or Little Italy. Or, hire a pedicab to transport you!

Support the PSA by Booking at the Sheraton. This will assure that your association meets its sleeping room contract and will keep convention costs low, since thousands of dollars in meeting room rental will not have to be paid to the Sheraton. Not meeting the PSA "room block" would have serious financial consequences and would most likely increase the cost of registration at future meetings.

The PSA 2012 discounted Convention Rate is \$149 single or double, plus tax. **To make a reservation, call 1-877-734-2726. Please ask for the PSA convention rate. Or book online by using the following URL: <http://tinyurl.com/PSA-Sheraton-SanDiego>**

All Reservations Must Be Made By Wednesday, February 15, 2012 to guarantee the PSA rate. *However please note that the PSA discounted room block could easily sell out before the February 15th deadline.* The hotel may still have rooms after this date, but at a rate-available basis.

Hotel Parking

Hotel parking is \$22 per day for self-parking and \$28 for valet parking.

Airport Transportation

The San Diego Sheraton Hotel is located directly across the street from the San Diego International Airport. A free "Sheraton" Shuttle passes through the terminal area every 15 to 20 minutes.

Academic Positions

University of Oregon. The Department of Sociology invites applications for two tenure-track Assistant Professor positions to begin September 2012, in the areas of political sociology/power structure and, race/ethnicity, or theory. We specifically require at least one individual with expertise and commitment to teach theory at both graduate and undergraduate levels. We prefer candidates who build on one or more of the department's other historic strengths in environment, gender, sociology of work, and economic sociology. Successful candidates will have experience working effectively with faculty, staff and students from diverse backgrounds. A Ph.D. in Sociology or closely related field is required by time of appointment, plus an exceptional record of research and teaching or demonstrated potential for such performance. Apply online at www.academicjobsonline.org/. Queries should be addressed to Chair, Staff Development Committee, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR 97403-1291; email: sociology@uoregon.edu. Review of applications will commence September 15, 2011. The University of Oregon is an equal-opportunity, affirmative-action institution committed to cultural diversity and compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act.

Steps You Must Follow for Submission to Session Organizers

All submissions must be made using the online at www.pacificsoc.org

You are encouraged to submit a proposal, idea, outline, abstract, or completed paper to be considered for inclusion in the 2012 Annual Meeting at the Sheraton San Diego Hotel & Marina, March 22-25, 2012. Completed papers and extended abstracts may be given more consideration for acceptance than an outline or brief abstract (two or three paragraphs for example).

Please follow the procedures below.

1. Look through the Call for Papers.
2. Select the best session for your submission and submit your completed paper, extended abstract (a two to three page summary of your intended presentation), idea, proposal, or brief abstract to the session organizer listed. All submissions must be sent online.
3. Fill out the form on www.pacificsoc.org and upload your submission. If your submission is successful, you will immediately receive a confirmation. **This confirmation indicates only that your submission was sent to the session organizer successfully; it does not mean the session organizer has accepted your submission.** If you need to contact the organizer, you may do so by email addresses listed in the Call for Papers.
4. If you cannot find a session that fits your proposal, send it to the Program Chair, Mary Virnoche (Mary.Virnoche@humboldt.edu) who may be able to find a place for it in the program before it is finalized or submit it online under the topic "Submissions that Don't Fit Any Session Listed."
5. Do not submit the same work to more than ONE session organizer at the same time.
6. You can submit more than one proposed presentation, but each submission must be submitted to no more than ONE organizer at a time. If you submit the same proposal to more than one organizer, then both may accept and the Program Chair will eliminate you without notice from one of the sessions. This is unfair to the session organizer and to others, as the session organizer may be counting on your proposal for his or her session and may have rejected another proposal only to find out later that your proposal has been dropped from the session because you submitted it to two organizers at the same time and it ended up in two separate sessions.
7. Special Note to Undergraduate & Graduate Students. The PSA welcomes and encourages participation in our program by undergraduate and graduate students. To best accommodate undergraduate participation, the Program Committee has organized two types of sessions: Undergraduate Roundtable Open Topic Sessions and Undergraduate Poster Sessions. Undergraduate students can submit proposals to only these two types of sessions. Graduate students can submit their work to any listed session in the call for papers, to the Graduate Student Roundtable Session or to the Graduate Student Paper Open Topics Session.
8. If your submission is NOT accepted, the session organizer will inform you. If your paper is not accepted, you can then send it to another session organizer or to the Program Chair, Mary Virnoche (Mary.Virnoche@humboldt.edu) who may be able to find a place for your presentation in the annual program.

Important Dates

October 15, 2011 – All papers/ideas/proposals to session organizers

November 15, 2011 – All session information from Session Organizers to the PSA Office

Join, pre-register or renew your membership now!

Membership benefits include a subscription to *Sociological Perspectives*, published by UC Press; a subscription to the PSA newsletter, *The Pacific Sociologist*; participation in the Annual Meeting; and many opportunities to network with other sociologists. *You may also pay online securely at pacificsoc.org.*

MEMBERSHIP

If there have been no recent changes in your name or contact information and you are renewing, enter your name below.

name _____

If there have been recent changes in your contact information or if you are joining as a new member, provide the information below.

name _____

address _____

city _____ state / province _____

zip / postcode _____ country, if not united states _____

tel _____ / fax _____ / email _____@_____

type of membership (check one)

STUDENT and/or under \$15,000 annual income: US / CDN \$ 15

FACULTY and/or over \$15,000 annual income: US / CDN \$ 40

ANNUAL MEETING PREREGISTRATION – PLEASE PAY IN ADVANCE TO AVOID THE HIGHER AT-MEETING COST

Please enter the information below as you wish it to appear on your conference badge:

name _____

institutional affiliation _____

type of registration (check one)

STUDENT and/or under \$15,000 annual income: US / CDN \$ 20

FACULTY and/or over \$15,000 annual income: US / CDN \$ 40

TOTAL PAYMENT

You can pay by check or credit card. Make checks out to psa. Sign your name if paying by credit card. *You can also pay online (secure site) at PACIFICSOC.ORG.*

_____ MEMBERSHIP DUES for 2011

_____ REGISTRATION for annual meeting

_____ CONTRIBUTION to the endowment fund (tax deductible)

_____ TOTAL payment enclosed or to be charged

Send completed form with check or credit card information to

Dean S. Dorn (PSA Treasurer), Dept. of Sociology, CSU Sacramento / 6000 J Street / Sacramento CA 95819-6005;

alternatively, if paying by credit card (see below), you may fax this completed form to the Pacific Sociological Association at 916.278.6281.

IF PAYING BY CREDIT CARD:

card number _____ expiration [mm / yy] _____

name as it appears on card _____

SIGNATURE _____

You can also pay for Membership Dues, Annual Meeting Registration, and Donations at
<https://www5588.sslldomain.com/MeetingSavvy/psa/default.aspx>

Special Note to Undergraduate & Graduate Students

The PSA welcomes and encourages participation in our program by undergraduate and graduate students. Except for California and possibly Hawaii, there are no state sociological associations in the Pacific region available for student socialization and participation in the discipline. One aspect of the PSA mission is to mentor the next generation of sociologists. To best accommodate undergraduate participation, the Program Committee has organized two types of sessions: Undergraduate Roundtable Open Topic Sessions and Undergraduate Poster Sessions. In the Public Call for Papers, these are the only two sessions open to undergraduate students. Graduate students can submit their work to any session in the Call for Papers.



Please inform us of email, telephone, or address changes at psa@sdsu.edu.

You may also report any errors in the Call for Papers to the same email addresses.

Visit www.pacificsoc.org to keep your membership up-to-date and to pre-register for the 2012 meeting.

Volunteer for Committee Service

PSA Committees are vital to the proper functioning of the Association. Each year there are vacancies on the various committees that must be filled. Each year the Committee on Committees is looking for interested and committed members who can be recommended to the President and the Council for possible appointment.

Committee Membership must represent the Southern, Central, and Northern sections of the PSA western region. Usually there is one opening for each region on each appointed committee. Those responsible for committee appointments are always glad to know of willing volunteers. Student members are now eligible to serve on all appointed committees with the exception of the Awards Committee. Appointments are usually for a three-year period.

The PSA has 15 committees that members can volunteer to serve on: endowment, membership, audit, contract monitoring, awards, status of women, status of ethnic minorities, status of gays, lesbians, bisexual and transgendered persons, teaching, freedom of research and teaching, civil liberties and civil rights, social conscience, community colleges, student affairs, and sociological practice.

The PSA Council appoints members based on recommendation from the Committee on Committees. Self-nominations are acceptable. Serving on a PSA committee is an effective way to network with professional colleagues.

To serve on a PSA Committee, you must be a member of the PSA in good standing. The next round of committee appointments will be made in December of 2011 with terms of appointment starting in 2012. If you are interested, please contact the Secretary, Virginia Mulle (ginnymulle@gmail.com), and indicate which committee or committees you would like to serve on. A list of committees and a description of what they do is available at www.pacificsoc.org under "committees."

Officers, Secretary, & Editors 2011-2012

OFFICERS:

President: Beth Schneider, UCSB
Past President: Sharon Araj, University of Colorado Denver
President-Elect: Valerie Jenness, UC Irvine
Vice President Denise Sequra, UCSB
Past Vice President: Don Barrett, CSU San Marcos
Vice President Elect: Karen Pyke, UC Riverside
Executive Director: Charles Hohm, SDSU

COUNCIL

Peter Collier, Portland State University
Stefanie Mollborn, Univ. of Colorado-Boulder
Shari Dworkin, UC San Francisco
Kathy Kuipers, University of Montana
Wendy Ng, San Jose State University
Isaac William Martin, UC San Diego
Tina Burdsall, Portland State University

*all officers are also part of the council

SECRETARY

Virginia Mulle, University of Alaska Southeast

TREASURER

Dean S. Dorn
California State University, Sacramento

EDITORS

Co-Editors: Marilyn Fernandez &
Chuck Powers, Santa Clara University
Sociological Perspectives

PSA OFFICE

The Pacific Sociologist
Charles F. Hohm, Executive Director
Pacific Sociological Association
San Diego State University
5500 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182-4423

Email: psa@sdsu.edu • Web: www.pacificsoc.org

The PSA Endowment Committee Announces Fifty \$125 Travel Grant Awards for Students Listed in the Program and Attending the Annual Meeting in San Diego

With the approval of Council, the PSA Endowment Committee will offer Fifty \$125 travel grants available to help pay expenses for graduate and undergraduate students who are giving a presentation at the annual meeting in San Diego.

The travel grant awards will be open only to undergraduate and graduate students who are not employed full-time in an academic or non-academic institution. Students who are eligible must also be listed as a presenter or co-presenter in a conference session in the PSA Preliminary Program for San Diego. The Preliminary Program will be published in the January 2012 Newsletter. Eligible students must also be members of the PSA in 2012 and must have paid pre-registration fees for the conference. Membership on a PSA committee does not qualify.

Procedures for Application for a Travel Grant

Students who meet the eligibility requirements above, need to send via email their name and email address to the Chair of the Endowment Committee: Dean Dorn (dornds@csus.edu). The deadline for submission is February 15, 2012. A random-numbers table will be used to assign a number to all eligible applicants. A random drawing will determine the recipients of the travel awards. Recipients will receive an Email confirming they have won an award no later than March 1, 2012. All recipients must pick up their \$125.00 travel grant at the PSA Registration Table at the conference. Identification will be required.

Call for Nominations for Elected Positions and Committee Membership on the Fall 2012 Ballot

The 2011-2012 PSA Nominations Committee requests nominations for the following positions that will have vacancies on the fall 2012 ballot: **President** (2014-2015); **Vice President** (2014-2015); the **Committee on Committees** (2013-2016) will have three vacancies, one each from the Northern, Southern, and Central regions; the **Nominations Committee** (2013-2016) will have one vacancy from the Southern region; and **PSA Council** (2013-2015) will have three vacancies, one each from the Southern, Central, and Northern regions and one vacancy for the **Graduate Student** (2013-2014) position from the Northern region. For a description of each position, visit the PSA Web site (www.pacificsoc.org) and click

on “officers” and then specific officer handbooks.

Members will elect candidates for these positions on the fall 2012 ballot. Please send names and addresses of potential candidates to the Chair of the Nominations Committee, Sharon Araji, University of Colorado Denver, Past President (Sharon.araji@ucdenver.edu). Self-nominations are welcome!

The deadline for submission of names is February 1, 2012. The other members of the nominations committee are Beth Schneider, UCSB, Amy Leisenring, San Jose State University, Amy Orr, Linfield College, and Michelle Madsen Camacho, University of San Diego.

NOTICE: Please inform us of any errors or cancellations immediately. Email the PSA office at psa@sdsu.edu.

Call for Nominations for 2012 Awards

Nomination Process: Any PSA member can place a nomination. In order for the nomination to be considered, you must provide the required documentation as presented below for each particular award for which there is a nomination. **Nominations for the Distinguished Scholarship Award are due by November 1, 2011. Nominations for all other awards are due by February 1, 2012.**

The 2012 Distinguished Scholarship Award

The Pacific Sociological Association's Award for Distinguished Scholarship is granted to sociologists from the Pacific region in recognition of major intellectual contributions embodied in a recently published book or series of at least three articles on a common theme. To be eligible for the 2012 award, a book must have been published in 2009 or later. If a nomination is based on a series of articles, the most recent article in that series must have been published in 2009 or later. The Committee does not accept nominations for the Scholarship Award from publishers. Nominations must be from individual members of the PSA. Edited books are not eligible for this award. If a book has both a hardback and paperback copyright date and no significant changes have been made in the book between editions, the committee will consider the earlier copyright date as the one determining eligibility for the award. Nominations for distinguished scholarship and all supporting materials must be submitted by November 1, 2011. You must provide the Committee with three copies of the book or articles. Send nominations for the Scholarship Award to: Shari Dworkin (shari.dworkin@ucsf.edu)

The 2012 Dean S. Dorn Distinguished Contributions to Teaching Award

The *Dean S. Dorn Outstanding Contributions to Teaching Career Award* honors outstanding contributions to the teaching of sociology. The award recognizes individuals whose distinction as teachers have made a significant impact on how sociology is taught. It is typically given for contributions spanning several years, or an entire career. Nominations for this award should be submitted in packet form and include the following information: 1) A summary statement of the nominee's contributions to the teaching of sociology that may include but is not limited to: honors and awards received by the nominee; publications or scholarly activity related to teaching/pedagogy; papers presented at national conferences on teaching/pedagogy; innovative approaches to teaching; a discussion of the nominee's impact in disseminating knowledge; leadership in teaching; mentoring students. 2) Current curriculum vitae. 3) A

minimum of six letters of support from students and colleagues, including the nominator's letter.

4) Other supporting documents as deemed relevant (optional). Send nominations for the Dean S. Dorn Teaching Award to: Joanna Gregson (gregsojg@plu.edu)

The 2012 Early Career Award for Innovation in Teaching Sociology

The Early Career Award is designed to honor and encourage the work of junior faculty (typically fewer than seven years post-Ph.D.). This award recognizes innovative and creative approaches to teaching and demonstrated commitment to mentoring students. Nominations for this award should be submitted in packet form and include the following information: 1) A summary statement of the nominee's contributions to the teaching of sociology that may include but is not limited to a discussion of innovative and/or creative approaches to teaching, and a discussion of the nominee's impact on student learning; demonstrated commitment to teaching pedagogy through presentations, publications, workshops or other evidence. 2) Current curriculum vitae. 3) A minimum of six letters of support from students and colleagues, including the nominator's letter. 4) Other supporting documents as deemed relevant (optional). Send nominations for the Early Career Teaching Award to: Joanna Gregson (gregsojg@plu.edu)

2012 Distinguished Contribution to Sociological Praxis Award

The Pacific Sociological Association's Distinguished Contribution to Sociological Praxis Award honors sociological work in the Pacific region (whether by an academic or non-academic), which has an impact on government, business, health, or other settings. The grounds for nomination include (but are not limited to) any applied sociological activity that improves organizational performance, contributes to community betterment, and/or eases human suffering. You must provide the committee with three copies of the supporting documentation: 1) A nominating letter, which provides an overview of the nominee's distinguished practice contributions; 2) Letters of support from

individuals having direct knowledge of the nominee's distinguished contribution to sociological practice. 3) Copies of presentations at scholarly conferences, published articles, and/or grant/contract proposals, primarily authored by the nominee, which address issues in sociological practice. This award is given bi-annually. Send nominations for the Sociological Praxis Award to: Sunil Kukreja (kukreja@pugetsound.edu)

The 2012 Distinguished Contribution to Sociological Perspectives Award

The Pacific Sociological Association's Distinguished Contribution to *Sociological Perspectives Award* honors an outstanding article published yearly in *Sociological Perspectives*. To be eligible, the article must be worthy of special recognition for outstanding scholarship and contribution to the discipline. The article must have been published in Vol. 54, 2011. This award is given annually. You must provide the Committee with three copies of the nominated article. Send nominations for the *Sociological Perspectives Award* to: Vikas Gumbhir (gumbhir@gonzaga.edu)

Continued on next page

California Sociological Association

**2011 Annual Meeting,
Berkeley CA, November 4-5th**

The California Sociological Association will hold its annual meeting on November 4-5th at the DoubleTree Hotel in the Berkeley Marina. The theme for the conference is California and the World. Our keynote speaker will be Christopher Chase-Dunn who is Distinguished Professor of Sociology and Director of the Institute for Research on World Systems at the University of California-Riverside.

For more information, please contact our President-Elect and Program Chair, Tony Waters (twaters@csuchico.edu) or our Executive Director, Ed Nelson (ednelson@csufresno.edu).

Continued from previous page

The 2012 Distinguished Undergraduate Student Paper Award and \$200 honorarium

The Pacific Sociological Association's Distinguished Student Paper Award recognizes an undergraduate student or students for a paper of high professional quality. This award includes a \$200 honorarium and two nights of lodging at the 2012 convention hotel. To be eligible a paper must be (a) worthy of special recognition for outstanding scholarship; (b) written by an undergraduate student or students in the Pacific region c) written or substantially revised in the last year; d) presented at the upcoming PSA annual conference; and e) unpublished. Nominations for the award must be submitted via email (a copy of the paper, including an abstract, accompanied by a least one letter of support). Hardcopies will not be accepted. The

deadline for nominations is February 1, 2012. Send Nominations for the Undergraduate Paper Award to: Laura Earles (leearles@lscs.edu)

The 2012 Distinguished Graduate Student Paper Award and \$200 honorarium

The Pacific Sociological Association's Distinguished Student Paper Award recognizes a graduate student or students for a paper of high professional quality. This award includes a \$200 honorarium and two nights of lodging at the 2012 convention hotel. To be eligible a paper must be (a) worthy of special recognition for outstanding scholarship; (b) written by a graduate student or students in the Pacific region c) written or substantially revised in the last year; d) presented at the upcoming PSA annual conference; and e) unpublished. Nominations for the award must be submitted via email (a copy of the paper, including

an abstract, accompanied by a least one letter of support). Hardcopies will not be accepted. The deadline for nominations is February 1, 2012. Send Nominations for the Graduate Student Paper Award to: Jane Ward (jane.ward@ucr.edu)

Social Conscience Award

The Pacific Sociological Association's Social Conscience Award is given to a worthy community-based organization located in the city in which the PSA Annual meeting is held. In 2012, the annual meeting will be held in San Diego. This is a monetary award and honors a community organization based in San Diego that is engaged in providing a much-needed social service in the community. You must provide the committee with two copies of supporting documentation. Send nominations for the Social Conscience Award to: Chuck Hohm (psa@sdsu.edu)

Suggestions for Giving a First-Rate Presentation

[Note: This is reprinted from the *Newsletter of the Midwest Sociological Association* and was written by Barbara Keating, Minnesota State University-Mankato. It has been slightly edited for the PSA. We continue to reprint this piece because it offers excellent advice for everyone on the program.]

I make the following suggestions to new and experienced presenters.

1. Make sure the PSA office knows of your A/V needs. Meeting rooms have data projectors and screen for powerpoint presentations. The PSA does not provide laptops. If you need equipment other than an LCD projector, don't assume it will be available or that it can be ordered at the last minute - it can't and it won't. You must order it well in advance.
2. Get your completed paper to the discussant at least a month before the meetings. A good review can be tremendously helpful for revising the paper for publication. But it takes time and thought. Every year, however, some discussants do not get papers until they arrive at the meetings. The discussants are doing you a favor. Help them to help you by giving them the time they need.
3. After you have finished the formal written version of your paper, edit it for a presentation version. Remember, you will normally have only 12-15 minutes to give your paper if there are four other
4. Do not read your paper to the audience. Talk about it. The well-crafted written formal sentence may be a better visual than audio experience. *Remember, your audience is listening, not reading.*
5. Arrive at your session early enough to set up any equipment you are using. This will also allow you to meet the other panelists. The organizer and/or presider will brief you on organization, order, and time limits.
6. Adhere to time limits. Three to four paper presentations, discussant comments, and audience participation do not allow much flexibility in one session. Presiders may enforce appropriate social sanctions on presenters who monopolize time.
7. If you bring copies of your paper for distribution, you may reduce the weight by printing single space on both sides of each page. Many presenters must bring copies of the statistical tables or model figures, perhaps with an abstract unless they use a power point presentation.

Please inform us of email, telephone, or address changes at psa@sdsu.edu.

You may also report any errors in the Call for Papers to the same email addresses.

Visit www.pacificsoc.org to keep your membership up-to-date and to pre-register for the 2012 meeting.

Important Dates

October 15, 2011: *All papers/ideas/proposals to session organizers*

November 15, 2011: *All session information from Session Organizers to the PSA Office*

Note that all paper submissions must be made online at www.pacificsoc.org.

While you're there, please renew your membership & pay meeting registration fees!

Editorial Transition at *Sociological Perspectives*: O'Brien & Elliott Succeed Fernandez & Powers

Dennis Downey
California State University, Channel Islands

The Pacific Sociological Association is extremely fortunate to have a well-respected and well-run journal as our flagship publication. Most of us recognize and appreciate the strong research presented to us in the issues that appear in our mailboxes every several months. As Chair of the Publications Committee for the past couple of years, I have come to have a better understanding of – and deeper appreciation for – all of the work that goes on behind the scenes to make that happen. Consider these facts: Each year, approximately 125 manuscripts are submitted to *Sociological Perspectives*. Each of them must be read and considered carefully by the editorial team. Generally, they are then sent out for review to several sociologists who have expertise in some area addressed by the research. That means contacting a larger number of sociologists to inquire whether they are available and willing to complete a review purely as a professional service. Once those multiple reviews are completed and returned (which is a feat of organization and technology in itself), the editors must carefully read over them, sometimes navigating between conflicting recommendations, to inform their own sense of the potential contribution of the manuscript. Then the editors must craft a careful letter to let the author know of the decision, focusing on delivering the news in a way that is constructive and productive for the author(s). (Of course, that news is most frequently not what the authors wish to hear, given an acceptance rate that hovers around 20% when calculated in the most conservative manner – and substantially lower when calculated in ways more common at peer-reviewed journals.) In spite of that labor-intensive process, the average time that the editors took to complete all of those tasks for each manuscript sent out for review in 2010 was well under 100 days. For those articles that ultimately appear in *Sociological Perspectives*, you can be confident that the focused attention given to them by editors (and reviewers) has increased their clarity and sharpened their contribution. For those that are not published, authors are given rich feedback on their ideas, analyses, and writing that represents an invisible – but invaluable – contribution to our discipline.

All of the information in the paragraph above was taken from the meticulous annual editorial report (representing another of the many tasks of the editor!) compiled by the editorial team at Santa Clara that has been at the helm of *Sociological Perspectives* for the past four years: Chuck Powers and Marilyn Fernandez – along with their Managing Editor Kay Boissicat. Based on the narrative above (which is certainly *not* inclusive of all of the work

carried out by the editors), we can deepen our understanding of just how fortunate we have been to have had such dedicated and proficient editors in charge of our journal. Perhaps I should speak personally: My own “behind the scenes” perspective (as Publications Committee Chair and as Editorial Advisory Board member) has given me immense respect and appreciation for the amazing dedication with which Marilyn and Chuck have carried out their duties as editors. They have maintained the high standards of publication and the efficiency of review processes that we have come to expect for *Sociological Perspectives* – and have done so with a conscientiousness and sense of responsibility to members and authors that is truly remarkable. We all owe them a profound sense of gratitude for their strong stewardship of our journal over the past four years. We in the PSA are fortunate indeed.

And our fortune doesn't end there! As most of you are aware, the PSA Council announced the incoming editorial team at our spring meetings in Seattle. Based on an extremely enthusiastic recommendation by the Publications Committee, the next editorial team for *Sociological Perspectives* consists of Robert O'Brien and James Elliott, of the University of Oregon. Together, Bob and Jim bring a wealth of experience and expertise across the breadth of our discipline. Bob has published extensively, focusing his research on a range of issues within the general area of criminology (e.g. crime rate trends, ecology of crime, etc.). He also brings focused expertise in research methods and statistics (such as structural equation models and age-period-cohort models). Jim's research focuses on urban development and social inequalities in the United States, ranging from research on native- and foreign-born migration, racial and gender inequalities in the labor market, struggles over public housing, and social vulnerabilities to environmental hazards. He has employed a variety of quantitative and qualitative methods throughout his career. It was clear to the Publications Committee that while each is an impressive editor in his own right, they are still more remarkable in what they bring to the editorial table collectively.

The Publications Committee was also impressed with their plans for *Sociological Perspectives* – for example, in the areas of editorial review processes and ideas for special issues. While ultimate editorial responsibility will lie with the two-person editorial team, they plan to develop a much larger and broader team of Associate Editors in different fields within our discipline to take the lead on initial screening and directing of submitted manuscripts. Bringing more expertise (and energy) into the process can only help in terms of speedy and thorough reviews, but it is the quality of the review

process that they focused on: “It is not clear that this process will save the co-editors time, but we feel it will strengthen the review process by giving us one more pair of eyes and judgment on the final disposition of the manuscript while still allowing us to maintain a relatively swift turnaround time for all review decisions.” The team also has tentative plans for special issues which would focus on timely issues that are of general interest to sociologists or perhaps particular interest to sociologists in our region. We believe that such special issues can make an important contribution by focusing our collective attention on analyses of important issues.

The Publications Committee was also impressed with the generous support that their home institution has guaranteed for the journal. That was undoubtedly facilitated by the fact that their departmental chair, Patricia Gwartney, and their Dean, Scott Coltrane, both have long histories of active participation in the PSA. (Many of you will remember that Scott was president of the PSA from 2000-2001.) Finally, I should add that the move to the University of Oregon will not be new to *Sociological Perspectives*; Eugene was where the journal was first established in 1957, and it remained there for nearly all of its first decade-and-a-half. (Bob and Jim explicitly mentioned an interest in “bringing the journal back home” in their proposal!)

We are excited to hand off the editorial reins to Bob and Jim. They have already begun to accept submissions for *Sociological Perspectives*, and their first volume will commence in January of 2012 (although, as is customary, the first couple of issues will include articles reviewed by the previous editorial team, and Chuck and Marilyn will officially be listed as guest editors).

So, PSA members can be satisfied that our journal – an important symbol of our collective life! – has gone from one great set of stewards to another. As I noted at the start: we are fortunate to have such a well-respected and well-run journal. I can add emphatically that we are equally fortunate to have members – like Marilyn and Chuck and Jim and Bob – with such strong commitments to our association that they are willing to step up to fill this crucial role for the association. Please make an effort to thank Chuck and Marilyn for the fantastic job they have done over the past several years. And thank Bob and Jim for stepping forward to take the reins of our journal for the next few years – and think about them when it comes time to find a journal to submit your own research. Finally, I hope that our editors (past and present) will inspire you all to find ways that you can make your own contribution to the collective work of maintaining the PSA as the vital and valuable professional association that it is.

2011 PSA Annual Meeting Satisfaction Survey

By Chuck Hohm, Executive Director

Since the PSA has a yearly contract with Survey Monkey and can conduct an unlimited number of surveys, the PSA Office decided it would be wise to conduct a satisfaction survey of members who attended the annual meeting in Seattle. By sending out numerous reminders, it was possible to achieve a return rate of 52.8%. Many of the questions allowed the respondents to comment. This report will summarize the percentage distributions and main points in the "comments" section.

Online program, online registration and registration at the hotel

The first four questions deal with the online program, the online registration and registration at the hotel. Question 1 was "Ease of accessing the online annual meeting schedule". Figure 1 shows that 64% gave responses of "Above Average" or "Excellent" to this question. Only 8% answered "Below Average" or "Not so Good." Thirty-eight members offered comments on this question and none of them were positive. Many suggestions were offered to make the online program easier to use and these comments have been forwarded to the Meeting Savvy, the online site that PSA uses.

Figure 1: EASE OF ACCESSING THE ONLINE ANNUAL MEETING SCHEDULE

	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	33.0%	178
Above Average	31.1%	168
Average	23.3%	126
Below Average	7.2%	39
Not so Good	1.1%	6
N/A	4.3%	23
Comments		38
answered question		540
skipped question		3

Question 2 was "Ease of online pre-registration for the annual meeting." Figure 2 shows that over 75% of the members responded with "Above Average" and "Excellent" and less than 4% indicated "Below Average" or "Not so Good." Seventeen respondents wrote comments and most of these comments indicated confusion with the site and problems using credit cards. Again, the comments have been sent to Meeting Savvy.

Figure 2: EASE OF ONLINE PRE-REGISTRATION FOR THE ANNUAL MEETING

	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	51.1%	274
Above Average	24.6%	132
Average	15.5%	83
Below Average	2.1%	11
Not so Good	1.5%	8
N/A	5.2%	28
Comments		17
answered question		536
skipped question		7

Question 3 was "Ease of onsite meeting registration." Thirty one percent answered "N/A." Of the remaining respondents, 82% indicated "Above Average" or "Excellent" and only 3% indicated "Below Average" or "Not so good." Fifteen respondents offered comments and the vast majority of these comments had to do with the difficulty of finding the registration area in the hotel.

Figure 3: EASE OF ONSITE MEETING REGISTRATION

	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	37.9%	201
Above Average	18.3%	97
Average	10.4%	55
Below Average	1.5%	8
Not so Good	0.6%	3
N/A	31.3%	166
Comments		15
answered question		530
skipped question		13

Question 4 was "Location of onsite annual meeting registration, inside the Sheraton Hotel." Fifty-nine percent answered "Above Average" or "Excellent," 29% said "Average" and 7% indicated "Below Average" or "Not so Good." Fifty one respondents had comments for this question and 45 of the comments were negative, with most of them having to do with the confusing layout of the hotel, lack of enough signage and the difficulty of getting from floor to floor in the meeting rooms area via the elevators.

Figure 4: LOCATION OF ONSITE ANNUAL MEETING REGISTRATION

	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	38.6%	206
Above Average	20.2%	108
Average	28.8%	154
Below Average	4.5%	24
Not so Good	2.2%	12
N/A	5.6%	30
Comments		51
answered question		534
skipped question		9

Clarity of Program and Quality of Book Exhibit

Question 5 was “Clarity of Program.” Seventy one percent of the respondents answered “Above Average” or “Excellent” and only 4% said “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” Twenty respondents offered comments and all of them had to do with ways the program could be improved. Most of the comments were on the difficulty of reading the program because of a lack of space between presentations, etc. The program could be made much easier to read but it would cost much more to print it and that is the reason the present layout is used.

Figure 5: CLARITY OF PROGRAM

		Response Percent	Response Count	
Excellent		36.4%	192	
Above Average		34.3%	181	
Average		24.1%	127	
Below Average		3.2%	17	
Not so Good		1.1%	6	
N/A		0.8%	4	
	Comments		20	
			answered question	527
			skipped question	16

Question 6 was “Quality of book exhibit.” Of all the questions asked, this one was the most problematic for the respondents. Only 26% answered “Above Average” or “Excellent” while 24% said “Average” and 21% said “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” Fifty-three respondents offered comments and the vast majority of the comments had to do with the small amount of books in the exhibit and the lack of publishers being present. The Executive Director of the PSA is looking into ways to entice more publishers to be present at the meetings.

Figure 6: QUALITY OF BOOK EXHIBIT

		Response Percent	Response Count	
Excellent		7.9%	42	
Above Average		18.6%	99	
Average		24.5%	130	
Below Average		15.6%	84	
Not so Good		4.9%	26	
N/A		28.2%	150	
	Comments		53	
			answered question	531
			skipped question	12

Quality of Sessions, Time Sufficiency for Questions and Answers, and Effectiveness of Meeting Space

Question 7 dealt with “Quality of sessions attended.” Sixty one percent of the respondents answered “Above Average” or “Excellent” to this question while only 8% answered “Below Average” or “Not so good.” Fifty eight respondents had comments and 13 of these comments were quite positive. The rest dealt with issues such as the low attendance in many sessions, the unevenness of quality of the presentations and too many presenters not showing up for their sessions. The Executive Director of the PSA believes that many of the above complaints could be rectified if the PSA added additional types of sessions. For example, rather than having the vast majority of the sessions being formal paper sessions with 3 to 6 twenty minute presentations, it might make sense to have a number of sessions with 8 to 10 presentations that are only 7 to 8 minutes long. The PSA could thus cut down on the number of sessions and increase the number of people attending sessions. Also, the standard formal paper session with 20-minute presentations could consist of fully developed papers and not just abstracts or PowerPoint presentations.

Figure 7: QUALITY OF SESSIONS ATTENDED

		Response Percent	Response Count	
Excellent		24.8%	133	
Above Average		35.9%	193	
Average		28.3%	152	
Below Average		6.3%	34	
Not so Good		1.7%	9	
N/A		3.0%	16	
	Comments		58	
			answered question	537
			skipped question	6

Question 8 was “Time sufficiency for questions and answers.” Thirty seven percent answered “Average” and 53% said “Above Average” or “Excellent.” Six percent indicated “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” Twenty seven respondents offered comments and most of the comments indicated that better planning needs to be done by the presider of the session so that sufficient time is left for Q & A.

Figure 8: TIME SUFFICIENCY FOR QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

		Response Percent	Response Count	
Excellent		21.2%	113	
Above Average		32.2%	172	
Average		37.3%	199	
Below Average		4.3%	23	
Not so Good		2.1%	11	
N/A		3.0%	16	
	Comments		27	
			answered question	534
			skipped question	9

Question 9 was “Effectiveness of meeting space.” Sixty seven percent answered “Above Average” or “Excellent” and only 7% indicated “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” Forty one respondents made comments and most of them centered on deficiencies such as not enough space in the meeting rooms, the difficulty in finding meeting rooms, the lack of a central area where PSA members could mingle and socialize, and the need for more elevators.

Figure 9: EFFECTIVENESS OF MEETING SPACE

		Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent		34.1%	183
Above Average		33.2%	178
Average		23.9%	128
Below Average		5.2%	28
Not so Good		1.7%	9
N/A		1.9%	10
Comments			41
answered question			536
skipped question			7

Helpfulness of hotel audio-visual staff; Did the respondent stay at the Seattle Sheraton; Quality of guest rooms; Satisfaction with the cost of guest rooms; & Service by hotel staff

Question 10 was “Helpfulness of hotel audio-visual staff.” Over half of the respondents (56%) said “N/A” to this question. Of those that answered other categories, over half (68%) said “Above Average” or “Excellent” and only 7% said “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” Nineteen respondents made comments and most of them were quite positive. The PSA was given a phone number to call and the number was made available in all meeting rooms. To the hotel’s credit, a staff person would come almost immediately to solve the audio-visual problem.

Figure 10: HELPFULNESS OF HOTEL AUDIO-VISUAL STAFF

		Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent		17.7%	95
Above Average		12.3%	66
Average		11.4%	61
Below Average		1.7%	9
Not so Good		1.3%	7
N/A		55.6%	298
Comments			19
answered question			536
skipped question			7

Question 11 was “Did you stay at the Seattle Sheraton Hotel?” Fifty three percent indicated that they had stayed at the Sheraton. Those that said they had not were asked why and 187 members responded with comments. Leading the way was the expense of staying at the hotel; having friends or relatives to stay within the Seattle area; being able to commute from home; and finding a cheaper hotel nearby. Though the PSA negotiates as best it can with hotels, members can usually find less costly hotels using internet sites such as hotels.com.

Figure 11: DID YOU STAY AT THE SEATTLE SHERATON HOTEL?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		53.0%	284
No		47.0%	252
If no, please specify reason for not staying at the Sheraton.			187
answered question			536
skipped question			7

Question 12 was “Quality of guest rooms (if you stayed at the Sheraton Seattle Hotel).” Eighty seven percent indicated “Above Average” or “Excellent” with only 2% saying “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” Fourteen respondents offered comments and the vast majority of the comments were very positive.

Figure 12: QUALITY OF GUEST ROOMS (IF YOU STAYED AT THE SHERATON SEATTLE HOTEL)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent		57.4%	163
Above Average		29.9%	85
Average		9.9%	28
Below Average		1.8%	5
Not so Good		0.4%	1
N/A		0.7%	2
Comments			14
answered question			284
skipped question			259

Question 13 was “Satisfaction with the cost of guest rooms (if you stayed at the Sheraton Seattle Hotel).” A little over a third (34%) replied “Average” with 46% saying “Above Average” or “Excellent.” Fourteen percent indicated “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” Twenty two members offered both positive and negative comments ranging from the rooms being sensibly priced, to being overpriced, etc.

Figure 13: SATISFACTION WITH THE COST OF GUEST ROOMS (IF YOU STAYED AT SHERATON SEATTLE HOTEL)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent		20.3%	57
Above Average		25.6%	72
Average		34.5%	97
Below Average		9.6%	27
Not so Good		3.9%	11
N/A		6.0%	17
Comments			22
answered question			281
skipped question			262

Question 14 was “Service by hotel staff.” Thirty percent indicated “N/A.” Of those that did see the service as applicable to them, 76% indicated either “Above Average” or “Excellent” with only 3% saying “Below Average” or “Not so good.” Fifteen members offered comments with most of them being quite positive.

Figure 14: SERVICE BY HOTEL STAFF

	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	30.7%	163
Above Average	22.8%	121
Average	14.9%	79
Below Average	1.7%	9
Not so Good	0.4%	2
N/A	29.8%	157
Comments		15
answered question		531
skipped question		12

Quality of restaurant guide and receptions

Question 15 was “Quality of restaurant guide, provided by local arrangement committee (yellow handout)”. Thirty five percent of the respondents did not use the guide. Of those that did, 74% indicated “Above Average” or “Excellent” with only 4% saying “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” There were 17 comments and most were very positive.

Figure 15: QUALITY OF RESTAURANT GUIDE

	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	25.1%	133
Above Average	22.5%	119
Average	14.6%	77
Below Average	2.1%	11
Not so Good	0.6%	3
Did Not Use	35.2%	186
Comments		17
answered question		529
skipped question		14

Receptions at the PSA meeting

Question 16 was “Did you attend a reception?” Thirty percent answered in the affirmative and 70% said they did not.

Figure 16: DID YOU ATTEND A RECEPTION?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	29.9%	159
No	70.1%	373
answered question		532
skipped question		11

Question 17 asked “Which reception(s) did you attend? Mark all that apply.” Keeping in mind that respondents could check off more than one reception, the event most attended was the Presidential Reception, with that event constituting 68% of receptions attended. This event was followed by the Student Reception (28%), the Welcome Reception for New Members (combined with the Egypt Panel) (18%), the GLBT Reception (13%), and the Race & Ethnicity/Women Reception (8%).

Figure 17: WHICH RECEPTION(S) DID YOU ATTEND? MARK ALL THAT APPLY

	Response Percent	Response Count
GLBT	13.3%	21
Race & Ethnicity/Women	7.6%	12
Presidential Reception	68.4%	108
Student Reception	27.8%	44
Welcome Reception for New Members (combined with Egypt Panel)	18.4%	29
answered question		158
skipped question		385

Question 18 was “Quality of GLBT Reception.” Of the 21 respondents answering this question, the vast majority (83%) answered either “Above Average” or “Excellent.” No respondents said “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” The one comment provided on this reception was very positive.

Figure 18: QUALITY OF GLBT RECEPTION

	Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent	38.1%	8
Above Average	42.9%	9
Average	19.0%	4
Below Average	0.0%	0
Not so Good	0.0%	0
Comments		1
answered question		21
skipped question		522

Question 19 was “Quality of Race & Ethnicity/Women Reception.” Again, the vast majority (68%) answered either “Above Average” or “Excellent” with only 12% saying either “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” Most of the 4 comments were negative (not liking all “minority” groups thrown together; feeling unwelcomed; etc.).

Figure 19: QUALITY OF RACE & ETHNICITY/WOMEN RECEPTION

		Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent		31.3%	5
Above Average		37.5%	6
Average		18.8%	3
Below Average		12.5%	2
Not so Good		0.0%	0
	Comments		4
answered question			16
skipped question			527

Question 20 was “Quality of Presidential Reception” and the vast majority (81%) said either “Above Average” or “Excellent” with only 3% saying either “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” Most of the 13 comments were very positive. Former Executive Director, Dr. Dean Dorn, initiated the Presidential Reception and it has always been a highly anticipated event.

Figure 20: QUALITY OF PRESIDENTIAL RECEPTION

		Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent		42.1%	45
Above Average		38.3%	41
Average		16.8%	18
Below Average		2.8%	3
Not so Good		0.0%	0
	Comments		9
answered question			107
skipped question			436

Question 21 dealt with the “Quality of Student Reception.” Fifty-three respondents answered this question and the majority (60%) thought the reception was “Above Average” or “Excellent” with 13% indicating “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” Most of the comments were quite positive. The Executive Director attended this event and was very impressed with the efforts that faculty put into it and the fun the students were having.

Figure 21: QUALITY OF STUDENT RECEPTION

		Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent		34.0%	18
Above Average		26.4%	14
Average		26.4%	14
Below Average		7.5%	4
Not so Good		5.7%	3
	Comments		13
answered question			53
skipped question			490

Question 22 was “Quality of Welcome Reception for New Members (Combined with Egypt Panel).” Of the 51 who attended this event and responded, 65% indicated “Above Average” or “Excellent” and only 8% said “Below Average” or “Not so Good.” The 14 comments were generally positive but a few respondents questioned the wisdom of including the reception and Egypt Panel in the same event.

Figure 22: QUALITY OF WELCOME RECEPTION FOR NEW MEMBERS (COMBINED WITH EGYPT PANEL)

		Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent		29.4%	15
Above Average		35.3%	18
Average		27.5%	14
Below Average		3.9%	2
Not so Good		3.9%	2
	Comments		14
answered question			51
skipped question			492

Presidential Address and Awards Ceremony; Conference Attendance; & Participation in the PSA Program





Question 23 was “Overall experience of Presidential Address and Awards Ceremony.” Seventy six percent indicated that they did not attend. Of those 118 that did attend, 63% answered “Above Average” or “Excellent” and 13% of those that attended answered “Below Average” and “Not so Good.” The 19 comments were mixed and a number of the commentators mentioned the low attendance as being troubling.

Figure 23: OVERALL EXPERIENCE OF PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS AND AWARDS CEREMONY

		Response Percent	Response Count
Excellent		6.3%	31
Above Average		8.8%	43
Average		5.9%	29
Below Average		1.4%	7
Not so Good		1.6%	8
Did Not Attend		75.9%	371
	Comments		19
answered question			489



Question 24 was “Days you attended the annual meeting. Figure 24 shows that, not surprisingly, Friday and Saturday saw more attendees than on Thursday and Sunday.

Figure 24: DAYS YOU ATTENDED THE ANNUAL MEETING

		Response Percent	Response Count
Thursday		60.5%	315
Friday		86.0%	448
Saturday		79.7%	415
Sunday		39.0%	203
	Comments		11
	answered question		521
	skipped question		22

Question 25 was “Did you participate in the PSA Program?” Eighty three percent indicated that they had and 17% said they did not participate.

Figure 25: DID YOU PARTICIPATE IN THE PSA PROGRAM?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Yes		83.4%	438
No		16.6%	87
	answered question		525
	skipped question		18

Comments and Thoughts on How the Conference Could be Improved

Question 26 was an open-ended question that asked respondents “Do you have any comments or thoughts about the 2011 Seattle Meeting, including ways in which we can improve it for next year?” There were 182 responses to this question.

Figure 26: DO YOU HAVE ANY COMMENTS OR THOUGHTS ABOUT THE 2011 SEATTLE MEETING?

	Response Count
	182
answered question	182
skipped question	361

There were some themes that emerged from the comments and they are as follow:

1. There are too many sessions with low attendance.
2. There are too many sessions with a low number of presenters because the presenters did not show up for the conference.
3. There is too much variation in the quality of papers [suggestions: a) require full papers, not just abstracts; b) do not allow undergrad and grad students to present in sessions with faculty; c) get more faculty from research universities to present their work].
4. PSA needs to use a wider variety of session formats, not just formal paper sessions and roundtables [suggestion: a) add sessions that would have say, 8 presenters (rather than 3 to 5) with each presenter being limited to say, 8 minutes (rather than 20 minutes) [this would also result in a decrease in the number of sessions and an increase in the number of folks attending sessions].
5. More faculty from research institutions are needed at the PSA meetings.
6. More space is needed for roundtables.
7. Better hotel layout is needed.
8. Need a better book exhibit.
9. Session organizers and presidors need to communicate better with the presenters before the conference.
10. Need much more time for “Question and Answer” periods.
11. Have fewer sessions with more selectivity.
12. Select a hotel with a common area where folks can congregate and mingle.
13. More sessions are needed in applied sociology.
14. Have the student reception on Thursday night rather than Saturday night

The Quality of the Seattle Meeting Compared to Previous Meetings

Question 27 was “How would you compare the quality of the Seattle Meeting compared to the previous PSA Meetings?” Figure 27 shows the distribution on this question. Forty percent of the respondents responded “N/A” to this question. Of those that did respond, the modal category was “About the Same” (or 59% of those that responded). Thirty four percent thought the Seattle meeting was “Better” or “Much Better” than previous meetings and 7% said “Worse” or “A Lot Worse.” There were 56 comments and the vast majority was quite positive.

Figure 27: HOW WOULD YOU COMPARE THE QUALITY OF THE SEATTLE MEETING COMPARED TO THE PREVIOUS PSA MEETINGS?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Much Better	3.0%	16
Better	17.4%	92
About the Same	35.4%	187
Worse	4.0%	21
A Lot Worse	0.2%	1
N/A	40.0%	211
Comments		56
answered question		528
skipped question		15

Demographics

Question 28 was “What is your age?” Figure 28 shows a positively skewed distribution with the modal category being 25-35 with 33% of the respondents.

Figure 28: WHAT IS YOUR AGE?

	Response Percent	Response Count
<25	18.0%	96
25-35	32.7%	174
36-45	22.0%	117
46-55	11.8%	63
56-65	10.7%	57
>65	4.7%	25
answered question		532
skipped question		11

Question 29 was “What is your race/ethnicity?” Figure 29 gives the results on this question. Caucasian is the overwhelming modal category with 72% of the respondents. Six percent said “other” and 5% indicated “Multiracial.” Both Hispanics and Asian Pacific Islanders constituted 8% each while African Americans made up 2% of the respondents. Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native made up less than 1% of the respondents.

Figure 29: WHAT IS YOUR RACE/ETHNICITY?

	Response Percent	Response Count
African American	1.7%	9
Asian/Pacific Islander	7.5%	39
Caucasian	72.5%	379
Hispanic	7.5%	39
Native American/American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.6%	3
Multiracial	4.8%	25
Other (please specify)	5.5%	29
answered question		523
skipped question		20



Question 30 was “Which category best reflects your institutional affiliation?” Figure 30 gives the breakdown on this question with “Doctoral” and “Four-Year College” being the modal categories (33% each), followed by “Master’s” (24%) and “Community College” (4%). Applied sociologists comprised 3% of the respondents.

Figure 30: WHICH CATEGORY BEST REFLECTS YOUR INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION?

	Response Percent	Response Count
Community College	4.0%	21
Four-Year College	33.4%	177
Master's	24.2%	128
Doctoral	33.0%	175
Applied Sociologist	3.4%	18
Other (please specify)	2.1%	11
answered question		530
skipped question		13


















Question 31 was “What is your gender?” Figure 31 shows that 62% of the respondents were female compared to 38% who are male.

Figure 31: WHAT IS YOUR GENDER?

		Response Percent	Response Count
Female		62.0%	323
Male		38.0%	198
answered question			521
skipped question			22

Question 32 was “What is your highest degree of education completed?” Figure 32 shows that nearly half of the respondents (49%) have their Ph.D.’s. Thirty five percent of the respondents are graduate students or have their Master’s degree. The distribution with graduate students follows: 16% are doctoral students and 19% are Master’s degree students or individuals who have their Master’s degree. Finally, 16% have the Bachelor’s degree or less. Like many regional associations, the PSA has had an increase in the number of students participating in meetings. In fact, the ASA has also seen a significant increase in the number of students being involved in its meetings. This shouldn’t be surprising as colleges and universities are attempting to offer more research experiences to graduate students as well as undergraduates. When students conduct research, their professors and administrators look for venues where their students can present their research. Hence, state associations (such as the California Sociological Association), regional associations and even national and international associations are increasingly offering such opportunities to students. The above being said, we must remember that it is of utmost importance to keep a reasonable balance regarding the proportion of presenters with differential amounts of education and presenters with differing institutional affiliations.

Figure 32: WHAT IS YOUR HIGHEST DEGREE OF EDUCATION COMPLETED?

		Response Percent	Response Count
High School Diploma or Equivalent		0.8%	4
1st year Bachelor's		0.2%	1
2nd year Bachelor's		0.4%	2
3rd year Bachelor's		2.1%	11
4th year Bachelor's		5.3%	28
5+ years Bachelor's		1.9%	10
Bachelor's Degree		5.3%	28
1st year Master's		4.1%	22
2nd year Master's		4.9%	26
3rd year Master's		0.9%	5
Master's Degree		9.2%	49
1st year Ph.D.		3.0%	16
2nd year Ph.D.		2.4%	13
3rd year Ph.D.		3.8%	20
4th year Ph.D.		1.5%	8
5+ years Ph.D.		5.5%	29
Ph.D. Degree		48.9%	260
answered question			532
skipped question			11

Summary

This Survey Monkey satisfaction survey of PSA meeting participants is the first of its kind for the PSA and we anticipate conducting such surveys yearly. As such, we will be able to see how our organization is changing (or not changing) on various important parameters.

Overall, PSA participants seemed to quite happy with the Seattle Conference. However, concerns were voiced regarding the hotel layout, the poor attendance in many sessions, the unevenness of paper quality, the fact that too many people who are on the program fail to show up for the conference, and the fact that the usual PSA session format usually consists of formal paper sessions with three to five 20 minute presentations. The PSA leadership will take these concerns into account and attempt to come up with alternative ways to organize and administrate the annual conference.