

From the Editors

It is with some regret that your newsletter co-editors, Jen Croissant and Franz Foltz, are announcing their resignations. To give plenty of time for a transition, our last edition will be the Summer 2004 printing, unless someone takes up the call sooner. The two-year's notice should be taken as a signal to potential editors or co-editors that the work of producing the newsletter is not at all onerous. Once you have a template and calendar established, it is mostly a matter of communicating with section officers, and taking the information that already comes across your desk and adding it to the newsletter. If it's so easy, why are they resigning? Having done this for 7 years, it has lost some of its usefulness for professional development (networking and name recognition), and is not quite as compelling to do, as to read. We also feel it would be fair to allow someone else a hand at it. That is, we feel pretty well grounded in the SKAT community, and the rewards of community building have attenuated to the point that putting the newsletter together is starting to feeling like a chore. So, if you are new to or established in SKAT and looking for a chance to build and shape an intellectual community, looking for low-effort name recognition, or wanting to help SKAT feel like "home," consider editing the newsletter. Personally, we would recommend this to someone just getting situated in a stable job, while still network building and before being socked with university service work that comes with getting tenure.

Based on feedback from the meetings in Chicago, we will be working on two issues for the newsletter: the first is continued improvement of

(Continued on next page)

From the Chair

Joan Fujimura, Department of Sociology, 8128 Social Sciences, 1180 Observatory Drive, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, 53706; fujimura@ssc.wisc.edu

Congratulations to our Section!

We had a successful recruitment drive, and we now have almost fifty new members, for a grand total of 410 members. Many of the new members are graduate students, which bodes well for building a new generation of science studies researchers and professors. This also means that we have an extra session at the Atlanta meetings. Thanks to all who worked on this membership drive.

Mike Lynch, program chair for next year, has developed a slate of interesting sessions for the 2002-3 meetings. Please look for the information on these sessions in this newsletter and send paper proposals to the organizers. Begin your planning now, since the deadline for proposals creeps up quickly.

The information on the deadlines for submitting papers for the Hacker-Mullins Student Paper Award and for nominating books for the Robert K. Merton Professional Award are also included in this newsletter. Please take note of the dates, so students can start planning their paper writing schedules. You can nominate books at any time, so why not start now?

Please also look in this newsletter for the minutes of our SKAT Business Meeting, held on August 19, 2002, at the annual meeting in Chicago.

Finally, I want to put in a good word for the new Program in Science and Technology Studies that we are building at the University of Wisconsin, Madison. (Please see our ad in this newsletter.) Yes, it is cold here, but this new, exciting program should warm your toes. We have a good interdisciplinary group of faculty and graduate students, as well as many undergraduates

(Continued on next page)

(Continued from Editors)

the Section Website (www.asanet.org) to reflect time-sensitive issues for the section, and to contain the most recent issues of the newsletter. The second will be to seriously develop an electronic distribution option. ASA is not facilitating an “opt-to-electronic” option, and if they have your email address, you will be receiving future newsletters electronically. However, we understand the affordances of paper (thank you K. Henderson) and will pursue that ‘opt-for electronic’ option in the future so that people can choose paper. We hope save the section some postage and printing costs. The Winter/Spring 2003 edition will thus be distributed electronically to all section members who have a working email on file. The remainder will receive it as a paper copy. We’ll see how it goes, and adjust accordingly. Through the ASA, we have listserv capabilities that will also be explored and utilized for time-sensitive information distribution. Newsletter deadlines: May 15, October 15, and February 15. Please send time-sensitive materials to Mary Virnoche (mv23@humboldt.edu), who manages the SKAT Web presence at <http://www.asanet.org/>. Don’t forget to have publishers send review copies of your books to Andrea Hoplight-Tapia (andreatapia@psu.edu), Book Review Editor.

(Continued from Chair)

who are becoming interested in this field. We hope that you will encourage your undergraduates to apply to graduate school here. We are also writing grant proposals to fund graduate and postdoctoral fellowships and to fund joint research projects. Life is exciting and busy, so who notices the cold???

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| From the Editors | 1 |
| From the Chair | 1 |
| CALL FOR SYLLABI: SKAT | |
| Instructional Materials | 2 |
| R.S.V.P./From the Members | 3 |
| Book Notes | 6 |
| On The Web | 8 |
| Nominations: Officers and Awards | 8 |
| ASA-SKAT 2002 | |
| (NB: Awards Citations) | 9 |
| Research Opportunities/Call for Papers & Reviewers/Grants & Fellowships/Upcoming Events | 10 |
| Employment Announcements | 12 |
| SKAT Council and Committee Information | 12 |

CALL FOR SYLLABI

It is time to revise the section publication of the “Syllabi and Instructional Materials for the Sociology of Science, Knowledge, and Technology.” Please consider submitting a copy of your syllabus, whether graduate or undergraduate, to this venture. Prior categories have included: Sociology of Science; Technology and Society; Sociology of Knowledge; Science, Technology, and Gender; Environment, Risk & Agriculture; Computerization in Society. Please suggest other categories or STS/SKAT related courses. I have thought of science, technology, and medicine; Information Technology and Society; commercialization, technology transfer; science communication and S&T and media; organizations and economics of science, and I am sure that there are others which reflect the diverse interests and teaching of SKAT section members.

Please submit syllabi electronically (MS Word Preferred) or as hard copy to Jennifer Croissant, MSE 16C Harshbarger/Mines, Bldg. 12, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 85721-0012, jlc@u.arizona.edu. Deadline for submissions is February 1 2003. In the body of your email or in a brief note, please give some indication of teaching context and course level: for advanced undergraduates, graduates, large-enrollment or general education course, and so on.

R.S.V.P.

Normativity, Sociology, and S&TS: A Reply to Fujimura, Michael Lynch. Department of Science & Technology Studies, Cornell University

This comment is a rejoinder to Joan Fujimura's essay "Is Description Non-Normative?" (*ASA-SKAT News* Winter/Spring 2002). Her essay was a comment on my talk at the 2001 ASA session she organized on "Whither Sociology of Science and Technology?" (A version of my talk was published in the Fall 2001 *ASA-SKAT News*, under the title, "The epistemology of epistemics: Science and technology studies as an emergent (non)discipline.") Before diving into the fray, I should mention that Joan and I have had running arguments about related issues for many years, and thus far we seem to have managed to dig at, and even mock, each other's positions in a way that provokes mutual laughter rather than hurt feelings and defensiveness. I will try to keep this reply brief, which will be difficult because Joan's response was longer than the squib she criticized, and it raised more issues than I can possibly address without further escalating the length (not to speak of the heat) of our exchange. In what follows, I take up Joan's two main arguments: first, on the question of description versus normative prescription, and second, on the relation between S&TS and sociology.

(1) Description, prescription, and normativity. According to Joan, my argument was that "STS's task should be to conduct descriptive, not normative, studies" (p. 1). She challenges this argument by raising the question, "But should STS conduct *only* descriptive studies?" The answer to this question can only be "No". I would hope that readers would not think that I suggested otherwise. A careful reading of my earlier note, comment, squib, essay, or whatever it was, should be sufficient to make clear that I was presenting a particular "take" on S&TS, and not an exclusive agenda for all others to follow. Accordingly, others are

free to reject my preference and, of course, I am free to criticize them.

Although Joan expresses high regard for well-crafted descriptive case studies, she recites a familiar argument against the possibility of pure descriptions that pretend not to express any political position or ethical commitment. Again, however, she is not refuting what I argued. By advocating a descriptive stance toward the topics of epistemology and ethics, I was not suggesting that such descriptions would be value free. Instead, I was suggesting that S&TS "epistemographies" and "ethographies" *investigate* expressions of knowledge and value commitment, and interactions between such expressions, in specific historical and cultural circumstances. There is no reason to figure that such investigations would be more or less free of 'value' or 'bias' than any other topical investigation. I added further that I did not believe that S&TS, or any of the social science disciplines that contribute to it, furnishes stable, case-independent, grounds for advocating or promoting any of the particular knowledge and value commitments it studies.

I am sure that others disagree, but I have severe doubt that S&TS *as a field* provides a distinctive theoretical, epistemological, or ethical basis for taking positions on particular issues of the day like stem cell research, cloning, global climate change, second-hand smoke, animal rights, etc. This is not to suggest that persons in our field do not, or should not, form educated views about these important issues. Nor is it to suggest that such views cannot, or should not, be presented and criticized through extensive research on particular cases and problems. Though I have no doubt that many "STSers", as Joan calls them, make "prescriptive statements" about bioethical and other contentious matters, I think it is worth questioning the basis for their

statements. Specifically, I question whether S&TS, as a corpus of empirical studies, a body of theory, or a collective endeavor, furnishes a general basis for such statements. By raising this question, I do not mean to suggest that persons, or collectives, associated with S&TS should refrain from exercising, expressing and articulating their judgments about controversial (or, for that matter, non-controversial) matters.

The question I raise is whether it adds anything other than illusory support to pronounce such judgments on behalf of the academic field of S&TS (or, STS, Science Studies, Cultural Studies of Science, etc.). The descriptive alternative I discussed would not necessarily compel silence on all political and ethical matters, but it would require a shift in orientation from treating S&TS as a body of general principles and doctrines which prefigures an ethics or politics, to treating it as a body of research that encourages skepticism about the primacy of principles and doctrines over *ad hoc* judgments in particular historical circumstances.

Well before S&TS came on the scene, epistemology and ethics were established areas of philosophy. A traditional, and still conventional, way to pursue ethical and epistemological problems is to seek general, even universal, principles and standards that transcend particular cases. Although many S&TS studies address ethical and epistemological matters, there has been a strong tendency in the field over the past thirty years to eschew universal principles – both as transcendental grounds for investigators' judgments and as foundations of the substantive actions and technologies studied. Given the emphasis on the lack of transcendental grounding for ethics and epistemology, we may want to think twice before saying, as for example Joan does (p. 3), that "science studies have taught us" particular metaphysical lessons (in this case, that "objectivity and subjectivity are not separable"). Substantial factions in the

field may agree with such assertions, but is it really the case that *science studies* have *taught* us to disavow the Cartesian divide? It may be more accurate to say that many (though not all) current members of the fields of social studies of science, technology, and medicine espouse anti-Cartesian views. How they formed their metaphysical views is an open question, and it is unclear to me that empirical studies in S&TS compel, or even support, a single ethical or epistemological position.

Joan does not attribute a single metaphysical position to the S&TS field, but she avows that "[w]e are positioned investigators, and our positions have political agendas." This is itself an arguable position. A point I wanted to make in my earlier essay is that S&TS is not simply a field in which participants express, for example, bioethical "positions". It also encourages investigation of such "positions": of the sources of positions; the interactions between different positions in specific historical and cultural circumstances; and the rhetorical expression and imputation of positions. If my own experience is indicative, such investigations can lead one to appreciate that "positions" are often less than transparent, and, further, the contingent work of imputing positions is itself a feature of the controversies we study. In a given case, one can be led to question the stability of positions and the conceptual adequacy of "position talk" itself.

(2) Sociology. In my earlier essay, I argued that S&TS is a distinct transdisciplinary specialty and not an application of general sociology to a distinct subject matter. In the course of this argument I stated that I believe that scientism remains dominant in American sociology. Joan takes issue with me on this point. She observes that major sociology departments (such as her own department at Wisconsin, which is, or once was, regarded as a bastion of quantitative sociology), and mainstream journals (such as the *American Sociological Review* and *American Journal of*

Sociology) are open to qualitative S&TS research. She also points out that leading quantitative sociologists occasionally express doubts about their methodological choices. We should be grateful for such tolerance and openness, but I was speaking of a *dominant* and not an *exclusive* tendency. Perhaps this would be difficult to verify empirically, and I'm not about to undertake the study, but my strong impression is that, compared with sociology in Europe and elsewhere, American sociology continues to house and nurture a scientific vision of the field's program and prospects. This is not just a matter of the relative predominance of quantitative methods in US sociology departments. It also a matter of the asymmetric way in which "qualitative" research (a misnomer that recalls the early modern distinction between primary and secondary qualities) tends to be defined, tolerated, and even performed as a residual or preliminary type of research. Perhaps Joan is correct to say that scientism is on the wane, especially if we compare the present situation to, say, the state of American sociology in the late 1950s. Fortunately, sociology is, in John Urry's words, "weakly policed", and throughout its history it has been home to non-scientistic approaches and undercurrents of criticism. At present, sociology is, perhaps, less susceptible than other social science fields to the confident ascendancy of rational choice theory, cognitive science, sociobiology, and other scientific trends. So, in that sense, sociology may provide more space than do most of the other social sciences for programs that challenge the dominant scientific trends.

Joan's defense of American sociology is a distraction from the main point I meant to raise by distinguishing S&TS from sociology. My point was that S&TS is a hybrid, and that "sociology" of science and technology is not simply a matter of adapting or applying general sociological theories, methods, or explanatory frameworks to particular subject matter. In the

early '70s, when proponents of the "strong programme" in the sociology of knowledge advocated a turn to the "contents" of science, it may have seemed that they were expanding the domain of sociology. But, as Bruno Latour has frequently noted, this turn to "content" inverted the relationship between social explanation and technoscientific innovation. This is because science and engineering innovations *constitute* and *reconfigure* the active ingredients of the historical societies in which they are housed as "contents", and general sociological frameworks never quite catch up to the fecundity and specificity of the natural/social productions that science and engineering unleash. There are organizational as well as intellectual implications of such a view of general sociology's (ir)relevance to S&TS. Rather than being compartmentalized as a substantive "sociology of x" (where "x" is chosen from a roster of institutions: economy, polity, religion, organizations, family, culture, education, law, knowledge, science, technology, medicine, etc.), S&TS can be viewed as an emerging field that owes its methods, topics, and intellectual orientations to no single discipline. Certainly, S&TS overlaps with sociology, just as it does with history, philosophy, anthropology, literary studies, and other fields, and it is also feasible (and quite common) to pursue S&TS research in association with one or more of those disciplines. As many of us can testify, it can be difficult, and in many circumstances impossible, to establish S&TS programs separate from established departments. The theoretical and methodological incoherence of sociology, which is often thought to detract from the vitality of the discipline, actually can work to the advantage of S&TS, in so far as the diversity of intellectual orientations housed within sociology departments and professional associations can provide temporary refuge for intellectual mongrels and members of various epistemic diasporas. We should not kid ourselves, however, into thinking that the refuge is a secure homeland, or that it is not vulnerable

to renewed efforts at epistemic cleansing in the name of “science”. In my view, the long-term success of S&TS depends upon the robustness of the transdisciplinary connections that first became prominent with the emergence of the “new” sociology of scientific knowledge in the 1970s. Needless to say, any (trans)disciplinary solution to the S&TS Diaspora would have to be a secular space, tolerant of diverse normative stances (including stances that distance themselves from ‘normativity’), and open to cross-cutting debates that dissolve into mutual laughter.

From the members:

Congratulations to Andrea Hoplight Tapia, our book review editor, who has a new job at Penn State. She can be contacted at the STS Program, Old Botany 201, State College, PA 16802, at andreatapia@psu.edu. Her appointment is coordinated with the new School of Information Sciences and Technology, STS, and Labor and Industrial Relations.

BOOK NOTES

Review: Galambos, Louis and Abrahamson, Eric J. (2002). Anytime, Anywhere Entrepreneurship and the Creation of a Wireless World, First Edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Reviewed by **Edward J. Glantz**, Pennsylvania State University (Ph.D. Student, School of Information Sciences and Technology.) Ejg8@Psu.edu

It is difficult not to notice the increase of wireless devices, such as phones, personal digital assistants, and other “smart” devices. To the uninitiated, there is nothing to indicate either the origins of this phenomenon, or better yet, its future. The events we are experiencing are one of those waves of innovation that are best viewed with the perspective of a historical lens to better appreciate the implications and ramifications. For example, consider another innovation from a century ago - the railroad.

Malone and Rockart (1991) suggest innovations, such as the railroad, follow a pattern with 3 orders of effect. The first order is the introduction of a new technology as a substitute, the second is efficiency benefits due to increased adoption of the substitute (which fuels itself by lowering costs due to volume discounts), and the third is the introduction of new products, services and lifestyles now enabled by wide-scale adoption of a new innovation. For the railroad, the third order effect led to social ramifications such as travel for leisure industries, suburbs, malls and so forth.

Not all innovations make it to the 3rd order effect. However, would it not be interesting to have the cognitive awareness of an innovation in process during our lifetime with the potential to impact lives

well into the future the way the railroad did? The social scientist could, for example, identify research on the technical implications, the engineer on support or derivative products and the business manager on new business units. What signposts exist to point out for us such innovations today?

Galambos, Louis and Abrahamson, Eric J. (2002) have, perhaps unintentionally, provided such a signpost for us. As suggested by the title, their book’s focus is twofold. The first is the introduction and current history of wireless personal communication, and the second is on entrepreneurship within this construct. This is an ambitious project because either of these topics could (and do) fill volumes. It is interesting to witness their intersection in this book.

The introduction of wireless for communication is not new. The origins can be traced to Nikola Tesla and Guglielmo Marconi, contemporaries of Bell and Edison. In 1901 Marconi successfully sent the first wireless transmission across the Atlantic Ocean. (Historians can hypothesize the current implications had Marconi and Tesla’s feats preceded Bell by a few years.) As such, one approach to understanding how wireless got from Marconi to where we are today could require immersion in the engineering, regulatory and market events of the past 100 years. Galambos and Abrahamson (2002) have, as professional historians, saved us this effort by doing this for us and calling attention to only what is needed for understanding.

Perhaps more interesting than the technologies are the relations between government regulators and the “old” ATT in this process. It

chronicles the ebb and flow of that relationship over time almost as if describing an old married couple. Of course this finally resulted in the 1984 breakup of ATT, which is really what jump-starts the “modern” wireless innovations. In telling this story, the book focuses on Sam Ginn and Pacific Telesis Group. Mr. Ginn was a top executive of the seven “Baby Bells” created by the AT&T breakup. Mr. Ginn had an inauspicious beginning. His principal chose not to write a college recommendation, arguing that it would only waste his parents’ money. Despite this, Mr. Ginn finds himself in charge of one of the worst financially positioned new regional phone companies after the breakup. Because of this, as the book describes, Mr. Ginn and company really had nothing to lose first with breaking ranks with their former bosses by challenging the terms of AT&T’s breakup agreement, and second with aggressively breaking the “bell head” mold to identify new markets and new products. An entrepreneurial response to difficult circumstances despite a lifelong indoctrination as a rigid “bell head” is the second, and perhaps stronger, focus of the book.

Thus, Pacific Telesis was essentially able to leapfrog, in a sense, the other baby bell sisters out of desperation. What really put them in the global wireless game, however, was serendipity. The

customers of Pacific Telesis in California included Ronald Reagan, who was elected to president and provided Mr. Ginn access to international leaders, who were also attempting to introduce innovation into their government controlled telecommunication systems.

Two years ago Sam Ginn resigned as chairman of the world’s largest wireless communication firm, Vodafone AirTouch Plc. Air Touch, which began as the wireless entity of Pacific Telesis, united with Vodafone in a merger valued at \$62 billion. The result is also historical for what it implies for our future. Clearly we are looking at a technology that, much like the railroad, will change how we work and live well into the future. This book is similar in style to Ken Auletta’s (1991) book describing the birth of cable television and the impact on the incumbent networks. Both describe giant companies faced with a changing regulatory landscape and scrappy entrepreneurs that seem to be made, not born, for their moments in history. My only issue with the book is the possible blurring of the more specific term intrapreneur (“a corporate executive who develops new enterprises within the Corporation”) and more general term entrepreneur (“one who organizes, manages, and assumes the risks of a business or Enterprise”).

Citations:

Auletta, Ken. (1991) Three Blind Mice: How the TV Networks Lost Their Way. New York: Random House

Malone, T. W. and J. F. Rockart (1991). Computers, Networks and the Corporation. Scientific American: 2-9.

New Books & Books Received for Review

At the Intersection of Biography and Natural History. (J. Croissant). For those interested in biography and autobiography in the natural sciences, these three recent books may attract your attention:

- ✓ Bonner, John Tyler (2002). Lives of a Biologist. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. A scientific memoir: a very particularistic and depoliticized view of an intellectual life, but nonetheless adds color and context to the span of a century of biology.
- ✓ Ridgen, John S. (2002). Hydrogen, The Essential Element. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Both a ‘history of hydrogen’ and a history of the intellectual communities that have studied it, although not surprisingly, done so as to privilege a realist, quasi-Mertonian tale of scientific progress.
- ✓ Mares, Michael A. (2002). A Desert Calling: Life in A Forbidding Landscape. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Focused on the natural history of desert regions (Sonora in southern Arizona-northern Mexico, as well as other North American Deserts and those in Argentina, Egypt, and Iran), the author’s biography interweaves with the study of the plant and animal life of desert ecosystems.

Other new books:

SKAT Member **Nachman Ben-Yehuda**, from Hebrew University in Jerusalem is pleased to report publication of his newest work: Nachman Ben-Yehuda (2002). Sacrificing Truth: Archaeology and the Myth of Masada. Humanity (Prometheus), Amherst, NY. The book examines how the 1963-65 archaeological excavations of the Masada were conducted and how they were used to reinforce a mythical narrative. The analysis is contextualized within questions of deceit in science.

ON THE WEB

For your amusement: those into futurisms and the self-promotional activities of public intellectuals might find "The Edge" quite interesting. See <http://www.edge.org> for a fascinating array of thinkers, including scientists, writers, and others, who have much to say about where our world might be going. Brought to our attention by Allen Berg, aka: Phineas St. George, a not-quite-retired sociologist.

NOMINATIONS: OFFICERS AND AWARDS

FOR FUTURE SKAT OFFICERS:

Interested in running for SKAT in the future? Please contact Trevor Pinch TJP2@Cornell.edu. This year we need to elect a new chair-elect, a new student representative, and two new council members. Chair-elect serves for two years and is then promoted to chair, the student representative serves for 2-3 years or until graduation, and the council members serve for three year terms. Also, we are looking for volunteers for nominations, awards, and membership committees. One need not be a member of council to participate in committees.

2003 Awards

Submissions for the **Hacker-Mullins Award** for the best graduate student paper are due on **May 15, 2003**, so please start planning your paper writing with this date in mind. **Trevor Pinch** (tjp2@cornell.edu) is chair of the Hacker-Mullins Award. Faculty, please remind your students about this award. The deadline for **Robert K. Merton Professional Award** is April 1, 2003, but book nominations can begin now. For now, please send your nominations to **Joan Fujimura** (fujimura@ssc.wisc.edu).

ASA 2002

Minutes of the Science, Knowledge, and Technology Section (American Sociological Association) Business Meeting, Palmer House Hilton, Chicago, August 19, 2002. Attendance: 33 section members, including current officers and many members of council.

Joan Fujimura called the meeting to order and introduced council members, officers and committee chairs. She thanked outgoing officials for their service to the section and invited nominations for positions that must be filled. Fujimura announced that **Trevor Pinch** will serve as nominations chair.

Kelly Moore, awards committee chair, announced the awards for student papers. The winners are: Kjersten C. Bunker ("Patterns of Discrimination in Public and Private Science: The Effects of Gender and Discipline") and Park Doing ("'Lab Hands' and the 'Scarlet O': On Models, Identities, and Performances"). **Ann Figert** announced the winner of the Merton Award. The winner is: Helen Longino's *The Fate of Knowledge*. Moore announced that Longino had indicated her gratitude upon receiving word of receipt of the award. (See awards citations, below.)

Fujimura encouraged those present to nominate books and papers. May 15, 2003 is the deadline for student paper nominations, and April 1, 2003 is the deadline for nominations for the Merton award.

Fujimura announced that **Mike Lynch** is in charge of 2003 sessions for the section. Lynch asked that members send him ideas. Fujimura announced that there will be one ASA special session and one ASA regular session in the STS/ sociology of science area.

Fujimura announced that **Tom Gieryn** and **Steve**

Zehr agreed to coordinate membership for the section. Gieryn urged members to help increase membership. This sentiment was seconded by Fujimura.

Fujimura announced that the section would try to have an offsite reception at next year's ASA meetings in Atlanta.

Daniel Kleinman presented the sections 2003 budget. Acceptance of the budget was proposed by Sydney Halperin and seconded by Kelly Moore. The motion passed without dissent. Fujimura made announcements about the section's website and listserv.

Andrea Tapia, the book review editor for the section newsletter, asked for proposals of books to review and encouraged members to write reviews for the newsletter. Fujimura raised the issue of converting the newsletter to electronic form as a way to save money.

Kelly Moore raised the issue of providing a clear and substantive role for the student members of council. Mike Lynch raised the issue of changing the section name and promised a ten year drive to rename the section.

The meeting was called to a close. Respectfully submitted, Daniel Lee Kleinman

Hacker-Mullins Student Paper Award (Co-Winners).

Citation for “**Patterns of dissemination in public and private science: The effects of gender and discipline,**” by Kjersten C. Bunker (Department of Sociology, Stanford University).

This paper evaluates the combined role of disciplinary affiliation and employment sector on the productivity of male and female scientists. In addition, it also examines the role of these factors for an array of means of dissemination. It shows that likelihood of publishing and patenting is influenced by gender, disciplinary affiliation and employment sector, and that gender disparity is greater in industry than in academic settings—other factors being equal.

I think this is an excellent contribution for a number of reasons. To begin, it addresses a socially relevant topic such as gender discrimination in scientific work. Then, it identifies important areas in the relevant literature that have been relatively unexplored, most notably the gender dimension of career development at the intersection of academic and industrial settings, and the role of publishing and patenting across disciplines and organizational contexts. In addition, it develops a creative research design that allows teasing out the potentially competing influences of multiple causal factors. Finally, the “Discussion and Conclusion” section is outstanding, summarizing the finding clearly, reflecting upon its significance, outlining important areas for further work, and in general claiming neither more nor less but exactly what it should—thus avoiding one of the most typical problems of writing by graduate student. This is first-rate sociology, and I would not be surprised to see a revised version in print sometime soon! (**Pablo Boczowski**, MIT, for the committee.)

Citation for: Park Doing, Cornell University Department of Science and Technology Studies “**“Lab Hands and the ‘Scarlet O’”: On Models, Identities and Performances**”

“‘Lab Hands’ and the ‘Scarlet O’” is a co-winner of the Hacker-Mullins Award as much because of the questions it asks and the methods used as for the answers that it provides. Using the “new ethnography,” in which he self-consciously makes himself a subject, an observer, and an actant, Doing investigates how the categories of “laboratory operator” and “scientist” are created, performed, and supported in a laboratory. One of the most important observations Doing makes is to show how the sense of touch matters in the social construction of technical skill. Scientists considered the operators who had ‘good hands’ that allowed them to ‘feel the equipment working’ the most skilled. Some scientists even claimed that the best operators could feel magnetism working. At the same time, operators considered themselves stigmatized by the scientists, marked with a ‘Scarlet O’ because scientists considered them to be little more than extensions of the equipment. Operators, however stigmatized the scientists, considering them to nothing more than “people who have learned how to tell you their theory is right” and who were largely incapable of manipulating the equipment. When Doing asks an operator if a scientist taught him to do the work, the operator replies curtly, “I taught them.” Doing shows how these relationships change over time as a result of changes in the laboratory structure, but never reduces identities to mere extensions of social structure, but continues to emphasize the importance of the interactions between equipment and people. (**Kelly Moore**, Columbia, for the committee.)

2002 Robert K. Merton Book Award

Helen Longino. 2002. The Fate of Knowledge. Princeton University Press.

Books by non-sociologists are considered for the Merton Award only if the work is sociological in nature or of specific interest to sociologists. In *The Fate of Knowledge*, Helen Longino has managed to meet both criteria. Building upon her work in *Science as Social Knowledge* (1990), Longino tries to bridge the gap between philosophers and sociologists of science by calling for a "scientific pluralism" to the study of scientific knowledge. How best to bridge the dichotomous divide between rational (cognitive) approaches and social approaches? Disassemble the dichotomy and then redefine what we mean by rational and social in order to acquire a social account of scientific knowledge.

Longino is among the first philosophers of science to recognize the positive role of interactional factors in securing objective knowledge. Her integrative account continues

the tradition of constructive debate and discussion between philosophers, historians and sociologists of science stimulated in the early seventies by Thomas Kuhn and embodied in the work of early sociologists of scientific knowledge. Longino also addresses other timely and important issues in relation to science--localism, individualism and reflexivity are just some examples.

These topics are deeply implicated in the changing nature of the social which Longino recognizes and incorporates into her account. We will leave it to you to read Longino's solution to the many questions social factors raise in science, and to the question how sociality should be defined and how it changes in its entirety. We think that this book will make you think and that the challenge is profound. (The Selection Committee: **Karin Knorr Cetina, Anne Figert, Jeremy Freese**)

Research Opportunities/Call for Papers & Reviewers/Grants & Fellowships/Upcoming Events

ASA 2003: Science, Knowledge & Technology Section
Sessions for 2003

(1) Presidential Panel
Organizer: Joan Fujimura
Department of Sociology and
Program in Science and Technology Studies
University of Wisconsin-Madison
8128 Social Science Building
1180 Observatory Drive
Madison, WI 53706
608-265-2724 (office)
608-265-5389 (fax)
fujimura@ssc.wisc.edu

(2) FUTURES AND FEMINIST TECHNOLOGICAL
STUDIES

Organizer: Jacqueline T. Orr
Maxwell School of Citizenship & Public Affairs
Department of Sociology
Syracuse University

Syracuse, New York 13244
jtorr@maxwell.syr.edu

(3) Workplace studies in Science, Technology & Medicine
Organizer: Michael Lynch
Department of Science & Technology Studies
632 Clark Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853-2501
Phone: (607) 255-7294
Fax: (607) 255-6044
MEL27@Cornell.edu

(3) Roundtables
Organizers:
Andrea Hoplight Tapia
Post Doctoral Fellow
University of Arizona
College of Education
Room 321C
Tucson, Arizona 85721

(520)626-8221
andreat@u.arizona.edu

Jennifer L. Croissant
Program on Culture, Science, Technology, and Society
CSTS/MSE, Bldg. 12
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 86721-0012
Phone: 520-626-7110 or 621-6070
Fax: 520-621-8059
jlc@u.arizona.edu
<http://www.u.arizona.edu/~jlc>

**18th National STS Meeting and Annual Conference
for National Association of Science, Technology, and
Society (NASTS) and Graduate Student Paper
Contest**

Conference Theme: STS: Organizational Connections –
Opportunities and Bridges

Dates & Place: 20-22 February 2003, Inner Harbor,
Baltimore

Proposal Deadline: December 2, 2002

Call for Papers/Presentations: The conference review committee will consider presentations in a variety of formats, including scholarly paper presentations, focused discussions, curriculum and module presentations, etc. The range of topics is broad, ranging from methods to improve science and technology education through the STS approach, to discussions on the image of science and technology in the media or literature, to analyses of the impacts of technological developments on society and the environment. To get a better idea of the range of topics and presentation formats, check past conference programs posted at the Association's web site www.nasts.org. Both individual and panel proposals will be considered. Graduate Students can submit their individual papers to be included in the Graduate Student Paper Contest as well. (Contest Information at www.nasts.org.) Send paper/presentation/panel **title** and **abstract** or **short description** to:

Constantine Hadjilambrinos
NMPRC, Marian Hall
224 E Palace Ave
Santa Fe, NM 87501-2013

Proposals may also be submitted by email to:
hadjilam@tju.edu

**Knowledge and Economic and Social Change: New
Challenges to Innovation Studies.** April 7-9, 2003.
Manchester School of Management, Manchester, UK. See:
<http://les1.man.ac.uk/cric/2003conf> for more information.

**Undergraduate Fellowship: The Leonard Rieser
Research Fellowship** will annually provide one-time awards of \$2,500 to between three and five undergraduate students seeking to explore the connections between science, global security, and public policy (science students are especially encouraged to apply). It will be presented to students whose academic interests, extracurricular activities, and career aspirations demonstrate an interest in the role of scientists in formulating public policy and in addressing global security policy challenges. See:
<http://www.thebulletin.org/fellowship.html>

SOCIAL MOVEMENTS IN HEALTH: Outline proposals for contributions are invited for the tenth monograph in the series published by Sociology of Health and Illness, in conjunction with Blackwell Publishers, in the year 2004. The monograph aims to bring together the fields of social movements and medical sociology in a collection that is both theoretically informed and research based. Possible areas for contributions are:

- 1) Social movement effects on access to the health care system and to specific services
- 2) Social movements and the social discovery of illness
- 3) Illness experience and advocacy movements
- 4) Citizen participation in creating scientific knowledge
- 5) Social movement theory and health social movements

Potential contributors should send an outline proposal for papers (up to 800 words) to co-Editor of the monograph, Phil Brown, Department of Sociology, Brown University, Providence RI 02912 by **November 30th 2002**. Email submission is encouraged (phil_brown@brown.edu) and all eventual paper submissions must also be in electronic form. International contributions are particularly encouraged. The monograph will appear both as a regular issue of the journal and in book form.

All proposals will be reviewed and notifications of the outcome will be given by 14th January 2003. Those invited to contribute to the monograph will be asked to submit articles of between 6,000-7,000 words by **July 1st 2003**, following the journal's stylistic guidelines, so that they can be refereed in the usual way. It is planned to publish the monograph in **September 2004**.

Employment & Fellowship Notes

Time-sensitive employment announcements have been sent directly to the SKAT website. The ASA (<http://www.asanet.org>) has the *Employment Bulletin* on-line, as well as annotated links to other employment listings and job-search aids.

Institute for Advanced Studies on Science, Technology, and Society offers international Fellows the opportunity of investigating the social implications of scientific and technological development. Applications for Fellowship may be submitted at any time. Contact: Director Prof. Arno Bamme, Institute for Advanced Studies in STS, Kopernikusgasse 9, A-8010, Graz, Austria. Email: kolleg@ifz.tu-graz.ac.at, <http://www.ifz.tu-graz.ac.at/kolleg>

SKAT Officers and Committees

Chair

JOAN H. FUJIMURA
fujimura@ssc.wisc.edu

Department of Sociology and Program in Science and Technology Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 8128 Social Science Building, 1180 Observatory Drive, Madison, WI 53706, 608-265-2724 (office), 608-265-5389 (fax)

Chair-Elect/Program Chair

MICHAEL LYNCH
mel27@cornell.edu

Department of Science & Technology Studies
Cornell University, 632 Clark Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853-2501, Phone: (607) 255-7294 Fax:
(607) 255-6044

Secretary/Treasurer

Daniel Lee Kleinman (05), dlkleinman@facstaff.wisc.edu

Council (Term Ends)

Trevor Pinch (03), tjp2@cornell.edu
Kelly Moore (03), km104@columbia.edu
Kathryn Henderson (04), hendrsn@acs.tamu.edu
Susan Bell (04), sbell@bowdoin.edu
Stefan Timmermans (05), timmermans@brandeis.edu
Laura Mamo (05), lmamo@socy.umd.edu

Student Representatives:

Jennifer Fishman (03) jfishma@itsa.ucsf.edu

Committees (Contact the Chairs to Volunteer)

Membership: Kathryn Henderson

Nominations: Trevor Pinch

Awards:

Publications: Jennifer Croissant, Franz Foltz. Mary Virnoche (mv23@humboldt.edu), Web.

Andrea Hoplight-Tapia (andreatapia@psu.edu), Book Review Editor

Newsletter: Please send announcements and news to either editor. Issues come out approximately one month after the deadline: send time-sensitive materials directly to M. Virnoche (above) for Web posting. Contribute electronically, by regular post, or fax. Deadlines are: **May 15, October 15, and February 15.**

Jennifer L. Croissant
CSTS/MSE, Bldg. 12,
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
phone: 520-626-7110/520-626-2980
fax: 520-621-8059
jlc@u.arizona.edu
<http://www.u.arizona.edu/~jlc>

Franz A. Foltz
STS Department/College of Liberal Arts
Rochester Institute of Technology
92 Lomb Memorial Drive
Rochester, NY 14623-5604
phone: 716-475-5368, fax: 716-475-7120
fafgsh@rit.edu