MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR:
Jennifer Keahey

Dear Section Members:

Recently, I had the pleasure of attending the Development in Dialogue conference at Notre Dame. Although we comprised a diverse group of scholars and practitioners operating from a variety of intellectual traditions, we found several points of connection.

After a half-century of neoliberal globalization, the politics of development is shifting. Our plenary speakers debated whether the authoritarian turn is giving rise to a new era of neoliberal nationalism. However, we broadly agreed that political instability is affecting development around the world. Several sessions grappled with tensions related to complexity and uncertainty.

To continue the dialogue, I would like to revisit the work of former ASA President, Erik Olin Wright. In 2010, Wright argued the necessity of combining diagnosis and critique with the more complex challenge of conceptualizing social change.

To put it another way, emancipatory development requires connecting theory with practice.

In a forthcoming article in Sociology of Development, I identify three schools that have challenged neoliberal interpretations of development; namely, participatory developmentalism, critical development, and critical realism. Each school offers a unique lens through which to understand the social, economic, and political dimensions of development.

I hope this message inspires you to reflect on the issues at hand and to engage with the new council members as we work together to advance the field of sociology of development.
opment, sustainable development, and human development. As critical scholars have noted, these development schools have been problematic in practice. Yet as theories of social change, they offer a clear roadmap for twenty-first century engagement.

Where do these schools converge?

They all agree that transformative development cannot occur without a steadfast commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. In a world where walls of hate and fear threaten social and human well being, it is all the more urgent for scholars and practitioners to transcend narrow lines of thinking that reproduce social divisions. According to Santos (2014), we must open our minds to the presence of multiple ‘ecologies of knowledge.’ As an interdisciplinary field, development has an important role to play in this process.

Within the academy, the Section on Sociology of Development has been at the forefront of institutionalizing a culture of diversity, equity, and inclusion. When Sam Cohn decided to start the Section, he called Rae Blumberg to ask gender and development scholars for their support. What Sam didn’t know is that Rae had been working with a group of feminist scholars to start their own Section. Ultimately the two groups agreed to unite their forces by forming into one Section and developing a norm of intellectual diversity to guide its governance. Not only was this norm embedded into our Section bylaws, but it also was the spark that fueled our intellectual growth. Within a few short years of its inception, Sociology of Development had become the fastest growing Section in ASA history.

Today we are a well-established Section with a reputation for path breaking scholarship. We support a wide range of services, including a journal, policy brief series, bi-annual newsletters, Section conferences, and several active Subsections. Our governance structure is democratic, and we take steps to ensure intellectual diversity in Section leadership.

We still have a lot to accomplish.

After nearly a decade of rapid growth, we need to shore up our services while continuing to innovate new strategies for connection. In the coming year, we will be conducting a membership survey that will inform Section planning. I encourage you to become involved in this process by sharing your ideas for our development. We also have need of volunteers, including people with strong editing skills and administrative experience.

Please become involved by reviewing the volunteer opportunities listed in this newsletter and stay tuned to the listserv for news about the survey. As we move into the second decade of our existence, it is our individual voices and our collective spirit that will enable us to meet the challenges of a world in flux.

Jennifer Keahey
Assistant Professor of Sociology
Arizona State University
https://newcollege.asu.edu/jennifer-keahey
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NEW COUNCIL MEMBERS

Jordanna Matlon, Assistant Professor, School of International Service, American University
Council Member (2022)

How will you be spending your time on research and teaching this year?

My research agenda includes a couple new papers that will be part of edited volumes, coming out of intellectual communities formed in prior and forthcoming workshops. I am also in the final stages of my book manuscript, *A Man among Other Men: Imaginaries of Black Masculinity in the Long Crisis of Racial Capitalism*. The book explores labor conditions and imaginaries of black masculinity in the French West African metropolis of Abidjan, Côte d’Ivoire. I examine the period from colonialism to *la crise* [“the crisis”] as a narrative arc, elucidating how racialized imaginaries of the ideal man have shifted in response to changing capitalist regimes. Situating the French colonial *évolué* and the global mass media icon as hegemonic imaginaries that shape Abidjanais men’s aspirations, I begin by analyzing black masculinity vis-à-vis capitalist processes of production, consumption and commodification. Next, I engage my ethnographic fieldwork to explore how these imaginaries manifest in the everyday livelihoods and lifestyles of underemployed Abidjanais men amid *la crise*. *A Man among Other Men* illuminates the sustained power of imaginaries even while capitalism affords a deficit of material opportunities. Revealed is a story of black abjection set against the anticipation of male privilege, a story of black masculinity in racial capitalism.

When I am not writing, I am teaching an MA class, Urban Development. I probably give the students more theory than is typical for our professionally oriented degree, but they tell me they appreciate it. I also developed a new class this year for our undergraduate honors students, Race in the World Political Economy. Next semester, I will teach two undergraduate classes: The Postcolonial City and Seeing Africa, the latter about the representation (and self-representation) of Africa and Africans in various mediums from colonial conquest to the present day.

What are you looking forward to doing on the council? What do you think are some of the priorities for the section going forward?

As a new member of the Sociology of Development Council, I intend to listen and learn before trying to set any priorities myself. That said, I will be chairing the student paper award this year. It will be a fantastic opportunity to read what the next generation of scholars is producing, and I look forward to gaining some fascinating knowledge and a solid sense of the intellectual future of Sociology of Development.

Victoria Reyes, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, University of California, Riverside
Council Member (2022)

How will you be spending your time on research and teaching this year?

I’m lucky to be on an AAUW postdoctoral American Fellowship this year to work on one of my next projects, tentatively titled Reputation: How Authors and Audiences Racialize and Gender Place. I return to Subic Bay, Philippines but shift focus to the place’s reputation. This project examines how place reputations are created, reformed, and consumed across different countries in an increasingly digitized world. It analyzes thousands of pages of digital texts from a wide array of sources, including travel, military, and popular culture forums as well as job advertisements and governmental and organizational materials. These represent different types of knowledge and are tangible ways we can study repu-
tation. They also allow us to focus on how and why some place-based images (or “cultural wealth”) become “sticky” and relate to economic activity (Bandelj and Wherry 2011), while others do not. This work tackles important and timely questions like: How do places get portrayed? How is this connected to the economic activity that the place attracts? How does this differ according to the authors of texts and the audiences that are being addressed? I’m particularly interested in state actors’ attempts to shape place reputation, how that compares to narratives on the ground and—for Subic Bay—what that means regarding the legacies of empire and contemporary presence of the U.S. military in the area.

What are you looking forward to doing on the council? What do you think are some of the priorities for the section going forward?

I’m honored to be an elected council member and look forward to continuing my service and involvement in the section in this capacity. One of the greatest strengths of the section is its pluralism and commitment to intellectual diversity. I think the priorities going forward for the section are to maintain this commitment and to continue to prioritize being an inclusive and welcoming section for development scholars across the discipline, including but not limited to underrepresented scholars, first generation scholars, scholars from the Global South, and policy practitioners, among many others. These commitments to diversity and inclusiveness foster innovative ideas, research, and policy solutions. I’m also committed to supporting and raising the profile of section activities, such as the policy brief series, newsletter, subsections, mentoring program, and employment initiative, as well as section-adjacent activities like the journal.

Alvin Camba, Johns Hopkins University
Student Representative (2020)

How will you be spending your time on research and teaching this year?

I’ll be spending my year in Jakarta, Taiwan, and Kuala Lumpur. Between August and December 2019, I will be traveling to visit Chinese projects in Jakarta, Sumatra, Surabaya, and Central Sulawesi. From February to May 2020, I plan to spend time in Kuala Lumpur in order to examine Chinese capital in Malaysia. Apart from the two countries, I recently traveled to Guam, Palau, Papua New Guinea, and Fiji to examine Chinese capital in the Pacific Islands. I’ve been back to the US for several short visits to do some consultancy work, but I look forward to just staying in one area in order to write.

What are you looking forward to doing on the council? What do you think are some of the priorities for the section going forward?

I look forward to doing several things. First, I plan to forward student’s needs and the perspective of someone from the developing world in the council. Since we are the Sociology of Development Section, we need to be especially sympathetic to the needs of our fellow scholars in the Global South. If you’ve lived in the West all your life, there are many things you often take for granted, including but not exclusive to visa requirements, sponsor letters, and others. I plan to forward these ideas during specific council meetings about conferences, workshops, and others. Second, I look forward to increasing the link between the graduate students and the council. If you’re a graduate student in the Development Sociology section and have a specific issue that you’d like to bring forward, please let me know. As for the section, I think we’re on the verge of further institutionalizing our place not just in academic sociology but also in the broader development community. While the section is quite new, we have garnered more and more attention and interests from sociologists and non-sociologists alike. As such, our focus has been to ensure the continuation of section activities in order to further strengthen our niche and academic space.
How will you be spending your time on research and teaching this year?

My research and teaching is in the areas of environment and population, and I approach population and environment as aspects of development, of course. Over the next year, I will be on sabbatical leave and will be working on related projects. Much of my time will be spent developing international-comparative angles to my ongoing work on migration and the food-energy-water nexus in water-constrained, agricultural, and rural contexts. I am particularly excited about the ability to finally spend some time out of the office, so to speak, in the Juarez-El Paso setting, and the Australian and Canadian contexts. On the teaching front, I will not formally lead any courses, but I will engage with students and faculty at several institutions, and I will remain connected to the National Research Traineeship (NRT) program on Rural Resiliency at Kansas State, an exciting new interdisciplinary graduate training program funded by the National Science Foundation.

You are already very involved in the section. What are you looking forward to doing on the council this time around? What do you think are some of the priorities for the section going forward?

I feel fortunate to have been connected with the section for so long now, dating back to 2010-2011, through service as a member of Council and as the Section’s Secretary-Treasurer. I have stayed involved because of the purpose of the section and the people in the section. To me, this section stands apart in the ASA. We all have many things to do. But I have found that this section is more than worth the time and energy commitment.

As have become section norms, I want to ensure that we continue to consider ideas for enhancing the section that flow up from the membership to Council; which means that we need to continue to make sure that our membership is as diverse and as representative of the sociology of development community as possible; which means further, that we must continue to reaffirm our commitment to being inclusive of the diverse array of theoretical approaches, methodological tools, and substantive ideas related to development.

Along these lines, I want us to continue fostering relationships and deepening our engagements with persons, groups, and institutions working on development issues both in and beyond the U.S., and with those working outside of sociology, in other disciplines, and outside of the academy, in policy, practice, and advocacy work.

Development—as a practice, a problem, and an ideal—is the singular challenge of the 21st century. What is meant by ‘the good life’ and how we collectively pursue this ‘ideal’, are social-ecological problems. We—Development Sociologists (!)—are uniquely positioned, given our theoretical and methodological approaches, to lead this effort.

I want to continue building efforts to make the section a home, a base, a hub, a jumping-off point, for people working on the issue of development, regardless of academic discipline, scholarly training, or location in the world. Since the section’s founding nearly a decade ago, the efforts of many people in the section have built a solid foundation from which we have re-established sociologically informed work on development. Looking ahead to our second decade, I want to deepen and broaden our efforts to bring sociological work into the research, teaching, policies, and public conversations about what a better, more humane, more socially and ecologically resilient world looks like and how we might get there.
INTERVIEWS WITH 2019 SOCIOLOGY OF DEVELOPMENT SECTION PRIZE WINNERS

2019 Sociology of Development Book Award

Michael Levien won the 2019 section award for his book, *Dispossession without Development: Land Grabs in Neoliberal India* (Oxford University Press, 2018). Levien is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at Johns Hopkins University. Below, Levien reflects on the project, his future research, and his sources of inspiration.

How did you start working on the research project that led to *Dispossession without Development: Land Grabs in Neoliberal India*?

I became interested in land dispossession before graduate school when I spent a year with an anti-dam movement in India’s Narmada Valley. At that point, the Save the Narmada Movement had been fighting for over two decades to stop the displacement of about 250 villages for the Sardar Sarovar Dam Project. While the Indian government had not resettled much less “rehabilitated” thousands of families, they nevertheless kept raising the dam height. After watching the flooding of several villages in the 2004 monsoon, I went back to the US and applied to graduate school so I could continue studying the issue. In 2007, as I was forming a dissertation topic, a new wave of land struggles broke out across India—not against public sector infrastructure projects, but against private “new economy” projects like Special Economic Zones. These new protests quickly stopped many projects and thrust this once obscure topic into the national and international spotlight. I wanted to understand what had changed; this book was the result.

What do you see as the core questions motivating your research going forward?

I am now pursuing two new projects. The first seeks to extend some of the insights from the book into a comparative sociology of dispossession. The core questions here are: why do farmers protest some instances of dispossession and not others? And why does the character of these protests—in terms of goals and ideologies—vary? Under what conditions do they succeed? And when they fail and are dispossessed, what shapes variation in outcomes? My starting hypothesis is that these outcomes are deeply shaped by the interaction between “regimes of dispossession” and agrarian social structures. Methodologically, this project will involve a series of contemporary and historical comparisons within and beyond India. More immediately, I am undertaking an ethnographic project on more decentralized and “criminal” forms of land grabbing undertaken by so-called “land mafia.” While this term is used widely in contemporary India, I want to understand: what exactly are land mafia and what enables their activity? Why have they seemingly become more widespread after several decades of economic reforms that were supposed to reduce this type of corruption? In turns out that a number of informants from my first project were, by any definition, “land mafia.” So that is my starting point.

What are one or two of your favorite books or articles that you’ve turned to for inspiration and insight?

A few books were particularly important sources of inspiration for this project. First of all there are Michael Burawoy’s monographs on factory regimes and his methodological collection *The Extended Case Method*, which I brought with me to Rajpura. These inspired my attempt to make some large arguments about the relationship between dispossession and capitalism through a village study. James Scott’s *Weapons of the Weak* remains, to my mind, a model for how to ethnographically study the development of capitalism in an agrarian context. While Scott showed how agricultural capitalism transformed social relations and politics in “Sedaka,” I attempted to do something analogous for real estate capitalism in “Rajpura.” In doing so, I tried to avoid the twin pitfalls of romanticism and uncritical modernism, which plague the study of dispossession, and found Raymond Williams’ delicate handling of this in *The Country and the City* highly instructive. Finally, I was deeply moved by Abdel Rahman Munif’s remarkable novel, *Cities of Salt*, which
chronicles the development of oil capitalism in the Gulf from the perspective of an oasis village. Much of what he describes—the unannounced arrival of prospectors, the collusion between local government and the oil companies, brutal dispossession and proletarianization, and yet the profiteering of village middlemen at the expense of fellow villagers—resonated a great deal in my fieldsite!

---

2019 Sociology of Development Book Award | Honorable Mention

Marie Berry is an Assistant Professor at the Josef Korbel School of International Studies at the University of Denver. Her book, *War, Women, and Power: From Violence to Mobilization in Rwanda and Bosnia-Herzegovina*, won the Honorable Mention for the 2019 section book award. Below, Berry discusses the roots of her project, her future research, and her sources of inspiration.

How did you start working on the research project that led to your book *War, Women, and Power*?

The roots of this book are buried deep in my own personal story and intellectual trajectory as a scholar. Before graduate school, I worked with Holocaust survivors in Seattle as part of the Holocaust Center for Humanity. I found myself amazed both by the tremendous horror they had lived through, as well as by their resilience and capacity to keep living and moving forward in their lives. The duality, of both suffering and resilience, of pain and growth, is what led to my own focus on war and its aftermath.

The idea for the research began to form when I was in Rwanda collaborating with young human rights activists in 2007 and 2008. I heard story after story of women who were “just housewives” before the war and genocide, but who had become community leaders or founders of grassroots organizations in the aftermath. These stories contrasted with everything I had read about women’s experience during the Rwandan genocide, which focused on their suffering, victimization, and experiences of sexual violence. As I began a PhD program, I began to more systematically explore how war is not only a period of destruction, but also a period of rapid social and institutional transformation. At the core of the book, which emerged from my dissertation work at UCLA, is thus an attempt to better understand the processes through which women in Rwanda and Bosnia experienced war, bear witness to its effects, and exhibit agency in ways often obscured by journalistic coverage or social science research emphasizing their suffering.

What do you see as the core questions motivating your research going forward?

My ongoing research remains motivated by the overarching question of how violence impacts societies, and women in particular. One of the depressing conclusions of *War, Women, and Power* is that many of the gains women made during the postwar period in both Rwanda and Bosnia were eventually set back by various factors—including the structure of the political settlement that created hierarchies of victimhood, the rapidly changing priorities of the international humanitarian regime, and a revitalization of patriarchy. While there isn’t space to elaborate here, these factors allowed women with particular backgrounds and war experiences to gain power and visibility in their societies after war, creating new inequalities and social fissures. In my current work with Milli Lake (London School of Economics), we are exploring *which women* are able to sustain momentum around gender rights after war, and who remains marginalized in that process. The Women’s Rights After War Project (WRAW), which we are spearheading in 10 postwar countries, uses feminist, participatory, and arts-based methods to better theorize the durability and equity of women’s empowerment after war.

Within this project, I see my own gaze increasingly drawn towards considering how we conceptualize and study violence. Scholars of political violence (including myself) often study cases of war, revolution, or genocide that are classifiable or legible—we study them over and over again and can name opposing sides, victims and perpetrators, aggressors and bystanders. But I am increasingly drawn to how violence, as experienced by those who live through it, isn’t...
constrained to the narrow logics that often structure our analysis. So many women I’ve interviewed over the years in postwar contexts have not only experienced insecurity and violence from opposing forces or “the enemy,” but also from intimate partners, police, relief workers, the transitional justice system, their lack of access to health care, poverty, the changing climate and ecological collapse. Which forms of violence deserve our attention as scholars? And which types of suffering deserve our grief?

Earlier this month I was in Nepal as part of the WRAW Project. One day, I complained of the air pollution and an activist remarked that there were no healthy women in the region. Stunned by the bluntness of this response, I learned then that more people die every year of air pollution related illnesses in Nepal than were killed during the entire 10-year-long Maoist insurgency. With inspiration from Judith Butler, I have been wrestling with what makes certain forms of death and violence grievable and therefore the subject of my own attention, and others invisible. I am committed to foregrounding the interconnectedness of these various forms of violence in my research going forward.

What are one or two of your favorite books or articles that you’ve turned to for inspiration and insight?

While I read novels constantly for writing inspiration, I find myself often returning to books by Sara Ahmed, Rebecca Solnit, and Audre Lorde for intellectual inspiration. Recently, I’ve been reading more on eco despair and the climate crisis—I just finished Rob Nixon’s book, *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*, and wish I had read it sooner. I’ve also been reading speeches and writing from activists who are fighting every day against oppression in all of its forms. Activists have so much to teach academics; I’ve learned so by reading work by women of color in the US who have been fighting against the restrictions on access to abortion, as well as from indigenous activists from across Latin America who have been calling our attention to the violence of climate destruction for decades. Reading outside of the discipline and my own subfields has been an absolutely vital part of my own (ongoing) education.

2019 Sociology of Development Faculty Article Award

Yan Long is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of California, Berkeley. Her article, “The Contradictory Impact of Transnational AIDS Institutions on State Repression in China, 1989-2013,” published last year in the *American Journal of Sociology*, won the section award for best faculty article.

How did you start working on the research project that led to your article?

My fieldwork for this article began in 2007. As I followed the evolution of Chinese AIDS activism, it became clear that I was observing demobilization and social movement decline. Repression was a major factor in this process. But to truly understand the nonviolent, covert, indirect and softer strategies of repression and their mechanisms was difficult. Not only have existing studies overwhelmingly focused on state violence and coercion especially in the authoritarian context, the years of tracking and recording the death of a movement I loved was mentally draining. I was filled with frustration and anger watching how the movement was quietly dissolved from both inside and outside. Writing this article thus served as an emotional outlet for me.

How have the findings you outline in this article influenced your overall research agenda? What do you see as the core questions motivating your research going forward?

I continue to examine the triangular dynamics of transnational organizations, the state, and social movements in my forthcoming book, *Side Effects: The Transnational Making and Unmaking of AIDS Politics*. The book demonstrates how foreign interventions drove the building of a participatory-democracy-based infectious disease control system in China. AIDS mobilization was a sharp sword cast by transnational forces. But it played into the hands of Chinese health bureaucrats who utilized the AIDS movement to regain and expand their control. My findings challenge the prevalent
but false dichotomy between democracy and authoritarianism by showing how the installment of particular sets of
democratic practices might contribute to the consolidation and expansion of the authoritarian political apparatus.

The interplay between globalization and authoritarianism is a core question in my research agenda. My theoretical
commitment is to bridge the gap between organizational studies and institutional theory, on the one hand, and com-
parative politics and transnational relations studies, on the other. How to understand the rationalization of authoritar-
ian and democratic power remains a major theme. In my new research project, I study the local experiences of global
trends manifested in the different configuration of nonprofit sectors in six global cities in North America, Oceania,
Western Europe, and East Asia. In particular, I am looking at the various ways in which the proliferation of profes-
sionalization, quantification, ranking/evaluation, and Internet technologies shape the interactions between authoritar-
ian and democratic practices that influence urban associational life. Hopefully my research can demonstrate the analy-
tical payoff of utilizing transnational perspectives.

What are one or two of your favorite books or articles that you’ve turned to for inspiration and insight?

I tend to be inspired by a wide range of studies from various disciplines such as comparative politics, international
relations, international development, health and medicine, science and technology, organizational studies, gender and
sexualities, etc. And I constantly struggle with the irony that I am an ethnographer drawn to “big structures and large
processes” described by Charles Tilly (1984). Currently I am obsessed with new transnational history. I benefit from
books such as The Company and the Shogun: The Dutch Encounter with Tokugawa Japan by Adam Clulow and Mecca of Revolu-
tion: Algeria, Decolonization and the Third World Order by Jeffrey Byrne. Transnational history studies analyze how partic-
ular regions are linked through specific practices, networks, or institutions. This is not to portray abstract globalization
in the aggregate but to highlight individual agency in relations to the world. Such approach speaks to my desire to de-
naturalize nation-states and expose paradoxes that are often overlooked in nation-state-bound studies.

2019 Sociology of Development Faculty Article Award | Honorable Mention

Yao Lu is an Associate Professor of Sociology, and faculty affiliate of the Columbia Pop-
ulation Research Center (CPRC), Weatherhead East Asian Institute (WEAI), Institute for
Social and Economic Research and Policy (ISERP), Institute of Latin American Studies
(ILAS), and Data Science Institute (DSI) at Columbia University.

How did you start working on the research project that led to the article “Empow-
erment or Disintegration? Migration, Social Institutions, and Collective Action in
Rural China,” forthcoming in AJS?

I have long been interested in the consequences of out-migration for sending communities and have studied many
aspects of the social consequences (health, family structure and child development, etc.). I was intrigued to understand
whether the profound impact of migration for sending communities extends to the political arena.

What do you see as the core questions motivating your research going forward?

In the article, I find opposing effects of migration on collective action. The positive and negative impacts result from,
respectively, political diffusion and community disintegration induced by migration. The key question is how the two
opposing processes balance out to shape the overall influence of migration—which I believe is conditioned by both
the local social landscape and the broader institutional context underlying a particular migration stream. With increas-
ing migration worldwide, the question of the political impact of transnational or trans-local migration becomes espe-
cially relevant. The influence may play out differently in other contexts of migration depending on the local and
broader contexts. These are really interesting questions to pursue.
What are one or two favorite books or articles that you’ve turned to for inspiration and insight?


2019 Sociology of Development Graduate Student Paper Award

Luciana de Souza Leão is a postdoctoral fellow in Sociology at the University of Michigan, where she will start a position as an Assistant Professor in Fall 2021. Her paper, “Optics of the State: The Politics of Making Poverty Visible in Brazil and Mexico,” won the section’s Graduate Student Paper Award.

How did you start working on the research project that led to your paper?

My research examines the critical role that social policy evaluations play in creating the political viability of welfare programs in Latin America. I first became interested in this topic when I was working as an economist in the Development Research Group at the World Bank in Brazil (2010-2012), where questions emerged regarding the politics of establishing evidence hierarchies for assessing success (or failure) in poverty-alleviation efforts in the developing world. While there seemed to be an overwhelming enthusiasm for the prospects of adopting randomized controlled trials (RCTs) to find out “what works” at institutions like the World Bank, I could also notice a strong rejection of the experimental approach among street-level bureaucrats and mid-level policymakers in Brazil. When I decided to quit economics and come to what I consider a better side of the social sciences to start my PhD in Sociology, I built directly on this firsthand experience to investigate the political, institutional and epistemic reasons that RCTs were so attractive for development practitioners and scholars, but were rejected by government officials that tended to prefer other types of evaluation methodologies.

What do you see as the core questions motivating your research going forward?

I am currently working on a book project, *Experimenting on the Poor: The Politics of Social Policy Evaluations in Latin America*, in which I address two sets of questions. The first asks how knowledge production and measurement practices affect the outcomes of anti-poverty programs. Here, I am interested in understanding how bureaucratic disputes over measurement have real consequences for poor families by studying how these seemingly technical disputes shape the social distribution of power inside the state, and hence how policymakers handle anti-poverty programs. The second set of questions has a more comparativist tone and aims to investigate what happens when states that have different political histories initiate the same poverty-alleviation programs: Do they face similar legitimation and implementation challenges? Here, I am interested in understanding specifically how Conditional Cash Transfer programs (CCTs) are shaped by the challenges that states face to legitimate these programs, i.e. by how states justify “simply giving cash to the poor” to distinct audiences.

What are one or two of your favorite books or articles that you’ve turned to for inspiration and insight?

As a scholar, I have also been interested in how institutional continuities make poverty and inequality so resilient to change, even when states adopt progressive policies designed to reduce socioeconomic disparities. Addressing this question requires an analytical framework to study change and continuity in long-term social processes, and for this purpose I always go back to Reinhard Bendix (1964)’s *Nation-Building and Citizenship: Studies of Our Changing Order*. I find
Chapters 1 and 8 particularly insightful to study processes of change in developing countries. As a comparativist, I have also been inspired by what I consider exemplary comparative work, such as Elisa Reis and Mike Moore’s (2005) *Elite Perceptions of Poverty and Inequality* and Marion Fourcade (2010)’s *Economists and Societies.*

---

### 2019 Sociology of Development Graduate Student Paper Award | Honorable Mention

**Catalina Vallejo Pedraza** is a PhD candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Virginia. Her paper, “Economic Reparations, Entrepreneurship, and Post-Conflict Development: Evidence from Colombia,” won the Honorable Mention for the section’s Graduate Student Paper Award.

**How did you start working on the research project that led to your paper?**

This paper is one of the three that constitute my dissertation. In this project, I compared how the Colombian and Peruvian state created reparation programs to compensate victims of civil conflict. These programs were engineered as transitional justice measures with the hope that they were going to provide recognition to those who experience gross human rights violations. I started fieldwork in Colombia in 2016 and one of the things that called my attention was that reparations were approached not only as a matter of rights but also as one of economic development. During interviews and observations, I kept hearing state officials talk about the importance of investing the reparation and controlling any impulse of using the compensation money in leisure activities or frivolous expenses. I decided to inquire more about why it was so important for the Colombian state to educate victims on making a good/responsible use of the reparations.

**What do you see as the core questions motivating your research going forward?**

I just finished my dissertation and I wish I could say I am done with the questions I had in this project but I am still answering them. I collected a big amount of data that I would like to use for my book project and to keep exploring three questions I care about deeply. First, how countries imagine themselves as post-conflict societies after years of violence and destruction. My research mostly focuses on the economic future nations like Colombia and Peru envision as the path to build peaceful societies. Second, I am interested in post-conflict state building and the role of lawyers and economists in engineering bureaucracies, budgets, and institutions. Third, I want to explore more the relationship between suffering, money and compensation to theorize the different meanings money carries when used to pay victims for their losses.

**What are one or two of your favorite books or articles that you’ve turned to for inspiration and insight?**

My favorite article for the last 5 years has been “Cents and Sensibility: Economic Values and the Nature of ‘Nature’ in France and America” by Marion Fourcade. It was by reading this piece that I became interested in how societies price things that, like suffering, lack a market price. There is a book I consult regularly for theoretical inspiration, methodological answers, and historical knowledge and it is *The Sympathetic State,* by Michele Landis Dauber. This wonderful book explains how social assistance programs in the US were born from programs that aimed at helping victims of misfortunes, which was incredibly helpful to understand the Colombian case better. Finally, Jenn Bair and Phillip A. Hough’s article “The Legacies of Partial Possession: From Agrarian Struggle to Neoliberal Restructuring in Mexico and Colombia” is for me a great example of top-notch comparative historical analysis about Latin America.
Sociology of Development Conference

The University of Notre Dame hosted the 2019 Sociology of Development Conference, “Development in Dialogue: Engaging Practitioners and Across Disciplines,” which drew more than 200 scholars and development practitioners from around the globe. The conference theme highlighted exciting ways that sociological research can contribute to (and learn from) broader communities working on a wide range of development-related topics. Taking the theme seriously, paper panels featured sociological research alongside presentations from other disciplines, including economists, political scientists, ethicists, peace studies, and urban landscape design. Paper sessions addressed longstanding themes within Sociology of Development, including socioeconomic growth trajectories, political institutions, health, and gender, while also showcasing growing new research interest in topics like development practitioners as a profession and the role of meaning-making and discourse analysis in development scholarship. The pre-conference workshop featured extended dialogue among scholars developing new sociological scholarship on corruption.

The theme of dialogue was also reflected in a series of three plenary panels, each of which differently engaged ways sociology can engage in dialogue, featuring combinations of scholars and researchers with experience in development practice. The opening Friday plenary featured Peter Evans (UC Berkeley), Patrick Heller (Brown University), Ann Mische (Notre Dame), and Walden Bello (Binghamton), with Jim Mahoney discussing. That panel examined the rise of populist politics, demonstrating how comparative and case analysis in sociological scholarship can illuminate pressing contemporary social issues. If you missed the conference but want to check out the presentations, videos of some panels—including the plenary sessions—are available on the conference website: devcon19.weebly.com.

The Saturday morning plenary challenged scholars to think about whether, how, and to what ends scholarship might seek to influence the world, featuring Sakiko Fukuda-Parr (the New School and former director of the UNDP Human Development reports), Ray Offenheiser (Notre Dame), Ann Swidler (UC Berkeley), and Michael Woolcock (the World Bank). Fukuda-Parr argued that understanding of the social world is informed by the transformation of words into numbers, but we principally measure things where there are vocal groups in the West pushing for measures, which leaves out issues important to the daily lives of people in the Global South. Swidler passionately argued that Malawians want modernity but without rule of law and an effective labor market, so many reforms go awry, and therefore cautioned against undermining valued institutions that work for people, like chieftaincy, if you can’t actually do better at providing people’s daily needs. Woolcock argued that if you want to influence others, you have to take time to understand and honor their epistemic community, whether that means a local village or economists at the World Bank. He encouraged sociologists to go beyond critique, observing that systems don’t change by yelling at them, so instead show how a new idea works, say how to actually build it, and put effort into making it happen.

Carrying forward that theme, the Saturday lunch plenary featured a panel of practitioners who spoke about how sociologists could find traction engaging development organizations in collaborative research or with the policy implications of sociological research. This panel was chaired by Ray Offenheiser (Former President of Oxfam America), featuring Michelle Adato (Senior Operations Advisor at Millennium Challenge Corporation), Naomi Hossain (Research Professor at American University and Former Research Fellow at the UK Institute of Development Studies), and Kimberly Pfeifer (Head of Research for Oxfam). Panelists mentioned that they do not often have time to browse full research articles, but some try to do so, and often encounter new research by attending conferences. Perhaps surprising to some, they countered prevailing beliefs that development organizations are only interested in big quantitative data or RCTs, mentioning that there is a growing interest in qualitative research within policy circles, as policymakers increasingly understand a need to know the narratives in order to under-
stand the numbers. Overall, these research-oriented practitioners professed a hunger to hear about sociological research that speaks in practical ways to the kinds of decisions their organizations regularly have to make, carrying forward the idea that if sociologists can learn to express our ideas in ways that are accessible to the epistemic community of development practice, there is an eager audience out there.

We are incredibly grateful to the generous sponsoring institutions across Notre Dame whose donations made the conference possible. We were particularly delighted to be able to offer travel grants to four dozen participants. In closing we want to highlight two new things the conference tried this year, both of which were incredibly successful. First, we created the option to pay a modest voluntary registration fee, 100% of which was used to provide more travel grants for under-resourced attendees. It was a great pleasure to see the big hearts of the development section in action: one quarter of the travel grants were made possible thanks to the generosity of other conference attendees.

Second, on Friday evening we offered an optional development Trivia Night, where participants met new friends and matched wits with other teams while enjoying pizza and beer. Could you recognize a photo of Timbuktu? Know the world’s second-largest importer of rice? The oldest stock exchange in the global south? Identify hot sauce by taste alone? Then you’d have loved Trivia Night. We are deeply grateful to the generous authors from the section who donated their books as prizes. Twenty-one books were donated, which were displayed at the conference and then given as prizes to the top-finishing Trivia teams.

Thanks to all the participants who helped make the 2019 Conference such a great experience!

The 2019 Conference Organizing Committee
Erin McDonnell, Ann Mische, Tamara Kay (ND Sociology Faculty)
Jake Dillabaugh, Luiz Vilaça, Tomáš Gold, Leslie MacColman (ND Grad Students)
Therese Hanlon (Kellogg Institute Events Program Manager)
DEVELOPMENT IN AN ERA OF GLOBAL STUDIES

What does development mean in today’s world? Is there such a thing as “national development” under globalization? How can we see development studies in light of the rise to prominence of global studies? How is development changing under today’s socio-economic conditions, and in regards to various institutions and different exploited, racialized, and gendered social strata? Sociologists studying development tackle a variety of structural problems faced by diverse communities. In the two essays below, M.S. Sreerekha, Rosalba Icaza, Jeb Sprague, and Hilbourne Watson provide some brief thoughts on the fundamental characteristics of development in today’s era of globalization.

Gender, Development and the Global

What kinds of questions are asked about development from a feminist perspective? Moreover, what kinds of questions are asked about development from across the colonial difference? How do we understand the fact that women constitute half of the world’s population and contribute equally to the world’s total production? For some, the meaning of development for women then should also lead to the question of women’s ownership and control of capital, labour and production in the world. However, the developmental model based on capitalism and modernity seems to have shown its own failure in addressing the needs and aspirations of the majority of the world’s population.

In response to this reality, important feminist critiques of development were produced by scholars in the 1980s from a “underdeveloped third world” perspective along with others (Sen and Grown 1988). These early critiques revealed how during the colonial period, development, modernity and patriarchy together contributed in a major way to increasing poverty, debt and disease for the majority of the population. However, what these early critiques didn’t reveal was the underside of development/modernity/patriarchy, in other words, the coloniality of power, capitalism, knowledge, being, and gender.

Capitalism, Gender and Development

Escobar, a well-known critic of the development project (1992) asserted that the economy of development stemmed from the post-World War II growth of capitalism while the idea of development evolved around a capitalist version of economic development. Further, feminist scholars of development debated that the very idea around development and modernity and the economy of labour and capital is fundamentally linked to and is built upon a sexual/gender division of labour which mostly negated women’s active role in the project of development. This has been made possible historically through the growth of a capitalist economy, which is based on making a clear distinction between production and reproduction and also among paid, unpaid and less paid labour of women (Rubin 1975, Mies 1986). In this process, all labour related to human reproduction is made unpaid and considered unproductive. Women’s labour is thus specifically defined within the creation of the category labeled ‘social reproduction’ which is made possible only using the ‘natural’ skills of women (Oakley, 1974, Edgell, 2006).

Interestingly, most critical research on capitalism and development does include consistent referencing based on the defining of the ‘natural’ and the ‘social’ in this manner, restricting contribution of women’s labour through production and reproduction in a fundamentalist and essentialist way. This phenomenon has been analysed and discussed in detail in the works of Marxist and socialist feminist scholars (Beechey, 1977, Hartsock 1987). Looking into the history of this process of restricting and limiting women’s labour defining within the idea of the ‘natural and thus linked to the ‘social’, feminist scholar Ann Oakley’s work (1974) explores in detail the specific laws and policies during the Western industrialisation period which contributed to marginalisation, exclusion and devaluation of women’s work and their role on capitalist production and profit. In response to Frederick Engels’ earlier work on the concept of reserve army of labour (1845), extending this phenomenon to the feminisation of labour and feminisation of poverty, socialist feminists like Beechey (1977) explored the relationship between capitalist patriarchy and women’s labour as fundamental. Further, feminist critiques of development also revealed the creation of a dichotomous relationship between feminism, labour and the modern welfare state where the notion of the ‘social’ and the ‘natural’ labour is used by the state and its development projects towards the expansion of capitalist development and its economy (Sreerekha, M.S, 2017).
Gender and the Global

The entry of both the concept of gender and the global has helped the process of integration and mainstreaming of development interestingly in similar ways. Feminists like Boserup (1970) who looked at development within a liberal welfare state framework supported the process of ‘recognition’ and ‘integration’ of women’s labour into development. However, there are important feminist writings, which critically analysed the conceptualisation and integration of women into development followed by the problematic homogenisation of third world women as a category (Kabeer 1994). Further, the introduction of the concept of gender followed by its mainstreaming is critically analysed by some feminists as a process which took away focus from the subject of women, replacing it with gender without much meaningful or useful impact in the field (Hirschman 1995). However, women’s movements, sexuality rights and queer movements working together brought forth a different space for discourses on genders and sexualities emphasising on their plurality and the need for historicising and politicising these plural identities and in their locations. Further, there has also been a stress on the fundamental relationship between genders, sexualities and capitalist patriarchy as reflected in the project of modernity and development (Jolly 2000). The entry of the term gender also seems to have had a deeper impact on the ways in which women’s struggles and resistance has been understood or analysed both in the academia and among various social movements (Icaza and Vazquez, 2018).

Global Capitalism and Development

The interpretation and understanding of a capitalist model of development as an economic and political process dividing the world as developed versus underdeveloped or first versus third world has been well researched through the schools of dependency and world systems theories (Frank, 1967, Wallerstein 1979). This perspective in its continuum however has now changed its direction more towards an understanding of global capitalism in the contemporary phase of globalised development. The term global has in the recent times replaced terms like international or universal and the contemporary processes of globalisation made it easy for the term to become more acceptable (Robinson 2004). New attempts in the propagation of the idea of the global and the impact of globalisation has together helped change the focus of development from being just a localized phenomenon, a nationally bounded or state centric process to understanding as transnational and translocal, revealing the global integration of the economy through global competitiveness using transnational capital and trade.

The term universal was earlier criticised for its abstract definition and interpretations and toothless existence through institutions like the United Nations. This has been true of most women’s empowerment projects too. In the case of women’s empowerment projects, there has been umpteen number of UNIFEM documents a critical reading of which by institutions like the DAWN and the works of feminist scholars like Kabeer, 1999 reflects this position. This also shows an interesting comparison between the two, the term global or universal and the term gender, remained less problematic or political, strategically keeping the abstractness and lack of focus in a particular factor through its language and definitions to some extent. However, what is relevant is the importance of the global understood as supra-territorial (Scholte, 2000) in the contemporary context, while the increasing power of global capital in real terms beyond national borders and its outcomes is analyzed.

Decolonial thinking on Gender, Development and the Global

A relationship between development and modernity and its relationship with contemporary capitalism and colonialism is analysed deeply in decolonisation theories and more recently in decolonial thinking. While an alternative to development itself has already been discussed by scholars like Esteva (1987), writings on the coloniality of development has conceptualized it as a mediation between the global north and the global south and functional to the representation and articulation of the modern/colonial divide, in other words, to the division between the human and the savage, between civilization and nature that lingers behind the notion of development (Icaza and Vazquez 2017). Furthermore, from the perspective of the coloniality of gender, development is also understood as a reality making process that has had effects not only in institutional arrangements and productive processes but also as power that access bodies and forms subjectivities (Icaza and Vazquez 2017).

A decolonial perspective on development and gender has been important and useful not only in moving beyond (de-centering) liberal individualism and modernity, but in revealing the existence of a plurality of other-than-modern/colonial standpoints and perspectives including that of gender (Icaza 2018). A decolonial feminist critique is thus contributing to a more meaningful and deeper understanding and analysis of con-
temporary global capitalism and its processes through globalisation.
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Development and Global Capitalism

“Globalization,” a term often bandied about, is the latest epoch in the development of historical capitalism—an uneven and diverse form of production based on exploitation for private accumulation.[1] Uneven and combined development inheres in the fundamental capitalist process, reflecting the operation of the law of value/production for private capitalist accumulation (as theorized by political economists throughout the long twentieth century (Amin, 1978; Arrighi, 1983; Frank, 1967; Hilferding, 1910/2006; Lenin, 1917/1969; Rodney, 1981; Sweezy, 1942; Wallerstein, 1979; Wood, 2005)). The organization of capitalist production is not designed though to promote the development of autonomous national economies, a fact that is reflected in the worldwide reality of combined and uneven development. The reality of capital accumulation as a global process is also reflected in the rise of transnational forms of business organization, production and accumulation. The rise of globalization or “global capitalism” helps us to understand how new and uneven transnational practices and processes are playing out through a heterogeneous world context (Dicken, 2015; Harris, 2016; Jayasuriya, 2005; Liodakis, 2010; Murray and Scott, Eds., 2012; Robinson, 2014; Sklar, 2002; Sprague, 2019; Watson, 2015).

The organization of production and of state power on a national basis formed the starting point for the internationalization of the production and accumulation process. The reality however, is that capital first emerged within the interstices of the world market, a fact that undermines nation-state centric and interstate analysis. State centric analysis is reflective of the territorial trap of geographic determinism and notions of a developed west versus an underdeveloped third world (Agnew, 2017). Methodologically we need an internationalist theory of history to combat false inside outside dichotomies that are associated with the state-centric logic that invents dichotomous relationships between individual places (each country) and the actual spatial processes that mirror the dialectic of an interconnected world. For transnational capitalists, the real economy is not a mass of independent national economies but rather an interconnected (global) space in which place and space form a heterogeneous unity, which approximates an open-ended totality that never reaches a simple whole. Put in more simple terms, capital accumulation is a worldwide process.

The historical importance of the role of the state for capitalist development can be seen through the colonially mercantilist, industrialization, heightening internationalization and globalization phases of world capitalism. Institutionalizing the right to exploit (Watson, 2015, p. 32) is indispensable for “providing the infrastructure of capitalism by levying and collecting taxes; funding or subsidizing research and development activities; building or financing the construction of public projects like ports, roads, highways, and defense and military security programmes; providing education and supporting the arts and other cultural activities” (p. 11). Here it is useful to consider sovereignty as being reproduced in “soft” and “advanced” forms, where various technocratic and elite groups have become oriented toward transnational practices in the contemporary era. Operating through a powerful state exercising “effective sovereignty” and acting to internationalize and globalize the reach and scope of its sovereign power, U.S. officials utilize diplomatic, commercial, political, military and other means to shape the contours of global governance in pursuit of their so-called “national security goals”.

Even as transnational processes intensify (such as through finance, trade, entertainment, communications, and various institutions), these dynamics entwine with many local, regional and international particularities, impacting how capitalist development occurs. Capitalist development is not organized to transform national societies and uplift the lives of the global majority, rather capitalist development is decidedly for the ends of private capital accumulation, which means that it is necessary to rethink the dominant development paradigm.

Uneven and combined development remains integral to capitalism’s spatial motion, with a “tendency for capital to concentrate in particular built environments” (Robinson, 2009, p. 74). Yet capital accumulation (at the most general level), in our view, is often misrepresented as national economic development. Far from being motivated to make the economic development of any single country its priority, the logic of capital is to enrich a handful of individuals and private institutions at the expense of nature and of the exploited, the marginalized, and gendered and negatively racialized working people.

Transnational processes are used then as a more efficient means by which capital can extract even more wealth from every corner of the globe, while being less accountable to humanity. The global reach of capital...
provides evidence that capitalists understand that they cannot afford to rely on any single country to satisfy their endless drive to accumulate capital. As such, fighting for deep progressive reforms and for socialism are extremely hard to achieve, and it is here where the territorial division of the world in conjunction with its growing transnational integration strengthens the need to appreciate the importance of building both international and transnational linkages and strategies from below to help us understand our world and fight to transform it in the interest of humanity.

Jeb Sprague is a Research Associate at the Institute for Research on World-Systems at the University of California, Riverside and has taught sociology at UVA and UCSB. His most recent publication is Globalizing the Caribbean: Political Economy, Social Change, and the Transnational Capitalist Class (Temple University Press, 2019).

Hilbourne Watson is an Emeritus Professor of International Relations, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, PA. His most recent publication is Errol Walton Barrow and the Postwar transformation of Barbados: The Late Colonial Period, Volume One (University of West Indies Press, 2019).

1] Capitalism is not a “system” in the normal understanding of a system, which implies balance, order, stability and regularity within a structural framework. Capitalism is inherently crisis-ridden though crisis is not necessarily evident all the time. Capitalism is best seen as a form of production for the ends of private capital accumulation, with capital accumulation as a global process.
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SECTION ANNOUNCEMENTS

Just Launched: NGO Knowledge Collective Data Portal

We are happy to announce the launch of the NGO Knowledge Collective (NKC) Data Portal: ngoknowledgecollective.org. This website catalogues 3,400 journal articles on nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) in development published in English from 1980-2014. Users can identify individual or sets of articles by country or region of study or by searching more than 200 keywords related to sectors and development issues. Each article is tagged with the frequency of selected keywords in the text, allowing users to fine-tune their searches and analyze the prevalence of these keywords in relation to citation information. Each article entry in the data portal contains a link to the article permanent DOI location on the internet. We continue to add articles published from 2015 forward.

The portal also includes a topic model visualizer, allowing users to identify literature using topics pre-generated through machine-learning, rather than just keywords. For example, the topic model visualizer allows users to identify articles from the early 1980s on NGOs providing small loans before the term “microcredit” entered the literature.

The NKC works against the “silo” effect in the study of NGOs. The data portal builds on a four-year effort to collect and synthesize journal articles across social science disciplines, geographies, and methods. We hope that the NKC Data Portal will be the “first stop” in research on NGOs, making it easy for researchers to identify the full range of articles on topics of interest, as well as to identify unanswered questions. We invite you to use the data portal – let us know when you do, and we will add your published work to our bibliography. Help us further build the intellectual community studying NGOs in development.

PIs of the NGO Knowledge Collective are Allison Schnable and Jennifer Brass (Indiana University), Rachel Sullivan Robinson (American University), and Wesley Longhofer (Emory University). Read the findings from our systematic review of the NGO Literature from 1980-2014 in World Development, or contact us at ngoknowledgedge@gmail.com.

Request for Feedback from ASA Committee on the Status of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer People in Sociology

The ASA Committee on the Status of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer People in Sociology seeks feedback from all ASA members on issues that may be faced by LGBTQ people within the association or the broader discipline. Such issues may be within the areas of education, workplace, research, visibility, and others. Historically, we have engaged in educational outreach efforts, conducted research on specific questions or problems, and proposed policy initiatives based on ASA member concerns. However, we are open to all feedback and new ways to support LGBTQ people within the discipline. In addition, if you are just interested in learning more about the committee, please feel free to reach out. To provide feedback, make us aware of an issue, or express interest, please email our ASA staff liaison, Jean Shin (ASA’s Director of Diversity and Inclusion) at jshin@asanet.org. Jean will forward the information to the committee.
Call for Applications: *Sectors* Co-Editor

We are seeking a new co-editor of our section newsletter, *Sectors*. This is a great opportunity for a junior scholar to become involved with the section and network with other individuals in our subfield. The newsletter is published semi-annually (in the fall and spring semesters) and includes Council and section news, feature stories, calls for papers and other opportunities in the field, and the section’s official reports. *Sectors* is e-mailed to all current section members through the listserv and posted on the section’s [website](#).

The co-editor will have a two-year term from August 2020 to July 2022. During the first year (2020-2021), the new editor will work in a team with one of the current co-editors. During the second year (2021-2022), they will continue working with a new co-editor selected in 2021. Both co-editors will work collaboratively to shape the content and formatting of the newsletter. They will seek out and develop original content for the newsletter and maintain regular features.

The Section Council will select the co-editor from all interested parties, and the co-editor will report to the Council regularly (during council meetings). The co-editor will work closely with the Chair and the Secretary-Treasurer of the Section.

Qualifications:
- Member of the Sociology of Development Section;
- Strong organizational skills, including ability to meet deadlines;
- Strong written communication skills;
- Strong MS Word and Acrobat Reader skills
- Graduate students are welcome and encouraged to apply.

Application consists of:
- a one-page statement of interest, qualifications, and ideas for the newsletter
- a one-page CV

Please submit applications to: socdevsectors@gmail.com by December 31, 2019. Applicants will hear back by the end of the Spring 2020 term.

**GIFT MEMBERSHIPS: ASA and ASA section memberships**

ASA members can purchase ASA and section memberships as gifts at [https://asa.enoah.com](https://asa.enoah.com) (Login required).

To gift an **ASA membership**, click “Purchase a gift membership for a student” under the Contribute/Give heading and then select “To search for or add a new individual, please click here.” Per the ASA, “Your gift will be redeemable by the recipient for a 2020 ASA student membership (or a $51 discount on another membership type for 2020). Your gift recipient will receive their gift credit via e-mail immediately after your purchase. Gift memberships are not refundable if unredeemed by the end of the 2020 membership year, September 30, 2020. Gift memberships are not tax deductible.”

To gift a **section membership**, click “Purchase a gift section membership” under the Contribute/Give heading and then select “Sociology of Development” from the dropdown option. Per the ASA “Section membership requires 2020 ASA membership. Only 2020 ASA members who do not already have a membership in that section are eligible to receive a gift. Your recipient will receive an e-mail immediately after your payment notifying them of the section gift. Your name will be included in this message. If the recipient declines the gift within 30 days of receipt, you will receive a refund by mail. Gifts are not tax deductible.”
New Harmonized International Social Survey Data Available

The Survey Data Recycling (SDR) project has deposited master data files with full documentation for accessing and using for cross-national analyses. In SDR.1 version, survey data are derived from 22 well-known international social survey projects and include 1,721 national surveys covering 142 countries between 1966 and 2013 combined with national attribute statistics. The harmonized variables are especially relevant for those studying comparative social stratification, population change, protest and political participation. Documentation and data files in version SDR.1 are available for download at Harvard Dataverse: https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataverse/sdr. Currently the SDR.2 project is sponsored by the Mershon Center for International Security Studies, the Dept. of Sociology, Ohio State University, and the Polish Academy of Sciences, and it is directed by K. Maciek Slomczynski, Irina Tomescu-Dubrow and J. Craig Jenkins. Drawing on National Science Foundation funding (#1738502), SDR.2 will deposit for public access an extended dataset for ca. 3,500 national surveys with harmonized variables pertaining to political participation, social capital and well-being. An overview of the methodological approach is available at several publications available at https://www.asc.ohio-state.edu/dataharmonization/publications/.

New Newsletter on Survey Data Harmonization:

Survey data harmonization and big data are innovative forces that are leading to new, emergent and interdisciplinary knowledge across the social sciences. The Survey Data Recycling (SDR) project, funded by National Science Foundation (#1738502), is sponsoring a newsletter on survey harmonization: Harmonization: Newsletter on Survey Data Harmonization in the Social Sciences. The newsletter provides a forum for researchers to share news and communicate with the growing community of scholars, institutions and government agencies who work on harmonizing social survey data and other projects with similar focus. It pays special attention to the methodology of survey data harmonization and contributes to the development of international research and standards on methodological issues such as data comparability, data quality, proper data documentation, and data storage and access, as well as analytic procedures that can contend with the demands of harmonized data. The current issue for Volume 5, No. 1 and back issues as well as signups for the newsletter are available at: https://www.asc.ohio-state.edu/dataharmonization/newsletter/.

New Dataset: Comparative Taxation Dataset

We announce the availability of a new dataset that may be of use to scholars of this section, the Comparative Taxation Dataset, available through ICPSR at this URL: https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/37365/versions/V1

The study covers 40 countries and areas from 1870-2001. The collection includes variables on taxation, as well as other relevant variables such as economically active population, infant mortality rates, unemployment, indices of industrial production, output of crude petroleum, output of natural gas, output of electrical energy, money supply, total central government expenditure and revenue, political parties, wholesale price indices, consumer price indices and other variables. Sources include International Historical Statistics (2003) and Peter Flora, State economy and society in Western Europe, 1815-1975 (1987).

The construction of this dataset is made possible by National Science Foundation (NSF) grant number SES-0847725. Please cite as:

New Policy Briefs: *Sociological Insights for Development Policy*

The purpose of Sociological Insights for Development Policy is not only to raise awareness of the thought-provoking research being done by members of our section, but also to strengthen engagement between scholars, policy makers and development practitioners. Our long-term aim is to enhance sociology’s impact on development discourse and practice throughout the world. For more information about the series, or if you would like to contribute a brief, please contact Alaka Basu at ab54@cornell.edu.

New Policy Briefs:

“Broadband Internet, Fertility and Work from Home” by Francesco C. Billari, Osea Giuntella and Luca Stella (2019, volume 4, issue 1).


New Issue of *Sociology of Development Journal*

*Sociology of Development* ([http://socdev.ucpress.edu/](http://socdev.ucpress.edu/))

This is an international journal addressing issues of development, broadly considered. With basic as well as policy-oriented research, topics explored include economic development and well-being, gender, health, inequality, poverty, environment and sustainability, political economy, conflict, social movements, and more.

Editors: Andrew Jorgenson & Jeff Kentor
Frequency: Quarterly in March, June, September, and December
eISSN: 2374-538X

Table of Contents
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**Women and Employment in Tunisia: Structures, Institutions, and Advocacy**
Valentine M. Moghadam
(pp. 337-359) DOI: 10.1525/sod.2019.5.4.337

**Building Empowerment, Resisting Patriarchy: Understanding Intervention against Domestic Violence among Grassroots Women in Gujarat, India**
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NEW MEMBER PUBLICATIONS

NEW BOOKS


Sometimes leaving home allows you to make an impact on it—but at what cost? Exit and Voice is a compelling account of how Mexican migrants with strong ties to their home communities impact the economic and political welfare of the communities they have left behind. In many decentralized democracies like Mexico, migrants have willingly stepped in to supply public goods when local or state government lack the resources or political will to improve the town. Though migrants’ cross-border investments often improve citizens’ access to essential public goods and create a more responsive local government, their work allows them to unintentionally exert political engagement and power, undermining the influence of those still living in their hometowns. In looking at the paradox of migrants who have left their home to make an impact on it, Exit and Voice sheds light on how migrant transnational engagement refashions the meaning of community, democratic governance, and practices of citizenship in the era of globalization.

https://www.press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/P/bo40850773.html

What has neoliberal economic restructuring meant for urban experience? What has it meant, specifically, for the experience of class relations in cities of the Global South? A number of studies already focus on the plight of the urban poor or middle class under restructuring. It is not just the one or the other group being transformed, however, but their relationship. It is their dynamic, not their individual situations, producing new urban spaces, social relations, and politics.

Marco Garrido documents the fragmentation of Manila into a “patchwork” of classed spaces, particularly slums and upper- and middle-class enclaves. He then looks beyond urban fragmentation at its effects on class relations and politics, arguing that the proliferation of slums and enclaves and their subsequent proximity have intensified class relations. For enclave residents, the proximity of slums is a source of insecurity. They feel compelled to impose spatial boundaries on slum residents. For slum residents, the regular imposition of boundaries fosters a pervasive sense of discrimination. Thus we see class boundaries clarify along the housing divide and the urban poor and middle class emerge as class actors—not as labor and capital but as squatters and “villagers” (in Manila residential subdivisions are called villages). Garrido further examines the politicization of this divide in the case of the populist president Joseph Estrada. He shows the two sides drawn into contention not just over the right to the city but over the nature of democracy.

The Patchwork City illuminates how segregation, class relations, and democracy are connected and thus helps us make similar connections in other cases. It shows class as a social structure to be as indispensable to the study of Manila—and of many other cities of the Global South—as race is to the study of American cities.

The U.S. military continues to be an overt presence in the Philippines, and a reminder of the country’s colonial past. Using Subic Bay (a former U.S. military base, now a Freeport Zone) as a case study, Victoria Reyes argues that its defining feature is its ability to elicit multiple meanings. For some, it is a symbol of imperialism and inequality, while for others, it projects utopian visions of wealth and status.

Drawing on archival and ethnographic data, Reyes describes the everyday experiences of people living and working in Subic Bay, and makes a case for critically examining similar spaces across the world. These foreign-controlled, semi-autonomous zones of international exchange are what she calls global borderlands. While they can take many forms, ranging from overseas military bases to tourist resorts, they all have key features in common. This new unit of globalization provides a window into broader economic and political relations, the consequences of legal ambiguity, and the continuously reimagined identities of the people living there. Rejecting colonialism as merely a historical backdrop, Reyes demonstrates how it is omnipresent in our modern world.


In this timely book, Shefner and Blad trace the 45-year history of austerity policies and how they became the go-to policy to resolve a host of economic problems. Using a variety of cases from the Global North and South, the book answers a number of important questions: why austerity persisted as a policy aimed at resolving national crises, despite evidence that it often does not work; how the policy itself evolved over recent decades; and who and what the powerful people and institutions are that have helped impose it across the globe. This book will appeal to students, researchers, and policy-makers interested in austerity, development, social movements, political economy, and globalization.
NEW ARTICLES AND BOOK CHAPTERS


The beautiful Caribbean basin is fertile ground for a study of capitalism past and present. Transnational corporations move money and use labor around the region, as national regulations are reworked to promote conditions benefiting private capital. Globalizing the Caribbean offers a probing account of the region’s experience of economic globalization while considering gendered and racialized social relations under conditions of the exploitation of workers.

Jeb Sprague focuses on the social and material nature of this new era in the history of world capitalism. He combines an historical overview of capitalism in the region with theoretical analysis backed by case studies. Sprague elaborates upon the role of class formation, marginalization, and the restructuring of local states. He considers both U.S. hegemony, and how various upsurges from below and crises occur. He examines the globalization of the cruise ship and mining businesses, looks at the growth of migrant labor and reverse flow of remittances, and describes the evolving role of export processing and supranational associations. In doing so, Sprague shows how transnationally oriented elites have come to rule the Caribbean, and how capitalist globalization in the region occurs alongside shifting political, institutional, and organizational dynamics.


This book analyses the political dynamics of neo-extractivism in Latin America. It discusses the critical concepts of neo-extractivism and the commodity consensus and the various phases of socio-environmental conflict, proposing an eco-territorial approach that uncovers the escalation of extractive violence. It also presents horizontal concepts and debates theories that explore the language of Latin American socio-environmental movements, such as Buen Vivir and Derechos de la Naturaleza. In concluding, it proposes an explanation for the end of the progressive era, analyzing its ambiguities and limitations in the dawn of a new political cycle marked by the strengthening of the political rights.


JOB MARKET CANDIDATES

CANDIDATE PROFILES

Stephanie Spaid Miedema, PhD Candidate, Department of Sociology, Emory University
Email: smiedem@emory.edu | Website: www.ssmiedema.com
Specializations: Stigma, sex and gender, health disparities, mixed-method research
Dissertation title: Sexual stigma, minority stress and mental health among sexual minority women and men across Asia and the Pacific

Dissertation abstract: Sexual minority groups across the Asia-Pacific region experience disparities in health compared to the general population. These disparities are, in part, a result of acute and chronic exposure to sexual stigma. Theories of sexual stigma describe how stigma due to one’s non-heterosexual sexuality contributes to poor health outcomes. However, these conceptual models, and much of the supporting evidence, derive from Western societies, although the theories of social science are not universal across people or place. This three-paper dissertation aims to fill extant gaps in our understanding of sexual minority health across diverse global contexts. I apply qualitative and quantitative methods to assess what factors should be considered in the study of sexual stigma across Asia-Pacific countries, and how exposure to multilevel sexual stigma influences mental health outcomes among sexual minority women and men. I draw on household survey data from the United Nations Multi-country Study of Men and Violence to test the associations between individual- and socio-structural dimensions of stigma on depressive symptoms among sexual minority men (n=562). Further, I use qualitative life history data with sexual minority women (n=21) in Thailand to evaluate the in-depth connections between gender non-conforming identity construction and the experience of sexual stigma. The results of these analyses demonstrate how socio-cultural features of Asian and Pacific Island societies influence the construct of sexual stigma, as well as its associations with mental health outcomes. The dissertation concludes with implications for sociological and public health theory-building and future research.

Patricia Ward, Boston University
Research interests: humanitarian aid and development, work and organizations, social inequalities, and the Middle East

Patricia Ward is a PhD Candidate at Boston University. Her research interests are in the areas of: humanitarian aid and development; work and organizations; social inequalities; and the Middle East. Her dissertation, “How Humanitarian Relief ‘Works’: International Aid Organizations and Local Labor in Crisis Contexts,” examines how the global aid sector is changing and reorganizing its operations amidst a growing number of protracted humanitarian crises worldwide. Trish specifically studies how “localization”—Western-based humanitarian aid organizations' increasing reliance on local labor to achieve their mandates—is transforming the role of local workers within the sector. She explores the experiences of local labor in Jordan as her case in this project, where she conducted over 90 interviews with aid workers, along with ethnographic observations of their daily work routines in both rural and urban locations throughout the country. Her findings document how localization is creating new forms of labor and relationships between and among workers and their communities transnationally and locally as they try to navigate and meet their employers’ contradictory—and confusing—expectations of them as 'local' employees. Trish's work shows how localization simultaneously ruptures and reinscribes Global North-Global South inequalities through ambivalent constructions of who local workers are, and how they should and can provide value to their organizations.
NOTES FROM THE FIELD

Cultural Distances, Boundaries, and Urban Ethnography

My dissertation is an ethnography of two musical scenes in the southern Indian city of Chennai: Carnatic, the preserve of “upper caste” Brahmins from South Chennai neighborhoods performed in exclusive, dedicated music halls, and Gaana music, predominantly associated with Dalits, or previously “untouchable” castes from the slums of North Chennai, often performed on makeshift street stages mainly at funerals. What can an ethnography of cultural practices tell us about a city and its people? How do the boundaries of caste, class, and territorial identity shape the experiences of social and spatial distance within the city? Three vignettes from my ethnographic fieldwork illustrate how the cultural practices that characterize these musical scenes illuminate the processes by which urban social actors mark distinction.

Invisible Boundaries

I was standing by the entrance to a prestigious venue for Carnatic music in South Chennai when a man to my right suddenly remarked, his nose wrinkled, “The crowds aren’t what they used to be. This festival has become so local now.” The connotations of “local” were abundantly clear. Local stands in opposition to the ostensibly refined Brahmins, the implied rightful constituency of this musical form and the hallowed venue; local gestures at the lower caste and class identities of the “interlopers”. Later that same evening, while riding home, I asked my rickshaw driver if he had ever been inside the music hall. He replied with a chuckle, “Have you seen me? Have you seen them? Even if I walked in there, they would assume I came to fill my water bottle. I don’t belong there.”

Territorial Stigma and Reclamation

Sanjay narrated an incident in which he had been stopped and questioned while traveling through a South Chennai neighborhood late at night after a Gaana funeral performance. I asked what might have given the policeman the impression he didn’t belong there. “My dark skin, my hairstyle, my clothes. I know people in South Chennai think we are all gangsters. They are scared of us.” In a song composed to challenge the stigma of a North Chennai address, Sanjay and his fellow singers triumphantly declare themselves “local”. In reclaiming ownership over their territorial identity, it becomes a source of pride. After Sanjay gleaned that I live in South Chennai, he joked, “Over there, they walk around in coats and ties – they don’t understand style like we do!”

Traversing Boundaries

Pradeep, a Gaana musician, patiently explained the economics of his performances between songs at a funeral. “We often sing at funerals for free or at a very nominal price because we’re all like a family here. We’re all poor but we all deserve to go with dignity.” A few weeks later, my own grandfather passed away. When I told Pradeep, he replied, “If only you’d told me earlier! I could have organized a free Gaana concert for your grandfather’s death.” Of course he had located me as “upper caste” and middle class, and he must have known that my parents could easily afford to pay even if they decided to adopt the practice of Gaana music at the funeral. Pradeep’s offer, then, was a gesture evolving trust and affection—a bridge over the cavernous social differences that typically keep researcher and researched apart. Interactions like ours confound the unspoken social and spatial boundaries of caste and class that punctuate nearly every social interaction within this urban milieu.

My project advances current understandings of how caste boundaries are enacted, maintained, and challenged through cultural practice; it also troubles the notion of “insider” ethnography.

Pranathi Diwakar is a PhD Candidate in the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago.
OPPORTUNITIES

NOMINATIONS FOR 2020 SECTION AWARDS

ASA Sociology of Development 2020 Section Awards
The Sociology of Development section of the American Sociological Association invites nominations for three awards recognizing outstanding scholarship in the area of the sociology of development: Book Award, Faculty Article Award, and Graduate Student Paper Award.

Sociology of Development Section Book Award
All books published in 2018 or 2019 are eligible. A brief letter of nomination (self-nominations are welcome) and a copy of the nominated book should be sent to EACH of the committee members listed below by March 1, 2020. In accordance with ASA policy, all award nominees must be current members of the association in order to be considered.

Chair: Kristy Kelly, Drexel University
537 Penn Street
Bethlehem, PA 18018
USA
Email: kek72@drexel.edu

Committee Member: Meghan Kallman
93 Capwell Ave
Pawtucket, RI 02860
USA
Email: Meghan.Kallman@umb.edu

Committee Member: Firuzeh Shokooh Valle
419 S 45th St Apt 5
Philadelphia, PA 19104
USA
Email: firuzeh.shokoohvalle@fandm.edu

Committee Member: George K. Danns
3820 Mundy Mill Road
Oakwood, GA. 30566
USA
Email: george.danns@ung.edu

Chair: Poulami Roychowdhury <poulami.roychowdhury@mcgill.ca>
Department of Sociology
McGill University

Committee Member: Heidi Rademacher <hrademacher@brockport.edu>
Sociology
SUNY-Brockport

Committee Member: Tom VanHuevelen <tvanheuv@umn.edu>
Department of Sociology
University of Minnesota

Committee Member: Bandana Purkayastha <bandana.purkayastha@uconn.edu>
Department of Sociology
University of Connecticut

Committee Member: Zach Levenson <zachary.levenson@uncg.edu>
Department of Sociology
University of North Carolina, Greensboro

Sociology of Development Section Faculty Article Award
Please send a letter of nomination and an electronic version of the article to EACH of the committee members listed below by March 1, 2020. If the article has been published, the copyright date must be 2018 or 2019. However, unpublished articles are also welcome and self-nominations are encouraged. In accordance with ASA policy, all award nominees must be current members of the association in order to be considered.

Chair: Poulami Roychowdhury <poulami.roychowdhury@mcgill.ca>
Department of Sociology
McGill University

Committee Member: Heidi Rademacher <hrademacher@brockport.edu>
Sociology
SUNY-Brockport

Committee Member: Tom VanHuevelen <tvanheuv@umn.edu>
Department of Sociology
University of Minnesota

Committee Member: Bandana Purkayastha <bandana.purkayastha@uconn.edu>
Department of Sociology
University of Connecticut

Committee Member: Zach Levenson <zachary.levenson@uncg.edu>
Department of Sociology
University of North Carolina, Greensboro
Sociology of Development Section Graduate Student Paper Award

Please send a letter of nomination and an electronic version of the article to EACH of the committee members listed below by March 1, 2020. If the article has been published, the copyright date must be 2018 or 2019. However, unpublished articles are also welcome and self-nominations are encouraged. The author must be a graduate student who has not received the PhD by March 1, 2020. For co-authored papers, all authors must be graduate students. In accordance with ASA policy, all award nominees must be current members of the association in order to be considered.

Chair: Jordanna Matlon <jcmatlon@american.edu>
School of International Service
American University

Committee Member: Steven Schmidt <seschmid@uci.edu>
Department of Sociology
University of California, Irvine

Committee Member: Alvin Camba <acamba1@jhu.edu>
Department of Sociology
The Johns Hopkins University

Committee Member: Barbara Wejnert <bwejnert@gmail.com>
Political Sociology
College of Arts and Sciences
University at Buffalo, SUNY

Committee Member: Holly Reed <Holly.Reed@qc.cuny.edu>
Department of Sociology
Queens College, CUNY

CALL FOR PAPERS

SASE 2020 Mini-Conference, Amsterdam, the Netherlands, July 18-20, 2020

Organizers:
Zophia Edwards, Providence College (zedwards@providence.edu)
Julian Go, Boston University (juliango@bu.edu)

Call for Papers:

In 2019, the Amsterdam Museum announced that it will remove all references to the Dutch “Golden Age” from its galleries, in recognition of the Netherlands’ role in perpetuating colonial brutalities and the transatlantic slave trade. This “decolonization” of the Amsterdam Museum offers an opportunity to also consider the possible “decolonization” of social science. In particular, it offers the opportunity for scholars to more seriously explore the role of colonialism, racism and slavery in capitalist expansion and global development. This mini-conference offers a forum for this critical exploration.

This mini-conference capitalizes on recent developments within social science more broadly. While critical theories and studies of development have existed for decades, starting with Dependency/World-Systems theories and continuing through the “postdevelopment” approaches – manifested in the work of Escobar (1984) and Ferguson (1990) among others – newer “decolonial”, “postcolonial” and “Southern” approaches have emerged in their wake. These paradigms have surfaced in a variety of fields and subfields, including comparative-historical sociology, social theory, political theory and comparative politics. Together they make explicit the Eurocentric, imperial/colonial and often racialized bases of Northern social science and seek critical alternatives, either by reconstructing historical narratives as “entangled” and “connected” or by discovering and critically deploying the knowledge, concepts and theories of postcolonial/Southern thinkers and social movements.

The miniconference will take stock of these recent critical turns and their implications for the study of development. Compared to earlier critical approaches, what if any is the added value of these approaches for understanding social,
political and economic development? What are the limits? What theories, concepts and research follow from the recognition of the decolonial/postcolonial critique of knowledge? Theoretical, programmatic, or empirical papers are welcomed. Topics might include but are not restricted to:

- legacies of imperialism and colonialism upon development
- the colonial gaze and the imperial episteme in development studies
- global academic inequality and epistemic inequality
- southern/subaltern knowledges, theories, and concepts
- decolonial developmental practices and knowledges in international organizations
- racialization and developmental projects
- Southern and subaltern resistance to Eurocentric development projects
- decolonial methods of research
- “imperial feedback” and the circulation of technologies and knowledges

Information and Submissions

Papers will be accepted on a competitive basis. The mini-conference will occur under the rubric of the annual conference of the Society for the Advancement of Socio-economics. Therefore, all submissions to the mini-conference must be done through the online SASE submission system, specifying that the submission is for the “Decolonizing Development” mini-conference. The deadline for submissions is January 10, 2020. Only abstracts need to be submitted by that date. If papers are accepted, full papers will be required by June 2, 2020. For submission and more information go to https://sase.org/events/conference-submission-and-award-guidelines/

SUBSCRIBE TO THE IPE MAILING LIST

The International Political Economy (IPE) subsection of the Sociology of Development seeks to bring together scholars who study the intersection of states and markets through a cross-national lens. IPE scholars recognize the centrality of the political economy for studying international development. Scholars in this subsection examine a range of issues, including economic growth, income inequality, poverty, health conditions, environmental degradation, institutions, and much more. IPE emphasizes the significance of economic and political globalization, including the flow of goods, capital, and people, as well as the formation of international organizations and other multilateral institutions that exist in the world economy. IPE scholars also investigate political economies within individual societies and how they influence race, class, gender, and other forms of stratification. IPE embraces a wide variety of theoretical and methodological approaches that help advance our understanding of the political economy in a global context. Ultimately, the subsection aims to facilitate the formation of scholarly networks comprised of those studying IPE in sociology and related disciplines, including international relations, political science, and economics.

The IPE subsection operates a mailing list that enables members to have conversations and share information and resources related to IPE, including funding opportunities, job advertisements, calls for papers, conference announcements, teaching materials, and links to scholarly work. To subscribe to the IPE mailing list (ipesocdev@googlegroups.com), contact Rob Clark (robclark@ou.edu).

Founding Members
Rob Clark (University of Oklahoma)
Jeffrey Kentor (Wayne State University)
Matthew Mahutga (University of California-Riverside)
CALL FOR APPLICATIONS

Problem-Solving Sociology Dissertation Proposal Development Workshop

Problem-Solving Sociology Dissertation Proposal Development Workshop

Doctoral students in departments of sociology who have not yet defended their dissertation proposals are invited to apply to a dissertation proposal development workshop on “problem solving sociology.” Northwestern University will pay for economy-class airfare and accommodation in Evanston, IL, plus meals and transportation expenses, for a one-day workshop to be held on May 21, 2020. This workshop is made possible by a grant from the National Science Foundation.

Problem-solving sociology seeks to use sociological theory to shed light on solving (not just describing) contemporary social problems, and seeks to use investigation of these problems to further sociological theory. The approach proceeds from the assumption that mitigating critical social problems can be a catalyst for breakthroughs in the basic understanding of society. The workshop will include discussion of principles and techniques of problem-solving sociology and examples of sociological scholarship that applies the approach, plus extensive feedback on individual student projects.

To apply, please submit by January 15, 2020, to mirieliyahu2014@u.northwestern.edu (1) a short cover letter detailing your university, your department, your year in the program, whether or not you have defended your dissertation proposal, and any other information that might be relevant. If you know the date you expect to defend your proposal, please indicate it, but we also welcome students who are several years away from defending. Please also submit (2) a separate document, no more than 2 single spaced pages, responding to some or all of the following questions (not all questions will be relevant for all applicants):

1) What is the social problem that you seek to solve? What are some potential solutions, and how can research shed light on how to move forward with solutions?
2) What social theories or approaches might be useful in solving this problem? If none, can you use this research as a way to critique and reformulate existing theories?
3) (more relevant for some topics than others) Have you been involved with non-academic groups that work on this problem? Describe if so, or if you have plans to be in future. Do you see a way to engage sociological theory with the work of these groups?
4) (if possible) How could short-term solutions feed into longer-term, structural change on this problem?

We welcome both creative and ambitious ideas, as well as focused and practical ideas, as well as ideas that are somewhere in between. If the problem is the basic structure of the economic system and the only solution that you see is revolution, then think about how to bring about revolution. If the problem is colleges closing over spring break and low-income students having nowhere to go, think about how to nudge institutions to respond to the needs of non-traditional members. If the problem is racism or sexism, think about how to solve (not just describe) racism or sexism. If you already know the solution to the problem, but the problem is convincing policymakers, then focus on how to convince (or change) policymakers.

Problem-solving sociology is discussed here (https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0094306118779810) but we are less interested in whether or not you have read this material and more interested in hearing your original ideas.

CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

Call for Graduate Student Submissions - South/South: Critical Ethnographies Workshop

We are pleased to announce the first annual meeting of the University of Southern California South/South Critical Ethnographies Workshop. The Workshop is designed to develop ethnographic methodologies that advance Global
South Studies, provide hands-on mentorship to graduate student fellows, and build an interdisciplinary community of ethnographers.

Faculty organizers Rhacel Parrenas and Josh Seim will be joined by faculty fellows Tanya Golash-Boza (University of California, Merced), Marco Garrido (University of Chicago) and Natasha Iskander (New York University).

**Call for Graduate Student Submissions**

We invite applications from graduate students in any discipline who are engaged in dissertation-level, ethnographic research on the Global South. We are particularly interested in works that document and examine south-to-south flows of culture, materials, monies and people.

Applicants must be advanced to doctoral candidacy (ABD status). To apply to become a 2020 graduate student fellow, prepare the following materials by **December 20, 2019** and submit the following electronically to uscglobalsouth@gmail.com:

1) A current CV (5 pages maximum).
2) A one-page description of the dissertation project (500 words maximum) from which the data is being excerpted.
3) A ten-page (maximum) writing sample (double-spaced, not including references) from an in-progress work (e.g., dissertation chapter or article). Writing samples should focus on empirical data and analysis. Please keep discussions of methodology, literature review, and other “front end” matter to a minimum.

Student fellows will be notified by January 15th, 2020.

For 2020, the South/South Critical Ethnographies Workshop will take place on Thursday April 2nd and Friday April 3rd at the University of Southern California.

Visit our website for more information.

USC Global South Working Group
uscglobalsouth@gmail.com

---

**MISSION STATEMENT**

The Sociology of Development Section of ASA promotes work in sociology on the causes and effects of development. We support work in all geographical regions including the United States, other advanced industrial nations and the Global South. We are open to work of all theoretical orientations and all methodological orientations. Both theoretical and applied work is welcome.

---

**SECTION COMMUNICATION PLATFORMS**

ASA Sociology of Development Page:
http://www.asanet.org/sections/development.cfm

Sociology of Development Website:
http://sociologyofdevelopment.com/

Sociology of Development Facebook Page:
https://www.facebook.com/ASA-Sociology-of-Development-Section-160936710615717/

Sociology of Development Listserv: SOCDEV
DEVELOPMENT-ANNOUNCE@LISTSERV.ASANET.ORG

Sociology of Development Newsletter:
Please send all your ideas, feedback, and submissions to socdevsectors@gmail.com.