

# ASA-SKAT: Science, Knowledge, & Technology Section

Winter/Spring 2002.

Editors: Jennifer L. Croissant, University of Arizona, Franz A. Foltz, RIT

## From the Editors

As you can see there is a lot in this issue of the newsletter. We packed 11 pages worth of material in 8 pages of newsletter. Many of the employment announcements went directly to the SKAT webpage, allowing us to keep the newsletter short. So if you are in the market for a job, please look there.

We have the start of a discussion (maybe the continuation of one) on "Whither STS." Please feel free to pass on your comments to either of us. Our contact information is on the back page. As my department is currently discussing its future concerning the possibility of offering an STS BS degree, it is particularly interesting to me.

Mary Virnoche, our web coordinator, reports a new e-mail: [mv23@humboldt.edu](mailto:mv23@humboldt.edu). Please feel free to pass on time-sensitive materials that would not meet newsletter deadlines. Andrea Hoplight-Tapia of Arizona coordinates the book reviewing activities; contact her ([andreat@u.arizona.edu](mailto:andreat@u.arizona.edu)) to recommend books for review, or to submit your (or your students') contributions. Newsletter deadlines: May 15, October 15, and February 15.

Franz and Jen

---

### Table of Contents

From the Editors	1
From the Chair	1
R.S.V.P./From the Members	4
Nominations: Officers and Awards	4
Book Notes	5
ASA-SKAT 2002	6
Research Opportunities/Call for Papers & Reviewers/Grants & Fellowships/Upcoming Events	6
Employment Announcements	8
SKAT Council and Committee Information	8

---

## From the Chair

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

### Is Description Non-normative?

I organized a session on "Whither Sociology of Science and Technology: Contemporary Theories and Methods" for the 2001 ASA meetings in Anaheim. One of the speakers was Mike Lynch, who then agreed to publish his provocative comments in our last SKAT Newsletter. I will take the opportunity of my Chair's column to continue the discussion. With the SKAT Newsletter editors, I also would like to encourage others to join in the fray with your views on where sociology of science, technology, and medicine should go. We have always been a contentious group, and I believe that the intellectual contention has been fruitful for the field. It has kept our ideas alive, growing, and changing, while other fields have become mired in status hierarchies about who gets to determine what counts as the stuff of what the field is and should be.

I will first note that Mike changed my "Whither Sociology of Science and Technology" to "Whither STS?" It is not clear to me that sociology of science, technology, and medicine (note my own change) is STS. Nevertheless, as the sociologist of science in the Sociology Department and a member of the new Program in Science and Technology Studies of University of Wisconsin-Madison, I accept Mike's amendment and will also play with the slippage between STS and sociology of science.

I agree with many of Mike's comments. However, like a good STSer, I will raise several points of contention. This is not to be argumentative for argument's sake. Instead, I take this opportunity to discuss two important issues. One is a debate about descriptive versus prescriptive research in STS. A second issue is STS's relationship to sociology.

Mike argues that STS's task should be to conduct descriptive, not normative, studies. He argues that we should, for example, produce what Peter Dear calls "epistemographies" which examine the intelligibility of scientific concepts, the historical and phenomenological roots of these concepts. Another option for our future STS work, suggests Mike, is to produce "ethographies," or "a kind of empirical ethics that examine how technological innovations provide conditions for *ad hoc* pursuit of political and ethical closure." Thus, rather than take a position on whether federal funds should be allocated to stem cell research, STSers should examine "the technical innovations, political actions, economic interests and ethical

commitments that constitute the debate.”

Mike does not reference the context of his own *normative* recommendations. In science studies presently, there is an ongoing debate about descriptive versus prescriptive work.

This debate takes several forms. One argument goes as follows: STSers should examine issues surrounding cloning, stem cells and other forms of bioengineering, but rather than tell people what should or should not happen, STSers should lay out the stakes and the stakeholders and the history of the development of the technological innovations. This research should then be presented without recommending choices about how to act on the information. I would call this kind of study “descriptive science studies” (i.e., epistemographies or ethiographies). This approach is in contrast to the work of “bioethicists,” which is viewed by some “STSers” as more positioned prescriptive work. 1 Much of what goes under the title of bioethics research and policy recommendations are often formulated as issues of individual actions and choices instead of as the outcomes of processes and institutions that have created the situation where a particular set of choices is being represented ahistorically and acontextually as the only option. However, there are also STSers who make prescriptive statements. Innuendos are sometimes made about their work as being too prescriptive in their positioned statements, their policy recommendations, and their very problem formulation and methodology.2 This dispute (which usually occurs behind the scenes) will continue to grow with questions of federal funding of stem cell research, the issue of human cloning (or, to use term newly minted by geneticists, “somatic cell nuclear transfer”), the artificial production of other new kinds of organisms through genetic engineering (genetically modified foods is just one example), biodiversity projects, etc. I would like to bring the description-prescription debate out of the closet by focusing on that part of Mike’s RSVP text.

In the context of the description-prescription debate, I agree with Mike that one of our jobs in STS is to produce good descriptive studies. Good descriptive studies provide us with substantive materials combined with analytic frames that help us to understand a particular science or technology, how it works in a particular context, who its users are and why/how they use it, who its producers and why/how they produced it, and its downstream consequences for different parties is. Mike further argues that STS should be separate from any discipline -- especially, for example, sociology -- because it would impose a set of requirements that would be in opposition to what counts as good STS research. For example, Mike states that “far from aggrandizing sociology by using its theories and methods to

---

1 However, as an aside, we should be careful about our own classifying and categorizing practices here. “Bioethics” is probably too simply represented here in ways that do not necessarily do justice to the complexity of debates within that “field.” Some debates are about “normative ethics” and “non-normative ethics,” which includes “descriptive ethics” and “meta-ethics.”

2 I refer here to the studies which I consider, perhaps subjectively, to be good research and not to studies I consider, again perhaps subjectively, to be ideologically driven pseudo-ethnographies.

explain natural science practices and products, S&TS research can work reflexively to undermine the general scientific claims of sociology. S&TS does not simply extend the explanatory domain of sociology to encompass the work practices in high, esteemed fields of scientific and technological production, it problematizes the canonical practices of sociological research.”

Here I challenge Mike’s view of sociology and its current relationship to STS. For example, Mike states on page 2 that “scientism continues to dominate sociology in the US.” By scientism, Mike presumably refers to “the belief that the investigative methods of the physical sciences are applicable or justifiable in all fields of inquiry,”<sup>3</sup> or “an exaggerated trust in the efficacy of the methods of natural science applied to all areas of investigation (as in philosophy, the social sciences, and the humanities).”<sup>4</sup> But I am no longer as certain as Mike is that such scientific desires are so dominant. Although sociology, when compared with anthropology or literature, seems to be the least impulsive discipline, there is also disagreement among sociologists about what constitutes the best object for, and methods of, study in the discipline.<sup>5</sup> In my department (Sociology at University of Wisconsin-Madison), where demography and other quantitative research is well represented, you will also find faculty members whose primary work is in the area of theory, comparative historical research, symbolic interactionist ethnography, and/or ethnomethodology. These two groupings are also not mutually exclusive, since there are faculty who combine methodologies.

Another “data point” for the lack of dominance of scientism in sociology is the collaborative invitation of Tuku Zuberi to speak to the department. Zuberi visit was co-sponsored by several research groups within the department including theory@madison, race and ethnicity, and demography.

Zuberi’s recent book Thicker Than Blood: How Racial Statistics Lie (University of Minnesota Press, 2001) is work coming from *within* sociology that argues for the need to examine methods and frames of thinking in demographic research. Zuberi is a demographer and sociologist at the University of Pennsylvania who uses history of science, critiques of “race” as a biological category, and theoretical and ethnographic studies of “race” to examine the demographic deployment of “race” as a causal variable. “Racial statistics are not biologically or demographically based, because both demography and biology developed ideas about race under the sway of the eugenics movement” (p. 106). Zuberi argues that using race as a variable allows causal statements to be made about the effects of race. He argues that race is not a thing in itself; it is instead a social relationship, a process, a sign of domination, a sign of racist relations within this society. Race is

---

3 The American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition. Houghton Mifflin Company, 2000.

4 Merriam Webster’s Collegiate Dictionary, Inc., 2002.

5 Mike, in two sentences at the end of his text, expresses a similar sentiment. “Sociology is not a hierarchical order of sub-specialties sharing a scientific outlook and a set of methods. Instead, it is more of a loose alliance among interest groups with their own partly separate agendas, constituencies, and connections to other fields” (p. 3).

really a statement of a social situation. It is not an innate, unchanging, unvarying attribute of an individual. He argues critically that, by continuing to use the variable "race," social scientists accept "the statistical definition of race as real rather than as a simple reflection of the classification process itself" (p. 106) and that "seeing race as a cause in racial statistics helps justify racial stratification" (p. 103). Zuberi is not altogether alone; there are others saying similar things (e.g. David Williams in sociology at the University of Michigan). Their call is for demographers to think critically about quantitative methods using the work of theorists, ethnographers, and historians. Although their work might not be emblematic of the current state of demography, it is a sign that there is critical reflexive thinking going on even in quantitative sociology and perhaps a sign that scientism may be on the wane in sociology. I wish that we in post-1970s sociology of science or STS could take the credit for producing these changes in sociology. But I think this movement in the field is farther reaching in its roots. Indeed, our studies come from the same intellectual and political movements -- in this case, critical thinking and research on race and racism -- that are provoking some sociologists to examine their own methods.

Yet another data point for change in sociology is a request that I received from the journal *American Sociological Review* (ASR) which is considered by many purportedly "canonical" sociologists to be the best sociology journal in which to publish. Charles Camic and Franklin Wilson, the co-editors, are requesting submissions from, among others, sociologists of science in order to widen the areas and methodologies represented in ASR publications. The editors are in my department, and both are enthusiastic about STS and sociology of science and want my help as Chair of SKAT "in communicating to [the SKAT membership] our sincere interest in receiving their manuscripts." (Please see the announcement on page ADD, and please do submit papers to them.)

Thus, while sociology of science may be problematizing "the canonical practices of sociological research" (page 2), so too are sociologists who are participants in those "canonical practices." I believe it is a mistake to antagonistically position "STS" (whatever that may be) against "sociology" (whatever that may be).

Let me now move back to the description-prescription issue. I agree with Mike that we in STS *should produce* (note the normativity here) "thickly descriptive" research (Geertz 1973), "epistemography," or "ethigraphy." For example, we want to examine the methods by which knowledge is produced in order to make explicit their historical, social, cultural, and epistemological locations. But should STS conduct *only* descriptive studies? According to Mike, "instead of trying to contribute to normative epistemology (or, for that matter, normative ethics), an alternative aim becomes possible: investigate normative usage of 'fundamental' scientific concepts and distinctions in historical and contemporary cases" (p. 3). Zuberi's writings perform Mike's "alternative aim," but they contribute to normative epistemology and normative ethics.

Similarly, many of the interesting STS studies take normative positions. The very choice of which problem to study is often based on what people care about and where they think it

is worth putting their efforts. STS research and writing is complex, difficult, painstaking, and time consuming. In part because of the exorbitant effort required to do the work, few of us choose to study something that has no meaning for us. Meaning often takes the form of having a particular perspective, position, or stake in the matter. That is, we often carry our normative positions into our studies. This does not mean that our positions cannot change during the study as we learn more about the case. It does not mean that our normative positions necessarily serve as blinders. But it also does not mean that we are distanced observers with no political or personal perspectives that might "affect" our research. As science studies have taught us, objectivity and subjectivity are not separable. Like science, STS too has always been a situated set of practices. One of Mike's stakes is to use STS work "to undermine the general scientific claims of sociology." That is a particular position taken by some who adhere to ethnomethodology. And it is a useful enterprise, one which every disciplinary approach probably should have. One could argue that ethnomethodology serves as a watchdog to sociology, just as ELSI is supposed to do for the National Center for Human Genome Research. But I would argue that both ethnomethodology and ELSI take positions, have stakes. Critique is always positioned. We are positioned investigators, and our positions have political agendas. Even Mike's.

If analysis and critique are positioned, can there be descriptive work that is not prescriptive? Consider, for example, Donna Haraway's work, which I would argue, is both critically descriptive and prescriptive. Her work is prescriptive in that she takes moral and political positions on the knowledge and methods she studies. Consider Haraway's statement of her research practices and goals.

We want "simultaneously an account of radical historical contingency for all knowledge claims and knowing subjects, a critical practice for recognizing our own 'semiotic technologies' for making meanings, and a no-nonsense commitment to faithful accounts of a 'real' world, one that can be partially shared and that is friendly to earthwide projects of finite freedom, adequate material abundance, modest meaning in suffering, and limited happiness." P. 579

"We seek knowledges ruled by partial sight and limited voice -- not partiality for its own sake but, rather for the sake of the connections and unexpected openings situated knowledges make possible. Situated knowledge are about communities, not about isolated individuals. The only way to find a larger vision is to be somewhere in particular. The science question in feminism is about objectivity as positioned rationality. Its images are not the products of escape and transcendence of limits (the view from above) but the joining of partial views and halting voices into a collective subject position that promises a vision of the means of ongoing finite embodiment, of living within limits and contradictions -- of views from somewhere." P 590

Haraway's work then explicitly means positioned research and partial perspectives: "only partial perspective promises objective vision." Her writings are examples of critical descriptive studies (epistemographies if you will) that give us the materials and analytic perspectives that help us understand particular histories and sciences from particular positions. If Mike argues against normative epistemology (or normative ethics), would we then consider Donna Haraway's research as out of STS bounds? Would we not want to count Donna Haraway's "situated knowledges" as part of STS?

## References

Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture" (Chapter 1) in the *Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.

Donna J. Haraway, "Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective." In Donna J. Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Michael Lynch, "R.S.V.P. The epistemology of epistemics: Science and technology studies as an emergent (non)discipline." In Jennifer L. Croissant and Franz A. Foltz (eds.), *Newsletter for ASA-SKAT: Science, Knowledge and Technology Section*, Fall 2001.

Tukufu Zuberi, *Thicker Than Blood: How Racial Statistics Lie*. University of Minnesota Press, 2001.

---

## R.S.V.P.

Responses are invited to the continuing exchange started by Michael Lynch's **The epistemology of epistemics: Science and technology studies as an emergent (non)discipline**, from the previous newsletter, and Joan Fujimura's and other responses.

Read or written any good books lately? The Robert K. Merton Book award is awarded annually by SKAT for the best book on science, technology and knowledge written in the past 5 years. To nominate a book, simply send Kelly Moore the title, author, and publisher of the book. The deadline for nominations is April 1.

The Hacker Mullins Graduate Student Paper Award is given annually by SKAT to the best published or unpublished paper written by a graduate student in the past year. The award includes a \$200 prize. The deadline for nominations is May 15, 2002. Send two copies of the paper to Kelly Moore, Department of Sociology, Barnard College, 3009 Broadway, NY, NY 10027-6598.

---

## NOMINATIONS: OFFICERS AND AWARDS

**FOR FUTURE SKAT OFFICERS:** Interested in running for SKAT in the future? Please contact Trevor Pinch [TJP2@Cornell.edu](mailto:TJP2@Cornell.edu).

**Distinguished Scholarship Award.** This new award is given occasionally in recognition of a career of scholarly achievement, represented by a body of published research and outstanding leadership in the study and teaching of the sociology of science, knowledge, and technology. The awardee, who should be a member of the section during the year in which the award is given, will be honored at the ASA Annual Meeting in 2002 at Chicago. The deadline for nominations is April 1, 2002. For each nomination, please prepare a letter indicating why the nominee is worthy of this award. The letter should be sent to Kelly Moore, Distinguished Scholarship Award Committee, Department of Sociology, Barnard College, 3009 Broadway, NY, NY 10027-6598. email: [km104@columbia.edu](mailto:km104@columbia.edu)

**Sally Hacker-Nicholas Mullins Graduate Student Paper Award.** SKAT invites nominations for the Hacker-Mullins Award. The \$200 award is given to a graduate student for a published article or unpublished paper concerning science, knowledge, or technology that was completed during the preceding 12 months. Students are especially urged to nominate their own papers for this award. The award will be presented at

the ASA Annual Meeting in 2002 at Chicago. The deadline for nominations is June 1, 2002. Please send two paper copies of the nominated work to Kelly Moore, Department of Sociology, Barnard College, 3009 Broadway, New York, NY 10027-6598, email: [km104@columbia.edu](mailto:km104@columbia.edu).

**Robert K. Merton Professional Award.** SKAT invites nominations (including self-nominations) for the Robert K. Merton Professional Award. The award is given annually in recognition of scholarly achievement, represented by a book or body of work concerning science, knowledge and technology published during the preceding 5 years. The winner, who should be a member of SKAT during the year in which the award is given, will be honored at the ASA Annual Meeting in 2002 at Chicago. The deadline for nominations is April 1, 2002. For each nomination, please send a brief letter identifying the work(s) to be considered, their publisher(s) (presses or journals), and any supporting material that would help the committee understand the contribution (for example, published book reviews). [Nominations should be sent to Joan Fujimura, Department of Sociology, 8128 Social Sciences, 1180 Observatory Drive, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, 53706; [fujimura@ssc.wisc.edu](mailto:fujimura@ssc.wisc.edu)]

---

## BOOK NOTES

**New Books—Art, Science, and Epistemology. Andrea Hoplight Tapia, Book Review Editor**  
([andreat@u.arizona.edu](mailto:andreat@u.arizona.edu)).

In this issue we present a short list of very recent titles concerning the nature of scientific knowledge and artistic practice, specifically the historical use of optical technologies and new convergences between scientific discovery and artistic exploration.

Castel, Boris and Sergio Sismondo, (2001) *The Art of Science*. Broadview Press.

Crary, Jonathan, (2001). *Suspensions of Perception*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fuller, Steve, (2002). *Social Epistemology, Second Edition*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Livingstone, Margaret, (2002). *Vision and Art: The Biology of Seeing*. New York: Harry Abrams Inc.

Longino, Helen E., (2001). *The Fate of Knowledge*. Princeton University Press.

Smith, Pamela H. and Paula Findlen, eds., (2001). *Merchants and Marvels: Commerce, Science, and Art in*

*Early Modern Europe*. London: Routledge.

Stafford, Barbara M. and Francis Terpak, (2001). *Devices of Wonder: From the World in a Box to Images on a Screen*. Getty Center for Education in the Arts.

Steadman, Philip, (2001). *Vermeer's Camera: Uncovering the Truth Behind the Masterpieces*. Oxford University Press.

Wilson, Stephen, (2001). *Information Arts*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Online: The Work Of Art In The Age Of Mechanical Reproduction, by Walter Benjamin  
[http://pixels.filmtv.ucla.edu/gallery/web/julian\\_scaff/benjamin/benjamin.h](http://pixels.filmtv.ucla.edu/gallery/web/julian_scaff/benjamin/benjamin.h)

**Review:** Hockney, David, (2001). *Secret Knowledge: Rediscovering the Lost Techniques of the Old Masters*. New York: Viking Studio.

By **Amy Scott Metcalfe**, University of Arizona (Ph.D. Student, Center for the Study of Higher Education, Science and Technology Policy Studies).

*Secret Knowledge* is a coffee-table book with an academic agenda as weighty as the volume itself. Yet, it is a research agenda that its author, British artist David Hockney, cannot fulfill. Rather, Hockney presents his readers with a stream-of-consciousness pictorial of what has become a controversial hypothesis about the relationship of artistic practice to the progress of the optical sciences in the period of Western history from the early Renaissance through the Enlightenment. In many ways, this book is significant for what it doesn't say; the visual evidence is compelling, and the implications for the social study of science and technology are intriguing. Perhaps this book is best considered as an open invitation to answer the "elephant in the living room" question: "When, where, why, and how were the domains of art and science divorced in the eyes of art history?" As Hockney has separated this work into three parts (visual evidence, textual evidence, and his recent correspondence with various experts), we are treated to some of the potential storylines by inference: threat of ex-communication drove scientific art-making practices underground, competition among artists and personal pride kept artistic "secrets" further hidden, and a fear of forgery and discredited "masters" held sway in the art market during more recent

times. Certainly questions exist about gender dimensions and scientific/artistic collaborations, as well as room for economic explorations of patronage and the elite pursuit of the "state of the art."

Neither art historian nor scientist, Hockney brashly challenges these epistemological domains and professional demarcations in an effort to persuade others to take up his cause célèbre. Make no mistake, if Hockney wasn't Hockney, this argument would not have much of a public voice, let alone a 296 page tome with 402 color plates. Hockney's strengths lie in his modern-day social networks and in his artistic sensibilities for diverse media and methods. In particular, Hockney has provided a striking example of why the study of art through the means of mechanical reproduction alone is insufficient. Ironically, Hockney claims that while his first ruminations on this topic occurred in the museum while looking at original artworks, it was only with the aid of a color photocopier and a stack of books, which provided easy access to hundreds of printed images, that he was able to assemble a photo-montage of his conceptual design. Thus it may be that we exist in a moment of techno-dominance where we are wedded to the devices that hinder us.

---

## ASA 2002

The section will be planning on the following sessions for ASA-2002.

- (1) **Gender and Science** (co-sponsored by SKAT and Sex & Gender Sections), Organizer: Mary Frank Fox, School of History, Technology, and Society, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0345 phone: 404- 894- 1818 fax: 404- 371- 8811 email: [mary.fox@hts.gatech.edu](mailto:mary.fox@hts.gatech.edu).
- (2) **Law and Science**, Organizer: Jennifer L. Croissant, Associate Professor, Program on Culture, Science, Technology, and Society, CSTS/MSE, Bldg. 12 University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ 86721-0012, Phone: 520-626-2980 or 621-6070, Fax: 520-621-8059, [jlc@u.arizona.edu](mailto:jlc@u.arizona.edu).
- (3) **Expertise and governance**, Organizer: Scott Frickel, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, 220 Newcomb Hall, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118-5698, office: (504)862-3002, fax: (504) 865-5544, email: [sfrickel@tulane.edu](mailto:sfrickel@tulane.edu)
- (4) **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](mailto:fujimura@ssc.wisc.edu)
- (5) **SKAT Roundtables**, Organizer: Andrea Hoplight Tapia, Post Doctoral Fellow, University of Arizona, College of Education, Room 321C, Tucson, Arizona 85721, (520)626-8221, [andreat@u.arizona.edu](mailto:andreat@u.arizona.edu)
- 

Session Sponsor: Science, Knowledge, and Technology Section, co-sponsored with Sex and Gender Section

Session Title: "Gender and Science"

Organizer: Mary Frank Fox, Georgia Institute of Technology

Presider: Mary Frank Fox, Georgia Institute of Technology

Authors/Papers:

1. *J. Scott Long*, Indiana University

The Presence and Participation of Women in Academic Science and Engineering: 1973-1995

2. *Kjersten Bunker*, Stanford University

Variations in Scientific Dissemination by Gender, Scientific Program, and Employment Sector:

A Contemporary Analysis

3. *Semya Hakim*, St. Cloud State University

The Effects of Marriage and Family on Career Outcomes of Scientists

4. *Maren Klawiter*, Georgia Institute of Technology

The Risky Path From Early Detection to Chemoprevention

Discussion: Stephen Kulis, Arizona State University

Topics: Science and Technology (42), Sex and Gender (43), Occupations/Professions (26)

Addresses:

Kjersten Bunker, 450 Serra Hall, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-2047

Mary Frank Fox, School of History, Technology, and Society, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0345

Semya Hakim, 720 4<sup>th</sup> Ave, EB-A 283, St. Cloud State University, St. Cloud, Minnesota 56301

Maren Klawiter, School of History, Technology, and Society, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332-0345

Stephen Kulis, Department of Sociology, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287-2101

J. Scott Long, Department of Sociology, Ballantine Hall, Bloomington, Indiana 47405

---

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

**The 4<sup>th</sup> Triple Helix Conference, November 6<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup>, 2002**, Copenhagen, Denmark – Lund, Sweden. **Deadline April 20, 2002.** *Professions, accountability and knowledge society:* We seek to better understand the role of professions in enhancing/degrading legitimacy of institutions (governance) and the related issue of the status of professions in creation, design

and implementation of accountability mechanisms.

Accountability is understood here to be a process through which social structures (family, community, state, universities, firms, professions, advocacy coalitions...) (re)produce and signal legitimacy, and thus gain power. Traditionally, in the context of professions, the question of accountability would be addressed in

terms of procedural rationality, diffusion of technique and strict control of formal knowledge. New currents in social science suggest an opportunity to complement this technocratic analysis through examination of the roles of professions in development of interactive and participatory -- decentralized, democratic -- dimensions of knowledge society.

While we welcome a range of theoretical or empirical papers that inform this general theme, we are particularly interested in submissions on the following topics.

- Surveys that reexamine classic themes in the history, sociology and economics of professions (e.g. standard setting, market enclosure, social control, role of the state) in light of contemporary literature streams (e.g., innovation studies, economic sociology, ecological modernization, globalization).
- Professions as learning organizations. We are interested in the ways in which the structure and culture of professions, including their relations with clients and various publics, mediates their productive contributions (outputs).
- Professions and environmental management. We seek papers that address the intersection of professions and environment, broadly construed. For example, the roles of professions in articulating risks (e.g., biodiversity loss, water management, toxics) and mobilizing response within policy networks.
- Professions and social movements. The tension between formal knowledge and political beliefs opens opportunities to examine the status of professions in political projects and, reciprocally, the status of political projects in professions. Case studies of newly emerging professions and/or the reconfiguration of older professions are welcome.

Steven Wolf, Dept. of Natural Resources, Cornell University,

USA [saw44@cornell.edu](mailto:saw44@cornell.edu), Scott Frickel, Dept. of Sociology Tulane University, USA [sfrickel@tulane.edu](mailto:sfrickel@tulane.edu), Gilles Allaire, Economie/Sociologie Rurales, INRA, FRANCE, [allaire@toulouse.inra.fr](mailto:allaire@toulouse.inra.fr)

**For more information see: [www.triplehelix.dk](http://www.triplehelix.dk)**

\*\*\*\*\*

**An international conference on conflicts of interest in clinical and basic research** that will feature presenters from the Council of Europe, the European Forum for Good Clinical Practice, the European Science Foundation, and 19 countries will be held on **April 5-6, 2002 in Warsaw, Poland.**

Countries represented include Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, England, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Ukraine, and the United States. American speakers include J. B. Martin, Dean of the Medical Faculty, Harvard University; J. Cohen, President, Association of American Medical Colleges; N. Hasselmo, President, Association of American Universities; J. M. Drazen, Editor-in-Chief, New England Journal of Medicine; C. D. de Angelis, Editor-in-Chief, Journal of American Medical Association; M. F. Marshall, Chairperson, National Human Research Protections Advisory Committee, and L. J. Rhoades, Associate Director, ORI.

The International Conference on Conflict of Interest and Its Significance in Science and Medicine is co-sponsored by the Council of Europe, the Soros Foundation, the State Committee for Research (Poland), and the Polish Academy of Sciences. For additional information visit the conference website at <http://surfer.iitd.pan.wroc.pl/events/conferenceApril2002.html>.

---

**SAVE THE DATE!**  
**ORI Research Conference on Research Integrity**  
**Abstracts Due April 8**

Dear Colleague,

We take this opportunity to let you and your colleagues know about the 2nd Research Conference on Research Integrity (RCRI), which will be held at the William F. Bolger Center for Leadership Development on November 16-18, 2002.

Continuing in the tradition of the 2000 ORI RCRI, the purpose of the 2002 Conference is to gather scholars from different disciplines together to discuss crucial research problems, explore different research methods, and share research results, with the ultimate goal of furthering understanding about ways to foster integrity and deter misconduct in research. See the ORI Website for the pre-publication of papers from the 2000 Conference: <http://ori.hhs.gov/html/publications/rcri.html>

The 2002 conference will also highlight research findings of the first grant awardees of the ORI Research Program on Research Integrity, which was initiated in 2000. Seven awards were made in 2001 with the support of National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke and the National Institute of Nursing Research, (see the September 2001 ORI Newsletter for complete story).

Abstracts for papers, poster sessions, panel discussions and working groups that discuss research on research integrity are welcomed. Research areas of particular interest include: authorship and publication, clinical research, human or animal subjects, conflict of interest, data management, institutions (universities or societies), mentoring, teaching responsible conduct, research climate, and research misconduct. In addition, papers and posters are welcomed on programs to promote research integrity, ways to improve research integrity, ways to improve programs and assess their effectiveness. Abstracts are due April 8, 2002 and will be peer reviewed. Limited travel stipends will be available for graduate students who have papers accepted for presentation.

This year, we will be hosting the research conference at the Bolger Conference Center in Potomac, Maryland. It is a unique and secluded setting conducive for this type of research conference.

See the ORI website for details on submitting abstracts and conference schedule as it develops at <http://ori.dhhs.gov/html/programs/RCRIConf2002.asp> or e-mail conference co-chairs Mary Scheetz at ([mscheetz2osophs.dhhs.gov](mailto:mscheetz2osophs.dhhs.gov)) or Nick Steneck at ([nsteneck@umich.edu](mailto:nsteneck@umich.edu))

Me look forward to another engaging and stimulating research conference in 2002!

Mary D. Scheetz, Ph.D.  
Research Conference Co-Chair

Nicholas H. Steneck, Ph.D.  
Research Conference Co-Chair

---

### Employment & Fellowship Notes

- Several employment announcements have been sent directly to the SKAT website.

#### **Institute for Advanced Studies on Science, Technology, and Society**

"The Institute for Advanced Studies" 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](mailto:kolleg@ifz.tu-graz.ac.at), <http://www.ifz.tu-graz.ac.at/kolleg>

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.

---

### SKAT Officers and Committees

#### Chair

JOAN H. FUJIMURA  
[fujimura@ssc.wisc.edu](mailto: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](mailto: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

TBA.

#### Council (Term Ends)

Trevor Pinch (03), [tjp2@cornell.edu](mailto:tjp2@cornell.edu)  
Kelly Moore (03), [km104@columbia.edu](mailto:km104@columbia.edu)  
Monica Casper (02), [mjcasper@cats.ucsc.edu](mailto:mjcasper@cats.ucsc.edu)  
Sydney Halpern (02), [shalpern@uic.edu](mailto:shalpern@uic.edu)  
Kathryn Henderson (04), [hendrsn@acs.tamu.edu](mailto:hendrsn@acs.tamu.edu)  
Susan Bell (04), [sbell@polar.bowdoin.edu](mailto:sbell@polar.bowdoin.edu)

#### Student Representatives:

Jason Owen-Smith (02) [jdos@stanford.edu](mailto:jdos@stanford.edu)  
Jennifer Fishman (03)

#### Committees (Contact the Chairs to Volunteer)

Membership: Kathryn Henderson  
Nominations: Trevor Pinch  
Awards: Kelly Moore, Chair.  
Publications: Jennifer Croissant, Franz Foltz. Mary Virnoche ([virnoche@sobek.colorado.edu](mailto:virnoche@sobek.colorado.edu)) (Web).  
Andrea Hoplight-Tapia ([andreat@u.arizona.edu](mailto:andreat@u.arizona.edu)),  
Book Review Editor

---

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