

**The Department of  
Sociology & Anthropology**

**THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM**

**Report of the Review Committee**

**May 18-22, 2008**

**Presented to Prof. Haim D. Rabinowitch, Rector**

June 11, 2008

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary</b>	3-7
<b>The Committee's Report</b>	8
Introduction	9
History & Current Situation	9
Foci for Attention:	10
Leadership	10
Anthropology	11
The Sociology-Anthropology Mix	13
Organizational Studies	15
The Demography Subfield	16
Research Infrastructure	17
The Global & the Local	18
Assessment	19
Students & Teaching	20
External Teachers	23
The Partnership between the Dept. & Administration	24
Next steps	24
<b>Appendices</b>	
<b>a)</b> Résumés of the Committee members	28
<b>b)</b> List of people who met with the Committee	44
<b>c)</b> Background material prepared by the Department of Communicatons & Journalism (under separate cover)	

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
***The Department of Sociology & Anthropology***

**Executive Summary**  
**May 22, 2008**

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem has an extraordinary past, a troubled present, and impressive potential for the future. In this context, the Standing Committee and academic administration of Hebrew University called for an evaluation of the department and consideration of how it might flourish and attain academic distinction in the future. The Rector appointed a committee of five international experts to undertake a review. The members of the committee included: Craig Calhoun, University Professor of the Social Sciences at New York University and President of the Social Science Research Council (chair); Virginia Dominguez, Gutsell Professor of Anthropology at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign and President-Elect of the American Anthropological Association; Ulf Hannerz, Professor Emeritus of Anthropology at the Stockholm University and former President, European Association of Social Anthropologists; Michael Hout, Professor of Sociology and Chair of the Department of Demography at the University of California at Berkeley and Member of the National Academy of Sciences; and Richard Swedberg, Professor of Sociology at Cornell University and formerly at Stockholm University. This committee reviewed documents prepared by the Department (DSA) and the Rector's Office; spent an intensive four days (May 18-22) meeting with faculty, students and administrators at HUI (both inside the DSA and in other departments and more central levels including the Director of Scholion, the Dean of the Social Sciences Faculty, the Rector, and the President); and deliberated in detail about the department, its performance and its prospects. This report reflects the work of this committee and the shared views of all its members.

In briefest summary, the committee was shocked by the recent disinvestments of HUI from sociology and especially anthropology. These have exceeded the average cuts which the entire university must bear. The committee is concerned, however, that the department has not yet developed an effective response to this situation and plan for its future. Yet it was also impressed by the intellectual strength of a wide range of members of the department's faculty and by its continued ability to attract strong students. It saw a department currently less than the sum of its parts, but it also saw quality in those parts – particularly the faculty – which meant that modest investment could achieve an exciting renewal of international distinction.

### **History and Current Situation**

The DSA quickly achieved prominence after its founding. It has been an important resource in Israeli national development and a recognized and influential participant in the international growth of both sociology and anthropology. The department has included several world-renowned researchers on its faculty and hosted a wide range of others in its intellectual activities. It has a global reputation bringing it both a ranking among the world's leading departments and recognition for distinctive contributions. Its faculty have been visiting or permanent members of leading departments in Europe and the US. The DSA has trained leading faculty members of every university department of sociology and anthropology in Israel and placed its students in positions at top international departments.

Yet the DSA is in a difficult phase. Several factors coincide to produce this:

- The DSA has shared – more than equitably – in the recent resource constraints of Israeli higher education and the specific retrenchments at HUJ. The effect of this has been multiplied by the departure of several senior and prominent faculty members to either early retirement or other positions.
- Like sociology and anthropology departments elsewhere the DSA has been buffeted by changing academic trends including notably the dramatic growth (and cost) of laboratory sciences, the popularity of professional degrees among students and their families, the relative disengagement of economics and psychology from the rest of the social sciences as they underwent their own major late 20<sup>th</sup> century growth, distance in the relationship between sociology and anthropology, and exacerbated tension between agendas of contributing to national public discourse and social policy and internationally defined and largely English-language measures of scientific excellence.
- More locally, the DSA underwent a specific trauma with accusations of intellectual dishonesty against a prominent faculty member and attendant trouble in relationships among colleagues.
- Even when the department's proposed appointments were promising and endorsed by the Faculty of Social Sciences they were overruled by top administrators.

No single factor alone would have been insurmountable but their cumulative effect has created a crisis. Crucially, the DSA has found it difficult in this context to achieve the leadership and collective conversation to develop an adequate strategy for its future. It needs shared engagement in solving collective problems.

It should be noted that over the long term the DSA did respond to some of these pressures effectively – notably by developing a very effective organizational studies master's program to meet demand for more practical education at an advanced level. But there has been less effective response recently and further work is needed for the department to regain its former international intellectual distinction and live up to its potential to surpass even this illustrious past. This will also require investment from HUJ.

Attention to several issues in the DSA's current situation is needed to make such investment effective.

- The DSA faces a serious lack of senior leadership. It is already the case that many recent chairs and the (well-chosen) next chair come from ranks below full professor. Only two full professors remain (plus the Dean, though his departmental role is necessarily reduced); fortunately both are internationally well known and should be able to provide additional leadership.
  - While senior recruitment may be helpful, empowerment and rapid advancement of some of the department's strong junior members is also needed.
  - Also crucial is achieving greater collective participation in decisions about the department's strategic vision and plans.
- The anthropology program – recently perhaps the department's strongest - is now in severe peril, having been cut from a peak of ten faculty members to two continuing and one newly recruited, all relatively junior.
  - It is vital that multiple new appointments in anthropology be made immediately. At least one senior faculty member would be highly desirable.
  - Departing or recently retired anthropology faculty members are supervisors for an absolute majority of all current and recent PhD students in the entire DSA.
- The department lacks an adequate infrastructure for pursuing research.

- The world's leading research universities have interdisciplinary centers that assist researchers in applying for grants and foster a climate of collaboration and integration.
- The Scholion is an effective support for the humanities and related social scientists, but there seems to be no similar institutional support for other social scientists.
- This could also be provided at a department level where at a minimum it should include an enhanced program of mutual discussion and collaboration, but should also include the technical (e.g. computer) and administrative support necessary to compete effectively for external funds and carry out top-level research.
- The department has not worked out a fully successful relationship between its engagements in practical training and policy-relevant research on the one hand and in longer-term academic research on the other (though it is vital for it to pursue both).
  - This will likely require some restructuring of the graduate curriculum.
  - It will require mutual consideration among faculty and an effort to develop appropriate processes for recruitment and assessment.
- The department is struggling to identify an appropriate balance between contributions to Israeli society and the pursuit of international recognition.
  - This need not be a matter of zero-sum trade off. Both sociology and anthropology most thrive everywhere when they are at once engaged in contemporary and often local social issues and broader empirical comparisons and theoretical analyses. Jerusalem, thus, is not only a local site but also a compelling setting for examining many global issues.
  - More generally, the existing assessment scheme seems problematic. It undervalues books (which are central to both sociology and anthropology); it introduces inevitable arbitrariness in journal rankings; and it diverts attention away from more direct consideration of substantive contributions.

## Next Steps

The DSA needs a strategic vision and plan for excellence. The entire department needs to reflect on and make decisions about intellectual identity and priorities. Simply trying to distribute hiring among sociology, anthropology, organizational studies, and demography would not constitute a plan. An effective plan would identify some broad lines of work for which the department could gain recognition and which would provide bases for mutual engagement among HUI faculty members with different methodological and theoretical orientations.

The DSA requires significant autonomy in setting its own agenda and pursuing excellence within the framework of its plan -- and accordingly must take responsibility for meeting high standards. This must include some latitude to take risks if substantial rewards are sought. While we applaud efforts to ensure high standards of quality and international recognition, and avoid parochialism we are concerned that rigid application of any set formula will be counterproductive. Any attempt simply to pursue recruitment based on abstract indicators of quality applied without substantial internal knowledge of the relevant fields and departmental agendas will result at best in mediocrity rather than excellence.

The DSA needs to build on the existing strengths of its faculty. At all levels there are first-rate individual faculty members, but they do not achieve a coherent whole.

- In particular, most lecturers in the department are excellent and an effort should be made to help them flourish and produce the research necessary for early promotion and tenure.

- The tenure and promotion processes should be made more predictable, with more transparent and speedier procedures.

However, renewal of the DSA's momentum and excellence is not likely to be achieved without strategic planning and a more focused vision. This must be one formulated by the faculty in collective discussion. It should involve a small number of areas – but relatively broad and flexible ones which would connect faculty with different methodological and theoretical orientations. For example, the DSA might focus on culture in ways that integrate attention to religion, ethnicity, media, and institutionalist approaches to organizations and economic sociology. And it might focus on inequality and cohesion in ways that integrate demography, social structure, ethnicity, and political economy. This could be intellectually stimulating, promote unification, and help in prioritization.

Providing a better infrastructure to support research is crucial. Ideally this will include both departmental and interdisciplinary facilities. This is especially important to facilitate collaborative research, including that which may attract external resources and that which will help build a common vision and profile for external recognition.

It is important that PhD students be fully integrated into the life of the DSA, treated as junior colleagues, and as part of the future of the department and of Israeli sociology and anthropology generally. This is especially true for those with strong academic inclinations and capacities. Some of these are very strong indeed, reaching first-tier international standards. If HUI is to continue to function largely in Hebrew, it must recruit some of these back and more generally Israel must establish a viable path to faculty status (ideally with HUI in the lead). For example, the DSA could urge some of its best MA level students to do PhDs in Europe or the US, but encourage them to consider HUI faculty positions later by providing support for dissertation research and/or postdoctoral positions.

The DSA must also recruit from outside and it has urgent needs. Enrolments have remained high while the faculty has shrunk. The issue is especially acute in anthropology.

The DSA urgently requires a renewal of internal mutual engagement. In the face of recent traumas, much of the faculty has withdrawn from active participation. This is reinforced by relocation of some outside Jerusalem. Professors are not in the department as much as they should be. There is a shortage of seminars and collaborative projects.

- Increased internal collaboration and intellectual engagement should ideally be supplemented by increased external ties with other social science departments and relevant programs based in other divisions. Participation in Scholion is already important – both for DSA and for Scholion.

In sum, successful renewal of the DSA is possible. It will not be automatic. It will require collective effort from the DSA faculty. It will also require that the administration make an investment. And it will require mutual respect and trust to sustain a working partnership between the department and the central administration.

## **COMMITTEE'S REPORT**



**REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY**  
**FINAL REPORT**

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem has an extraordinary past, a troubled present, and impressive potential for the future. In this context, the Standing Committee and academic administration of Hebrew University called for an evaluation of the department and consideration of how it might flourish and attain new academic distinction.

The Rector appointed a committee of five international experts to undertake a review. The members of the committee included: Craig Calhoun, University Professor of the Social Sciences at New York University and President of the Social Science Research Council (chair); Virginia Dominguez, Gutsell Professor of Anthropology at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign and President-Elect of the American Anthropological Association; Ulf Hannerz, Professor Emeritus of Anthropology at Stockholm University and former President, European Association of Social Anthropologists; Michael Hout, Professor of Sociology and Chair of the Department of Demography at the University of California at Berkeley and Member of the National Academy of Sciences; and Richard Swedberg, Professor of Sociology at Cornell University and formerly at Stockholm University. This committee reviewed documents prepared by the Department (DSA) and the Rector's Office; spent an intensive four days (May 18-22) meeting with faculty, students and administrators at HUU (both inside the DSA and in other departments and more central levels including the Director of Scholion, the Dean of the Social Sciences Faculty, the Rector, and the President); and deliberated in detail about the department, its performance and its prospects. This report reflects the work of this committee and the shared views of all its members.

To summarize briefly, the DSA was once a major center of research and graduate education with a strong collective orientation and international profile. Over time, it lost some of this clarity of profile but maintained both high quality and a critical mass of excellent research. The committee members approached the review with a sense of this high level of achievement.

The committee was shocked, however, by the recent disinvestments of HUU from both sociology and especially anthropology. These have exceeded the average cuts being borne by the entire university. Resulting from attrition as well as negative decisions on appointments and retention, these have left the DSA both demoralized and below the critical mass of faculty it needs to manage its research and teaching programs effectively. The department seems not yet to have developed an effective response to this situation and plan for its future. It has not, for example, identified specific foci around which it will seek to develop intellectual strength and an international profile. Yet at the same time, the committee was impressed by the intellectual strength of a wide range of members of the department's faculty and by its continued ability to attract strong students. It saw a department currently less than the sum of

its parts, but it also saw quality in those parts – particularly the faculty, many of whom are genuinely excellent – which means that modest investment could achieve an exciting renewal of international distinction.

## **History and Current Situation**

After its founding, the DSA quickly achieved prominence. By the 1950s and 60s it was an important resource in Israeli national development and a recognized and influential participant in the international growth of both sociology and anthropology. The department has included several world-renowned researchers on its faculty and hosted a wide range of others in its intellectual activities. It has a global reputation bringing it both a ranking among the world's leading departments and recognition for distinctive contributions. Its faculty have been visiting or permanent members of leading departments in Europe and the U.S. The DSA has trained leading faculty members of every university department of sociology and anthropology in Israel and placed its students in positions at top international departments.

Yet the DSA is in a difficult phase. Several factors coincide to produce this:

- The DSA has shared – more than equitably – in the recent resource constraints of Israeli higher education and the specific retrenchments at HUJ. The effect of this has been multiplied by the departure of several senior and prominent faculty members to either early retirement or other positions.
- Like sociology and anthropology departments elsewhere the DSA has been buffeted by changing academic trends including notably the dramatic growth (and cost) of laboratory sciences, the popularity of professional degrees among students and their families, the relative disengagement of economics and psychology from the rest of the social sciences as they underwent their own major late 20<sup>th</sup> century growth, distance in the relationship between sociology and anthropology, and exacerbated tension between agendas of contributing to national public discourse and social policy and internationally defined and largely English-language measures of scientific excellence.
- More locally, the DSA underwent a specific trauma with accusations of intellectual dishonesty against a prominent faculty member and attendant trouble in relationships among colleagues. The department did not manage this crisis effectively, either with regard to its impact on collegiality or its impact on graduate education.
- Even when the department's proposed appointments were promising and endorsed by the Faculty of Social Sciences they were overruled by top administrators. We do not offer an independent assessment of candidates, but we do suggest that the department cannot thrive if it is not able to set an intellectual agenda for itself and develop excellence in relation to that agenda.

No single factor alone would have been insurmountable but their cumulative effect has created a crisis. Crucially, the DSA has found it difficult in this context to achieve the leadership and collective conversation to develop an adequate strategy for its future. It needs shared engagement in solving collective problems.

It should be noted that over the long-term the DSA has responded to some of these pressures – notably by developing a very effective organizational studies master's program to meet the demand for more practical education at an advanced level. But there has been less effective response recently and further work is needed for the department to regain its former international intellectual distinction and live up to its potential to surpass even this illustrious past. This will also require investment from HUJ and the development of a working partnership with higher levels of administration.

## **Foci for Attention**

Several issues in the DSA's current situation need urgent attention if the department is to thrive internally and achieve international distinction. Attending to these issues is a condition for making investment in the department effective.

**Leadership:** The DSA faces a serious lack of senior leadership. This is not simply a matter of the capacities of individuals, but of the number of individuals available and their willingness to take on leadership roles. It is already the case that many recent chairs and the next chair come from ranks below full professor. This is not necessarily a problem in any individual case, and indeed the committee unanimously believes the next chair has been well-chosen despite being relatively junior. The issue is the overall pattern which is likely to be exacerbated in coming years.

Only two full professors remain (plus the Dean, though his departmental role is necessarily reduced). Fortunately both are internationally well known and should be able to provide additional leadership. That they do so is crucial. The department needs not simply an effective individual, but an engaged collective leadership. This leadership moreover, needs not only to make decisions but to reach out to the entire faculty to create a common discussion of departmental issues and develop a common agenda.

We are struck by the relative lack of seminars and mutual intellectual engagement within the department. This is needed in itself. Also crucial is linking this sort of common intellectual life to greater collective participation in decisions about the department's strategic vision and plans. At present the department has no strategic plan – either in the literal sense of a five year plan as mandated by the administration or in the more substantive sense of a clear understanding of how it intends to achieve excellence and become a better place for its own members to carry out their work.

It may be that a retreat would be valuable, with its opportunity for sustained discussion. It may be that a focused set of seminars on key issues – both intellectual and organizational – would be an adequate mechanism for developing a stronger shared understanding of a collective future. Whatever the mechanism such a shared understanding is crucial. It is a necessary complement to managerial efficiency and effectiveness.

Senior recruitment may be helpful, though it is not likely to be an easy course for the DSA. Empowerment and rapid advancement of some of the department's strong junior members is also needed. We were impressed with the department's youngest faculty members and with the leadership potential of some of them. While they will not be chairs in the immediate future, we believe it is important that they become active participants in collective leadership. By this we mean not just that they assume administrative burdens, e.g. in advising. We mean, rather, that they be encouraged to participate in developing plans and vision.

The shaping of such plans and vision, and effectiveness in carrying them out, will depend considerably on the willingness of key faculty – including especially, but not only, senior faculty – to work with the chair both within the department and in making the department's cases to higher administration. For example, while we believe it is unfortunate that the administration chose not to back the department's recent recruitment effort, we also believe the department did not help itself as it might have by making an active campaign to demonstrate why these appointments would have been effective in pursuing a specific plan for achieving excellence and recognition.

Strong leadership should be evidenced in an entrepreneurial approach to building the department, a proactive search for high quality faculty, an ability to move quickly to achieve agreement on potential recruits, and a willingness to work with other HJ programs where this will help secure faculty (or achieve other gains). More generally, if well led the department should be able to forge more alliances and collaborative activities with other departments and programs in both the social sciences and humanities. In a situation of scarce resources, a purely internal strategy may be less effective than outreach and mobilization – “the best defense is a good offense.” But preconditions for this are clarity of collective purpose and strong leadership. And strong leadership will depend both on the individual chair and crucially on the effectiveness with which other faculty rally around the chair in pursuing collective goals.

**Anthropology:** The anthropology program – recently perhaps the department’s strongest - is now in severe peril, having been cut from a peak of ten faculty members to two continuing and one newly recruited, all relatively junior. It is vital that multiple new appointments in anthropology be made immediately. At least one senior faculty member would be highly desirable. It should be noted that departing or recently retired anthropology faculty members are supervisors for an absolute majority of all current and recent PhD students in the entire DSA. The attrition rate in anthropology is a severe problem.

The anthropological component of the DSA has for many years had a very strong reputation in the international anthropological community. It has had distinguished members whose theoretical, methodological and ethnographic contributions to the discipline have drawn much attention and praise, and these faculty members have also been very active, well-connected members of international scholarly networks. This has been reflected in their invitations to conferences and as visiting speakers and researchers at universities abroad, and also in the visits to the Hebrew University by many prominent anthropologists from elsewhere, who have been pleased to use opportunities to maintain and develop exchanges with Hebrew University anthropology. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, to put it briefly, has been a significant center of international anthropology.

It is therefore extremely disturbing that the anthropological discipline has rapidly suffered a number of important losses in a short period. It is important to recognize, however, that a considerable part of this decline could not have been predicted. While some important senior figures have reached or have been approaching the rather foreseeable retirement age, a number of other members of the anthropology faculty have departed (or, in one case, will be absent for several years) for some variety of other reasons that could not easily have been anticipated. The need to renew the anthropological component of the DSA quickly, with full recognition of the desirability of safeguarding its reputation for excellence, is thus all the more urgent. The Department as well as the Faculty of Social Sciences have obviously understood this, although its attempts to deal constructively with the situation have not been entirely successful. We understand that one new appointment has so far been approved, bringing the anthropological component up from two to three faculty members, though this is a far cry from the ten the DSA had just a few years ago. It may not at this stage be possible to rebuild anthropology to that numerical strength, given the general retrenchment within the university, but it is important to understand that the discipline has been weakened more than other components in the DSA, a department which in itself has lost more faculty positions than most at the university. It is consequently necessary to earmark resources for a number of faculty positions in anthropology.

The two remaining anthropologists in the department are active, committed scholars in whose continued contributions to the department we have strong confidence. They are, however, relatively junior academics – only one of them has tenure – who cannot fill the gap left by senior faculty members who have departed, or will soon leave. These senior members of the department have been very prominent in teaching, have carried very large burdens as advisors not least of a great many PhD students, and have been strategically important for their international reputations and networks. While some of the renewal of the anthropology component of the DSA should undoubtedly be planned to involve additional recruitments at more or less junior levels – and the department is adding an apparently strong junior anthropologist next year - we would see it as desirable to try and recruit one or more senior scholars who could help shape the scholarly focus of the anthropological program for the future, and build new bridges to the international anthropological community. Yet other ways of strengthening anthropology at the Hebrew University may also be considered. A series of visiting professorships for prominent foreign scholars could also bring expertise as well as important international linkages, and it is, of course, of great importance to recruit new younger faculty and inspire them to pursue long-term interests of value to the department as a whole.

With particular regard to such renewal, it may be useful to add a few words here about the balance between internal and external recruiting. The department and the university as a whole are obviously well aware of those risks of intellectual inbreeding that may recurrently present themselves in countries with relatively small national scholarly communities and few institutions of higher learning. From this point of view, it is obviously desirable to recruit a proportion of faculty members who have had significant academic experiences elsewhere in the world, preferably at leading universities. We can thus see the value of encouraging not least students intending to pursue a PhD to reach for training abroad. Yet clearly it is one measure of the excellence of a department that it also pursues a PhD program of its own, of the highest quality. To secure a strong recruitment to it, its students must not be made to feel that their training is devalued, or that they are disqualified as candidates for future teaching positions in their own department. One should not entirely underestimate the value that some internal recruitment may have for maintaining cohesion and long-term commitment to the program. The way to resist intellectual inbreeding here is to try and find ways for the department's own PhD students to spend some period abroad, while still integrated in the program, and also to make sure that they are exposed to wider international influences through visiting speakers and conference participation. A simple arrangement that could also valuably contribute to the cohesion of the graduate student community may be to support reading groups who engage with current developments in the discipline together.

There is one additional factor worth considering in faculty recruitment for anthropology. This discipline is strongly committed to a fundamentally world-wide perspective toward cultures, societies, and human diversity. We would not want to disregard the strong interest of Israeli scholars, not least in sociology and anthropology, in their own national society. Israel is obviously a country that has much to attract scholarly interest, and no doubt the location of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, a very special world city, contributes to the attention scholars elsewhere will give to the work of their colleagues there. Nevertheless, it is our opinion that anthropology, in any university, has a special obligation to open up perspectives toward global cultural and social diversity, and we would consequently recommend that this dimension of the discipline also be considered as further faculty appointments are made.

## **The Sociology-Anthropology Mix**

Achieving renewed excellence in anthropology depends on thinking through effectively the place of anthropology in the combined DSA. This means both its distinctive identity and the desirable relationships between sociologists and anthropologists in the department. And this requires thinking also about ways in which the presence of anthropology is an asset for sociology.

The DSA's mix of sociology and anthropology was not unusual in the middle of the twentieth century, but it has become unusual since then – at least in the international English-speaking context in which it seeks to compete and lead. The oldest, largest, and often most renowned departments of anthropology in the Anglophone world have been in autonomous existence for over a century. Few were combined with sociology. Even where this was once the pattern, in the 1960s and 1970s many universities of international reputation and ambition in the United States recognized the vibrancy of both disciplines and chose to create separate departments of anthropology and sociology. The continued housing of sociologists and anthropologists in a single department at the Hebrew University (and in all Israeli universities) does not follow the pattern in the English-speaking world.

This presents a notable difficulty for the Hebrew University. Keeping the two disciplines in a single department risks making the Hebrew University look out of step, or even out of date, in the context of the best universities with which it seeks to compete. To turn this debit into an asset, the Hebrew University needs to show the world that the mix of sociology and anthropology in the DSA is advantageous in ways that benefit the social sciences in general and perhaps Israel in particular. In other words, if the Hebrew University is going to continue to house the two disciplines in a single department, it is going to need to turn that into a comparative advantage.

We have considered ways to do this. Clearly it is for the department, the faculty, and central administration at the Hebrew University to decide, but some options we have considered include:

- (a) a choice to develop, privilege, market, and boast the kind of sociology that would engage best with an ethnographically grounded anthropology, whether understood through common field methods or through common areas of inquiry like culture (both of which have long been associated with anthropology but are recently among the most dynamic areas in sociology);
- (b) a choice to develop, privilege, market, and boast the kind of anthropology that would engage best with a particular type of sociology, whether it is demographic, organizational, political, phenomenological, cultural, or economic;
- (c) the explicit crafting of the graduate program (or at least of its most prestigious track) as a joint sociology and anthropology degree (and the boasting both in Israel and abroad of the particular advantages of such training);
- (d) the development of annual conferences, weekly or biweekly seminar series, Working Paper series, graduate student symposia, and thesis-writing “courses” on broad themes showcasing and debating approaches from both fields and their intersection at the Hebrew University.
- (e) a Web presence—perhaps monitored and led by MA and PhD students at the Hebrew University—that includes debate, conference papers, interviews, visual material, and open discussion, and that is visible and accessible to the rest of the world.

At present the DSA has individuals who are in fairly close touch with other members of the faculty and who value those connections. However, the department on the whole lacks the kind of synergy that we envision here and that the department has had in the past.

For the DSA to achieve international influence and prominence as a department—one that could attract students and faculty from throughout Israel and abroad—it needs to become known for something. One possibility is that it could achieve recognition as an experiment in interdisciplinarity within the social sciences (since sociology and anthropology are not at the present time often in active collaboration elsewhere, despite recent intense advocacy of inter- and multi-disciplinarity at many universities in North America and Europe). This possibility dovetails with our more general suggestion that the DSA reconceptualize itself as a department with two or three thematic foci, not disciplinary or quasi-disciplinary ones. For example, it could choose to develop concentrations at the MA and PhD level in social and historical demography, on one hand, and Cultural Studies (with a social science bent) on the other. Alternatively, it could choose to develop its already existing strength in the sociology and anthropology of religion (especially the monotheistic religions of the developed and developing worlds and their practices, interactions, and tensions) with a dual orientation toward the local/regional and the theoretical.

The DSA already has strength in these areas. Adding excellent junior and more senior people with related passions and expertise would maximize the chances of achieving international visibility, attractiveness, and intellectual leadership in a short time. Targeting related international scholars for short-term and longer-term visits and collaborations would expand the reach and attention to the department, its innovations, faculty, and students.

### **Organizational Studies**

Many positive things can be said about the program for organizational studies at DSA. It attracts excellent students; it counters the common academic emphasis on theory with a genuine concern for practical issues; and the placement rate of its graduates appears high (mainly as consultants in private business and the military). It may also be the case, as one faculty member said to us, that organizational studies at HUI constitutes the country's best program in organizational studies of a sociological character.

Each year some 15-20 places are set aside at the MA level for students who want to pursue organizational studies; and the competition for these places is intense. The fact that only one out of five students is admitted makes for a highly qualified student body. The students we met were also satisfied with the education they received.

While keeping these positive features in mind, it is also clear that the current shape of the program has some less desirable sides. The emphasis is mainly on qualitative skills, and the program would benefit from the introduction of more quantitative methods. The program is also somewhat old-fashioned in nature, even if it is no longer exclusively dominated by social psychology, as it once was, and even if attempts have been made to introduce a critical approach to management studies as well as a concern with networks. Modern organizational theory in sociology, in contrast, deals considerably more with institutions and comparative studies. It also engages more with new directions in the field, say economic sociology and political economy. Related to this latter point, it deserves to be pointed out that since the department has an internationally recognized expert on political economy, it would seem natural to include him in the work of the organizational studies unit.

Even more basically, the department has not worked out a fully successful relationship between its engagements in practical training and policy-relevant research on the one hand and in longer-term academic research on the other. This is an acute issue with regard to organizational studies, though it has echoes elsewhere. We applaud the department for pursuing both academic and practical training, but we think a more effective relationship between the two should be sought. This will likely require some restructuring of the graduate curriculum. It will require mutual consideration among faculty and an effort to develop appropriate processes for recruitment and assessment.

In organizational studies specifically, a large number of students – the vast majority, we were told - do not write theses, which means that the coming together of theory, research and practice is replaced with a one-sided emphasis on practice. This may impoverish those students who do not gain research experience as part of their master's degrees. It also means that common courses are undermined by an attempt to serve both research and non-research students.

What is ultimately at issue, however, is not so much the somewhat old-fashioned thrust of the program (which can and should be remedied), nor its internal curricular structure, but its overall lack of coordination with the rest of the department. As things now stand, organizational studies lives its own separate life in the department. This constitutes an acute danger for organizational studies, since it raises the issue of its *raison d'être* in a future department that is united around a positive vision for what it wants to accomplish.

This danger for organizational studies, however, can potentially be turned to its advantage. If organizational studies finds a way to link up its future profile with the main concerns of the department, the benefits would be mutual. Modern organizational sociology, for example, is currently dealing with issues such as culture and stratification, two areas that the department may choose to focus more strongly on in its new agenda.

### **The Demography Subfield**

Integrating the Demography Department into the DSA has been a success. The Demographers brought DSA added strength and depth in quantitative methods. The larger DSA protects Demography from the fragility that characterizes many small departments. By all accounts and our observation the demographers are a good institutional and social fit with the DSA. We encourage the demographers, sociologists, and anthropologists to seek and take opportunities to get better integrated substantively.

This means that pursuing the development of a shared research infrastructure would be better than pursuing the creation of a separate population studies center. It also means that it is important to look for potential common intellectual interests to which researchers with both demographic and other sociological and anthropological research methods can contribute. The DSA's demographers could productively collaborate with other DSA colleagues on a broad range of topics including family, religion, social inequality, and development.

The demographers are among the most productive researchers in the DSA. Several recent pieces illustrate well the use of issues in Israeli society to address theoretical concerns that are not unique to Israel. The demographers have also introduced approaches to history and comparative research in Africa that extend the range of intellectual interests represented in the DSA.



The demographers have embraced an important role in the DSA's quantitative methods training program. They staff a standard statistical curriculum in the graduate programs and offer advanced coursework that serves the students who are preparing to do dissertations in demography, family, stratification, or political economy.

Both the demography group and the DSA in general stand to benefit from bringing scholars together in focal areas for intellectual exchange and potential collaboration. This can create an opportunity to span distinctions that usually divide people into camps. An important example is the qualitative / quantitative distinction. Qualitative and quantitative research can give different perspectives on the same subject — typically the qualitative evidence is gathered up close while the quantitative evidence is gathered at some distance from the phenomenon. Combining the two perspectives can strengthen the insights of each — quantitative evidence can establish the generality of qualitative data while the specificity of qualitative evidence can uncover processes that underlie quantitative data. The trend in sociology in recent years has been to seek out common ground for quantitative and qualitative research and researchers. The work of newer members of the department reflects this, in some cases combining qualitative and quantitative work very effectively. We are not suggesting that every member of the faculty retool, of course. The same goal of bridging a gap can be achieved by collaboration. Colleagues can coordinate their efforts in ways that reinforce one another's work and produce a joint product of higher quality and greater impact than either piece of research alone.

### **Research Infrastructure**

The DSA is strikingly lacking in basic infrastructure for the conduct of research, especially collaborative research. Currently it is the demographers who suffer most from the DSA's lack of an adequate infrastructure for pursuing research. This is both because they are very actively engaged in research and because they tend more to conduct large-scale quantitative research.

The world's leading research universities have interdisciplinary centers that assist researchers in applying for grants and foster a climate of collaboration and integration. We were surprised, thus, that there is not an Institute for Israeli Studies or similar structure to play a role in the social sciences analogous to that Jewish Studies plays in the humanities and to support a range of research using different qualitative and quantitative methods. Such a support system could advance both ethnographic investigations in which the department has excelled and comparative research. In each case it would make research in Israel more effectively a part of international knowledge formation.

Research infrastructure could – and indeed must - also be provided at a department level where at a minimum it should include an enhanced program of mutual discussion and collaboration, but should also include the technical (e.g. computer) and administrative support necessary to compete effectively for external funds and carry out top-level research.

The evidence concerning library resources is somewhat contradictory. We do get a certain impression, however, that faculty members in fairly large part have access to new books if they buy them privately, or if they use research funds. This, of course, suggests that students risk not having the kind of access to books that a top research university ought to offer. We realize that university libraries everywhere are now pushed toward spending much of their funding on electronic journals, often commercially published and quite expensive. Yet as we have pointed out, sociology and anthropology are in large part book-oriented disciplines. It is important to bear this in mind in allocating funding for library purchases.

Another point bears only a little on research, but significantly on international recognition. This is its out-of-date, poorly functioning, and not-very-informative website. The state of the website is a sign of the department's neglect of collective goods. It should be treated as an asset for the department and upgraded accordingly.

More generally, achieving research excellence depends on collective goods as well as individual resources and incentives. These start with collegueship and intellectual conversation, extend into shared research facilities, and are capped off by collaborative research and publication. A situation in which individual faculty members must supply their own materials – even photocopying – for research is contrary to the achievement of research excellence. So is one in which faculty members typically work from home. It should be a goal to provide shared resources that draw faculty into the department and into collaboration.

### **The Global and the Local**

The department is struggling to identify an appropriate balance between contributions to Israeli society and the pursuit of international recognition. This need not be matter of zero-sum trade off. Both sociology and anthropology thrive everywhere when they are at once engaged in contemporary and often local social issues and broader empirical comparisons and theoretical analyses. Jerusalem, thus, is not only a local site but also a compelling setting for examining many global issues.

The DSA makes effective use of Jerusalem as a research setting and studies Israeli society more generally both as a particular object of study and as a case in comparative perspective. But it has not achieved a clear collective understanding of the relationship it desires between the pursuit of knowledge for international circulation and engagement, as experts, in local policy-making and public debates.

More generally, the Hebrew University clearly pursues excellence, and sees it reflected not least in international recognition. It follows from this that it promotes scholarly publication in English, by far the leading world language, especially in international business and the sciences. This means that everyday life, governmental life, and university instruction overwhelmingly take place in Hebrew at HUJ, but faculty publications are largely in English. This dilemma is a familiar one to many countries whose national language(s) are not fully recognized as international scholarly languages.

We believe it is important that national academic institutions and scholarly communities in this situation give careful consideration to the balance between participation in international scholarly activity and the effort to achieve recognition for such participation, on one hand, and a public role largely performed on national arenas and in a national language. Participation in such public service is widely regarded as one of the obligations of scholarly life, and it is natural that this is not least true of the disciplines of sociology and anthropology, dealing with issues of social life that may affect all citizens.

It may be important here to draw a distinction between publications – journals or books – aimed primarily at an academic readership but still published in the national language(s), and those that aim at a wider public. We assume that the former compares less favorably in most cases with publications in an international language (again, mostly English) which presumably have a wider potential audience and hardly lose any readers by *not* being in the specific national language. The latter, in contrast, may have their most important readership at

home, and in the national language. To give full recognition to this important public role of certain kinds of Hebrew-language publishing by faculty members, the university must not make the facile assumption that writing and publishing in Hebrew is by definition parochial and of limited intellectual worth, but should give serious attention to criteria for assessing the scholarly value of public service (and Hebrew-language) contributions, whether at the level of particular items or of entire periodicals or publication series. The problem is obviously not unique to Israeli academic life, but it should be recognized that one of the problematic aspects of a device such as the Jerusalem index is that it tends to disregard an important part of the cultural role of universities.

## **Assessment**

The HUI, in common with many universities around the world, has turned to the use of assessment tools based largely on external rankings and indices of journal publications and citations. The DSA has participated in this assessment effort, but it has not worked through for itself how best to integrate this into its pursuit of excellence in its specific fields and within its collective agenda. The existing assessment scheme thus seems problematic in several ways. Notably, it undervalues books (which are central to both sociology and anthropology). It approaches journals in overly narrow disciplinary terms, under-recognizing interdisciplinary publications. And the DSA itself has exacerbated the problem by creating an unnecessarily narrow group of “A” journals in the Jerusalem Index. Biases in the Jerusalem Index are especially problematic for anthropology. First, it is difficult to maintain a single list for two disciplines of different size. Second, some of the world’s leading disciplinary journals are ranked lower than we would expect. Third, key interdisciplinary journals which are very important to anthropology – and indeed in some cases sociology - are not adequately recognized.

We were sufficiently concerned by the role the Jerusalem Index seemed to play in assessment that we wish to offer some further comments. HUI uses the Jerusalem Index to assess faculty research productivity. The Jerusalem Index reflects each department’s grading of journals in its discipline: A = top 5-8%, B = next 10%, C = rest of top half, and D = bottom half. The logic of the index implies that a high quality department will publish more than 15% of its articles in A and B journals and relatively fewer in C and D journals.

The administration needs an objective tool for comparing departments. The Jerusalem Index could fulfill that need if intellectual activity in every department were concentrated in its leading journals. Neither Sociology nor Anthropology is like that, however. Books are central to intellectual activity in both disciplines; in most specialties books tend to be more important than articles. Relying on the Jerusalem Index — or any metric based solely on articles — will bias assessments by excluding many of the faculty’s most important intellectual contributions. It will underestimate the DSA as a whole, and rank faculty members in a way that only slightly resembles their productivity and international reputations.

Aggressive application of the Jerusalem Index can be counterproductive in another important way, too. If faculty become convinced that journal articles are all that count at HUI, they will probably write more articles and fewer books. They will advance at HUI but get nowhere in the wider world. HUI might even slip in international prestige while looking better on the Jerusalem Index.

Both of these consequences — distorted assessment and counterproductive behavior — are well-understood pitfalls of index-based incentive systems. Theory and research show that

these kinds of arrangements can, under very general circumstances, lead to distortions and counterproductive behavior<sup>1</sup>. The consistent recommendation of the administrative science literature is to use indexes only as a first input in a broader assessment.

To these well-known pitfalls of index-based incentive systems like the one based on the HUI, we add another one peculiar to the journal scene. While the articles in A journals are, on average, better than articles in B journals, those in B journals are better, on average, than the ones in C journals, etc., it does not follow that every article in an A journal is better than every article in a B journal. Editors and referees make errors when assessing articles — sometimes accepting papers they should not publish and sometimes rejecting papers they should publish. With enough observations these errors will average out. But when hiring or giving tenure to young scholars, the number of articles under consideration is far short of the large number needed for the average to converge on the true mean. Relying too heavily on an index will expose HUI to the errors of editors and referees in the most important decisions. In short, you cannot reliably infer the quality of individual articles from the quality of the journal that published them.

These problems with the Jerusalem Index in general are sufficient cause for concern, but there is also a specific problem with the Sociology-Anthropology list. The A journal list is too short. The current list that applies to the DSA classifies less than 4 percent of journals in the A category even though the guidelines call for classifying 5-8 percent of journals in the A category. The current A list contains the obvious choices. We suspect that perhaps the DSA could not reach consensus on which of a too-large set of journals should be A's so they made them all B's. They need to revisit that decision and fill up their A list. As it stands, the DSA has specifically chosen to have its faculty and the candidates it seeks to appoint appear as publishing only in "B" journals when they publish in some of the strongest and most widely recognized journals of anthropology and sociology. We suspect this reveals both a lack of collective agreement and a failure of leadership in helping the department recognize the likely consequence of such a decision.

Finally, in a point we elaborate on above, the preference for English-language publications discourages contributions to Israeli intellectual life, which is mostly conducted in Hebrew. Here, in particular, the second consequence of index-based incentive programs — counterproductive behavior — comes into view. If Hebrew were rewarded, DSA faculty members might devote some energy to writing about the relevance of their research for national policy or understanding social life. But if it goes unrewarded, some will write less for public consumption than they otherwise would. It might be counterproductive for a public university to appear aloof from public life.

## **Students and Teaching**

The DSA provides three degrees: BA, MA and PhD. Each of these feeds directly into the other in the sense that the PhD students at DSA tend to come from the MA students at DSA, who in their turn tend to be recruited from the Department's BA students. One factor that further limits the pool of graduate students is that applicants without a background in

---

<sup>1</sup> George Baker, 2002. "Distortion and risk in optimal incentive contracts," *Journal of Human Resources*, 37, 728-751. Avinash Dixit, 2002. "Incentives and Organizations in the Public Sector." *Journal of Human Resources*, 37, 696-727.

sociology and anthropology cannot be admitted, without a required year of preparatory courses.

This tends to produce inbreeding and unnecessarily limit the potential student body of DSA. While it would be decidedly better if there were no such requisite at the graduate level, the current situation is extra damaging for the demography section since demographers traditionally have a very diverse (and non-social science) undergraduate background. We therefore recommend that the DSA change its policy immediately with regard to students applying for the demography track and in the future possibly also for the department as a whole.

The pool of BA students is very large. About 700 students are active in the three-year program. This is a high number for a department of DSA's size and increasingly difficult to handle with the severe reduction in size the department is now facing. This constitutes once again a strong reason for adding more faculty members to the DSA as soon as possible.

During their years of study the BA students essentially learn the basic tools of sociology and anthropology. Many students have a double major, with the second major usually in some other social science. Given that HUI does not provide a general education degree at the undergraduate level of the type that one can find in the United States, the existence of many double majors among the students seems appropriate. The students we met were uniformly enthusiastic about their studies and felt that faculty members were happy to assist them. Contact with the faculty outside of the teaching mainly took the form of e-mails.

The one thing that BA students would like to have changed was the existence of huge classes; they prefer, as students do all over the world, smaller classes. Faculty members in turn praised undergraduate students at HUI for their high quality. Information on what BA students do once they have received their degree at DSA does not seem to exist.

The population of MA students is, to repeat, mainly drawn from the BA student population. There are some 120 students, with around 40 graduating each year. About half of the latter have organizational studies as their specialty, with the remaining three tracks accounting for the rest. In addition, a minute number of students complete combined degrees with urban studies and environmental studies. This is a lopsided composition and it testifies to the popularity of organizational studies. In our view it is only acceptable if the organizational studies program becomes better integrated into the rest of the department. The urgency to produce such an integration increases dramatically once the department has agreed on its new direction. If it does not happen at this stage, a discussion may be needed with the administration about what to do with organizational studies.

A concern raised by several faculty members – and shared by the committee - was that the number of Israeli Arabs among the students is very low at all levels. We were told that there were some at the BA level, none at the MA level, and one at the PhD level. Faculty members who discussed this issue expressed their concern with the current situation and emphasized that they were trying to change it through a tutoring program.

For the quality of the graduate students to increase they need to be exposed more than they are at present to international social science at its best. Support for trips to international meetings and conferences, and ideally also a year abroad at some high quality institution, constitute ways of accomplishing this.

This raises the issue of getting new resources or allocating existing resources differently, as does the attempt to get the absolute top students to join the department through selective incentives (e.g. individual research budgets, extra favorable scholarships and the like). But there also exist other ways to increase the quality of the graduate students that are not very costly and may even be largely free. One example is to follow the U.S. academic departments in strongly emphasizing the sense of cohort of each incoming group of students, thereby increasing the interactions among them and and fostering a fruitful exchange of ideas.

A small annual sum would also make it possible for the students to create their own graduate student association. When this issue was discussed with a faculty member we were told that students at DSA should not necessarily be encouraged to participate in student politics, and that its graduate students, being older than their U.S. counterparts and often having families, would not have the time for such activities. It should therefore be made clear that the main concerns of a graduate association are of a scholarly nature. Examples of its activities include seminar series organized by graduate students, using themselves or invited guests as speakers, and conferences of graduate students organized together with students at other Israeli universities. A graduate electronic newsletter is another example. The graduate student association may also want to discuss issues such as the tendency in the DSA (as in many departments) for the PhD students to divide themselves into an inner circle of active and ambitious students, and an outer circle with students who often feel less motivated and encouraged.

While the BA students and MA students we met felt that the faculty helped them in an efficient and generous manner, this was not the case with the PhD students. These were unhappy with the current state of the department; and while they felt that their individual advisers assisted them well, they also expressed strong disappointment at their lack of contact with other faculty members. According to the students, the department is often empty, with no one around (“No faculty is here”).

It should also be emphasized that the satisfaction of the graduate students with their individual advisers is apt to change very soon to the negative, given the current reduction of faculty at the DSA. What will accelerate this process is that it is precisely the faculty members who advise the majority of the students who are going to disappear or have already disappeared. Unless countered in a decisive manner through some new appointment(s), this situation is likely to result in lower quality dissertations as well as much individual unhappiness and demoralization.

One issue sapping the strength of the PhD program is the extent to which students must pass through a Master’s program focused mainly on students not seeking research careers. It appears that the courses at the MA level are too simple – perhaps too simple even for their intended practitioner constituency but certainly for future researchers. All PhD students and research-oriented master’s students described the core Master's courses as overly basic and simple. A closely related problem is the fact that there is little coursework specifically for PhD students. This means that there is less cohort-building than there could be as well as less good education. We recommend adding common coursework for all PhD students in the department. We also think the department might make more use of the track that admits students directly to the PhD program rather than keeping them in the MA program. If there were some PhD courses, this would work better.

Overall, it would seem that students respond in a positive manner to the fact that DSA is a joint department that provides training not only in sociology but also in anthropology. The BA students we met commented favorably on being taught both disciplines and made little distinction between the two. At the doctoral level, the importance of identifying oneself as either a sociologist or an anthropologist emerged with more clarity as well as urgency, even though students reported appreciating the existence of both disciplines in the department. According to one viewpoint, anthropology students tend to know more sociology than vice versa at the graduate level.

While faculty members and HUI administration did provide us with the basic facts for an evaluation, some material was nonetheless missing. These include continuous data on how long it takes to complete a PhD, how many of the admitted doctoral students end up without a degree, and where the students who complete a doctoral degree have been placed. Based on what we were told, it would seem that it currently takes around seven years to complete a degree, that around 70% of the admitted students end up getting a doctoral degree, and that a majority of the graduates find non-academic jobs. This sounds roughly like the situation in many equivalent departments around the world, with the possible exception that the placement of doctoral students in non-academic jobs seems quite high. But more and better information is, to repeat, needed for a final judgment.

We were not given a list of the names of students who have received doctorates on an annual basis and the titles of their dissertations. This would have assisted us in our judgment of how successful the four tracks have been and also in understanding what topics and methods have attracted the most attention. According to one source, for example, qualitative theses outnumber quantitative theses by two to one, a figure that the department may want to discuss when it discusses its future agenda.

The department lacks an explicit policy about hiring or not hiring its own PhDs. Of course, there are arguments for as well as against doing so, not least since a small country such as Israel has a limited number of universities. Nonetheless, a discussion of this issue – with input from the graduate students – may be a good idea. In general, we believe that the DSA should have a high-quality PhD program such that it would indeed want to recruit its own graduates, perhaps after completion of postdoctoral fellowships or first jobs elsewhere.

Indeed, we were struck by the lack of a DSA collective vision of future faculty recruitment as a process that might have roots in its own educational programs. For example, we know that other Israeli departments in various fields have explicit policies that send some of their best undergraduates or Masters students abroad for PhD programs, but keep track of them and try to ensure both that they have research possibilities in Israel and that the department consider them as potential future faculty. One could imagine, for example, using dissertation or postdoctoral fellowships as a way to draw strong Israeli students in international PhD programs to return to Israel. This could produce a boost for the recruitment efforts at HUI.

### **External Teachers**

We note that a large part of the teaching in the DSA is done by external teachers. Of the two such teachers we met, one has a rather favorable situation by way of a durable connection to a research institution, while the other may be more typical, teaching on a piecemeal basis in many institutions, on short-term contracts, with very limited benefits, and with little opportunity for research.

We understand that this is not atypical for HUJ; indeed the DSA is rather close to the average in its reliance on external teachers within the Faculty of Social Sciences. We also know that teachers employed on similar terms are now a recurrent feature of university life in many countries, an expression of an imbalance between student numbers and university resources. It is therefore unlikely that the DSA can take action to change the present situation importantly in material ways. Even so, we would hope that the DSA will give some systematic thought to ways of integrating external teachers further into the activities of the department, by improving their access to some types of resources, by acknowledging their value through shared intellectual activities, and by generally attempting to avoid placing them in continued positions of marginality.

### **The Partnership between the Department and the Administration**

Excellence in the DSA depends on a strong partnership between members of the department and the administration. Right now we not only detect a lack of partnership but a climate of suspicion and mistrust that probably limits the prospects for growth. In fact the interests of the administration and the DSA coincide perfectly. But mistrust is such that each side displayed to us tendencies to doubt whether the other side really was pursuing excellence. Some conflicts are inevitable. Even the best partners argue. Conflict can be productive in a climate of trust or corrosive in a climate of mistrust.

A first step in rebuilding trust between the DSA and the administration is to communicate the results of this review as an opportunity to move forward together. The President and Rector could foster this by hosting a seminar on this report instead of mailing it to the DSA with a covering memo. Partners meet to discuss important news; commanders issue orders. A face-to-face meeting will do far more to foster the development of partnership than a routine memo will. Engaging the whole DSA is crucial for now.

The fragmentation of the DSA is so nearly complete that finding a single partner within the department is unlikely. The administration has to reach out to a broad array of senior leadership and recognize the potential of several untenured and recently tenured members too. It needs to cultivate two-way communication, go beyond the formal, and engage with groups instead of individuals.

### **Next Steps**

The DSA needs a strategic vision and plan for excellence. This should be based on substantial mutual conversation among its faculty, and should reflect decisions about intellectual identity and priorities. Simply trying to distribute hiring among sociology, anthropology, organizational studies, and demography would not constitute a plan.

- An effective plan would identify some broad lines of work for which the department could gain recognition and which would provide bases for mutual engagement among faculty members with different methodological and theoretical orientations. For example, the department might choose emphases on the study of cultural issues and social inequality, cross-cut by a concern for migration and social cohesion.

The DSA requires significant autonomy in setting its own agenda and pursuing excellence within the framework of its plan.

- This must be combined with genuine departmental commitment to excellence and to pursuing such a plan proactively.



- Any attempt to pursue recruitment based simply on abstract indicators of quality applied without substantial internal knowledge of the relevant fields and departmental agendas will result at best in mediocrity rather than an effective unit.

The DSA is in urgent need of new faculty members. Enrolments have remained high while the faculty has shrunk. The issue is especially acute in anthropology.

- An additional senior anthropologist should be sought, but at the very least multiple junior anthropologists should be hired.
- Continued successful recruitment is also necessary to sociology.
- It is important that faculty be recruited within a proactive plan to achieve excellence, recognition – and also greater mutual engagement among faculty members.

The DSA needs to build on the existing strengths of its faculty.

- At all levels the individual faculty members are strong, but the departmental whole is less than the sum of its parts. Building on the strengths of faculty is a matter not only of recruitment but of collaboration.
- In particular, the lecturers in the department are very strong and an effort should be made to help them flourish and produce the research necessary for early promotion and tenure. The tenure and promotion processes should be made more predictable, with more transparent and speedier procedures.

The DSA should be open to potential joint appointments with other cognate programs at HUJ.

- Joint appointments will not obviate the need for autonomous appointments but can be crucial in a time of fiscal stringency and enriching at any time.
- It will be harder to be “planful” about joint appointments and often necessary to be opportunistic and act quickly. This should not be an insurmountable obstacle, however, and the existence of a strong plan and mutual discussion should actually make it easier to discuss how potential candidates might be integrated into the department.

The DSA urgently requires a renewal of internal mutual engagement. Absent such mutual engagement, recruiting alone will be insufficient to renew the department’s moral and excellence.

- In the face of recent traumas, much of the faculty has withdrawn from active participation. Professors are not in the department as much as they should be. There is a shortage of seminars and collaborative projects.
- Increased internal collaboration and intellectual engagement should ideally be supplemented by increased external ties with other social science departments and relevant programs based in other divisions.

Providing a better infrastructure to support research is crucial.

- This must include improvements in both departmental and interdisciplinary facilities.

- This is especially important to facilitate collaborative research, including that which may attract external resources and that which will help build a common vision and profile for external recognition.
- Participation in Scholion is already important – both for DSA and for Scholion. Other structures are needed to serve other lines of research.

It is important that PhD students be fully integrated into the life of the DSA, treated as junior colleagues, and as part of the future of the department and of Israeli sociology and anthropology generally. This is especially true for those with strong academic inclinations and capacities—perhaps a quarter of the total who are very strong indeed, reaching first-tier international standards.

- If HJ is to continue to function largely in Hebrew, it must recruit some of these back. More generally, Israel must establish a viable path to faculty status (ideally with HJ in the lead).
- This may also involve more systematic encouragement of international educational opportunities. For example, the DSA could urge some of its best MA level students to do PhDs in Europe or the U.S., but encourage them to consider HJ faculty positions later by providing support for dissertation research and/or postdoctoral positions.

In sum, we return to where we began. The DSA was once a major department – a leader in its fields internationally and inside Israel. It still has many excellent faculty. Indeed, we are very impressed with the quality of individual faculty members. But we are equally and less happily impressed with the absence of strong interaction and collaboration among them and the lack of a strong plan for how to renew the strength, vitality, and intellectual agenda of the department. We think that the current difficulties can be overcome, but only by the combination of effective recruitment, renewed mutual engagement, and a new relationship of partnership rather than mistrust between the DSA and the HJ administration.

## **APPENDICES**

## **APPENDIX A**

### **RESUMES OF COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

- 1. Prof. Craig Calhoun (Chair), Social Science Research Council**
- 2. Prof. Virginia R. Dominguez, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign**
- 3. Prof. Ulf Hannerz, Stockholm University**
- 4. Prof. Michael Hout, University of California, Berkeley**
- 5. Prof. Richard Swedberg, Cornell University**

## CRAIG CALHOUN

### SHORT CURRICULUM VITAE

**ADDRESS:** Social Science Research Council                      Phone (212) 377-2700  
810 Seventh Avenue, 31<sup>st</sup> floor                                      FAX (212) 377-2727  
New York, NY 10019    email: calhoun@ssrc.org

**WEB PAGE:**                      www.ssrc.org/calhoun

**EDUCATION:**                      D. Phil., 1980, Oxford University, Sociology and History.  
M.A. (Econ.), 1975, Manchester University, Social Anthropology.  
M.A., 1974, Columbia University, Anthropology  
B.A., 1972, University of Southern California, Anthropology.

**EMPLOYMENT:** Social Science Research Council, 1999- ; President.  
New York University, 1996- ; University Professor of the Social Sciences;  
Director, Institute for Public Knowledge, 2007- .  
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1977-1996- ; Professor, Director  
of the University Center for International Studies, Dean of the Graduate School

#### **BOOKS (authored):**

- (1982) *The Question of Class Struggle: Social Foundations of Popular Radicalism During the Industrial Revolution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, and Oxford: Basil Blackwell.  
(1989, 1994, 1997) *Sociology*, with D. Light and S. Keller. New York: McGraw-Hill.  
(1994) *Neither Gods Nor Emperors: Students and the Struggle for Democracy in China*. Berkeley: University of California Press.  
(1995) *Critical Social Theory: Culture, History and the Challenge of Difference*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.  
(1997) *Nationalism*. Buckingham: Open University Press and Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.  
(2007) *Nations Matter: Citizenship, Solidarity, and the Cosmopolitan Dream*. Abingdon, Oxford: Routledge.  
(forthcoming) *Roots of Radicalism: Tradition, the Public Sphere, and Early 19<sup>th</sup> Century Social Movements*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.  
(forthcoming) *Cosmopolitanism and Belonging*. Abingdon, Oxford: Routledge.

#### **BOOKS (edited):**

- (1976) *The Anthropological Study of Education*, with F. A. J. Ianni. The Hague: Mouton, and Chicago: Aldine.  
(1990) *Structures of Power and Constraint: Essays in Honor of Peter M. Blau*, with W. R. Scott and M. Meyer. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.  
(1992) *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.  
(1993) *Bourdieu: Critical Perspectives*, with E. LiPuma and M. Postone. Cambridge: Polity Press and Chicago: University of Chicago Press.  
(1994) *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.  
(1997) *Hannah Arendt and the Meaning of Politics*, with John McGowan. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.  
(2002) *Dictionary of the Social Sciences*. New York: Oxford University Press.  
(2002, 2007) *The Classical Social Theory Reader* (with Joseph Gerteis, James Moody, Steven Pfaff, and Indermohan Virk). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

- (2002, 2007) *The Contemporary Social Theory Reader* (with Joseph Gerteis, James Moody, Steven Pfaff, and Indermohan Virk). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- (2002) *Understanding September 11: Perspectives from the Social Sciences* (with Paul Price and Ashley Timmer). New York: New Press.
- (2005) *The Sage Handbook of Sociology* (with Chris Rojek and Bryan Turner). London: Sage.
- (2006) *Lessons of Empire?* (with Frederick Cooper and Kevin Moore). New York: New Press.
- (2007) *Sociology in America: A History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (2007) *Practicing Culture* (with Richard Sennett). Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge.
- (forthcoming) *The Public Mission of the Research University* (with Diana Rhoten). New York: Columbia University Press.
- (forthcoming) *Varieties of Secularism: Charles Taylor and "A Secular Age"* (with Michael Warner and Jonathan VanAntwerpen). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

#### SELECTED RECENT ARTICLES:

- (2003) "The Class Consciousness of Frequent Travelers: Toward a Critique of Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism," *South Atlantic Quarterly* v. 101#4, pp. 869-97.
- (2003) "Why Historical Sociology?" Pp. 383-395 in Gerard Delanty and Engin Isin, eds.: *Handbook of Historical Sociology*. London: Sage.
- (2004) "A World of Emergencies: Fear, Intervention, and the Limits of Cosmopolitan Order," The 35th Sorokin Lecture, *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 41.4 (November 2004): 373-95.
- (2005) "My Back Pages," in A. Sica and S. Turner, eds., *Disobedient Generation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- (2005) "The University and the Public Good," *Thesis Eleven*, 84, pp. 7-43.
- (2006) "Is the University in Crisis?" *Society*, 43 (4), pp. 8-18.
- (2006) "Pierre Bourdieu and Social Transformation: Lessons from Algeria," *Development and Change*, vol. 37 #6: 1403-1415.
- (2006) "Public Discourse and Political Experience: T.J. Wooler and Transformations of the Public Sphere in Early 19<sup>th</sup> Century England" (with Michael McQuarrie), in A. Benchimol and W. Maley, eds.: *Spheres of Influence: Intellectual and Cultural Publics from Shakespeare to Habermas* (Oxford: Peter Lang).
- (2007) "Social Solidarity as a Problem for Cosmopolitan Liberalism," in S. Benhabib, I. Shapiro, and D. Petranovich, eds. *Identities, Affiliations, and Allegiances*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 285-302.
- (2007) "Media, Civil Society and the Rise of a Green Public Sphere" (with Guobin Yang), *China Information*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 211-236
- (2007) "Nationalism and the Cultures of Democracy," *Public Culture*, Vol. 19 #1, pp. 151-73.
- (2007) "Orthodoxy, Heterodoxy, and Hierarchy: 'Mainstream' Sociology and its Challengers" (with Jonathan VanAntwerpen) in *Sociology in America: A History*, edited by Craig Calhoun. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- (2008) "Media, Power, and Protest in China: From Cultural Revolution to the Internet," (with Guobin Yang) *Harvard Asia Pacific Review*,
- (2008) "The Imperative to Reduce Suffering: Charity, Progress, and Emergencies in the Field of Humanitarian Action," in Thomas G. Weiss and Michael Barnett, eds.: *Humanitarianism in Question: Power, Politics, Ethics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- (2008) "Cosmopolitanism and Nationalism," the Ernest Gellner Lecture for 2007, *Nations and Nationalism*.
- (2008) "Religion, Secularism, and Public Reason," in *The Holberg Prize Symposium for 2005: Jürgen Habermas, Religion, and the Public Sphere* (Bergen: The Holberg Prize).
- (forthcoming) "Cosmopolitanism in the Modern Social Imaginary," *Daedalus*.

## VIRGINIA ROSA DOMINGUEZ

Curriculum Vitae (short version)

January 22, 2008

Edward William & Jane Marr Gutgsell Professor  
Department of Anthropology  
University of Illinois  
193 Davenport Hall  
607 S. Mathews Ave.  
Urbana, IL 61801  
Phone: (217) 244-9495  
Director  
Fax: (217) 244-3490  
Studies  
Email: [vdomingu@uiuc.edu](mailto:vdomingu@uiuc.edu)

President-Elect  
American Anthropological Assn.

Co-Founder and Consulting

International Forum for U.S.

Born: January 5, 1952, Havana, Cuba

Citizenship: U.S.A.

### Education:

Ph.D. 1979 (Dec.) Yale University, New Haven, Conn. in social anthropology  
M.Phil. 1975, Yale University in social anthropology  
B.A. 1973, Yale University (Phi Beta Kappa, Summa cum laude, Honors with exceptional distinction as Scholar of the House)

### Other:

Berlitz School of Languages. Budapest, Hungary (2000-01); Hungarian;  
Jerusalem Municipality Language Ulpan (summers 1980 and 1981). Hebrew;  
The University of Chicago. Chicago, Illinois 1974-75; anthro. & history;  
Harvard University. summer 1971; math;  
American University of Beirut. Beirut, Lebanon summer 1970; math;  
Berlitz School of Languages. Guadalajara, Mexico summer 1969; French);  
Alianza Cultural Uruguay-U.S.A. Montevideo, Uruguay, April-Dec. 1967; Course on North American Civilization

### Academic Positions:

2007 (January)-present: Edward William and Jane Marr Gutgsell Professor of Anthropology, University of Illinois @Urbana/Champaign  
2004-2006 (Dec.): Professor of International Studies (secondary University of Iowa appt.)  
2001 (spring): Salgo Professor of American Studies, Eotvos Lorand University, Budapest  
1995-2006 (Dec.): Co-Founder and Co-Director, International Forum for U.S. Studies (a Rockefeller Humanities Site at the University of Iowa)  
1998 (Fall): Acting Chair, Department of Anthropology, University of Iowa  
1993-2006 (Dec.): Professor, University of Iowa, Department of Anthropology  
1994-1997: Director, University of Iowa Center for International & Comparative Studies  
1991-1993: Professor, U. of California at Santa Cruz (Anthropology); also DGS 1991-92)  
1987-91: Associate Professor, Duke University, Dept. of (Cultural) Anthropology  
1984-85: Visiting Professor, The Hebrew University, Dept. of Sociology & Social Anthropology  
1983-84; 1987-91: Director of Undergraduate Studies, (Cultural) Anthro. Duke University  
1979-87: Assistant Professor, Duke University, Department of Anthropology

1976-79: Junior Fellow, Harvard University Society of Fellows

1973-76: Graduate Fellow, National Science Foundation

### **Editorial Positions**

Editor, American Ethnologist, 2002-2005 and 2005-2007

Member, Editorial Board, Jewish Cultures of the World Book Series, Rutgers Univ. Press, 2007-present

Member, Editorial Board, The American Quarterly (1999-2002)

Member, Editorial Board, Comparative American Studies: An Int'l Journal ('02-present)

Member, Editorial Advisory Board, Iowa Journal of Cultural Studies

Member, Editorial Board, Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power 1998-present)

Member, International Editorial Advisory Board, Communal/Plural: Journal of Transnational and Crosscultural (1998-2001)

Associate Editor, American Ethnologist (1994-98)

Member, Editorial Collective, Public Culture (1994-1999)

Founding member of Edit. Board, Public Worlds Books, U. of Minnesota Press (1990s)

Member of International Editorial Board for new book series on Transnational Cultural Studies of the Univ. of Illinois Press (1998-2000)

### **Service on International and National Boards**

President-Elect, American Anthropological Association (December 2007-2009)

Elected Member, American Anthropological Assn. Nominations Committee (2003-06)

Appointed Member, American Anthro. Assn's ANTHROSOURCE Working Group (2003-2005)

President, Society for Cultural Anthropology (Nov. 1999-Nov. 2001)

Chair, President's Advisory Academic Council, The Wenner-Gren Foundation (2001-02)

Member, Executive Comm., International Assn. for American Studies (2000-2003)

Elected Member, Board of Directors, Society for Cultural Anthropology (1995-1999)

### **Books and Monographs** (in print)

1975 From Neighbor to Stranger: The Dilemma of Caribbean Peoples in the United States. New Haven: Antilles Research Program at Yale.

1981 The Caribbean and Its Implications for the United States. Co-authored with Jorge Dominguez. N. Y.: Foreign Policy Assn, Headline Series.

1986 White by Definition: Social Classification in Creole Louisiana. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. (1994- new paperback edition)

1987 Special Annual Issue of Cuban Studies on "Sex, Gender, and Revolution in Cuba." Guest co-editor with Yolanda Prieto.

1989 People as Subject, People as Object: Selfhood and Peoplehood in Contemporary Israel. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

1995 Special Issue of Identities on "(Multi) Culturalisms and the Baggage of 'Race'" (Guest Editor) Volume I, No. 4

1995 Questioning Otherness: An Interdisciplinary Exchange. Iowa International Papers, Occasional Papers 30-37 (153 pages). Co-edited with C. M. Lewis.

1997 Evaluating Human Genetic Diversity. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press. 91 pages. Co-author as member of Committee on Human Genome Diversity (of the Nat'l Research Council, U.S. Nat'l Academy of Sciences).

1998 From Beijing to Port Moresby: The Politics of National Identity in Cultural Policies (edited with David Wu) NY: Gordon & Breach.



**Academic Articles (in print)**: dozens in peer-reviewed journals and edited volumes, including:

Current Anthropology, American Ethnologist, Cultural Anthropology, Identities, Social Research, American Anthropologist, Washington University Law Review, Political Power and Social Theory, Political Anthropology, SAQ (the South Atlantic Quarterly), Ethos, Communal/Plural, Comparative American Studies

**Selected Grants. Fellowships. Honors, and Awards (post-doctoral)**

- 2007 Simon Visiting Professorship, Univeristy of Manchester (England) (November 2007)
- 2006 University of Iowa Graduate College Outstanding Mentor Award (Social Sciences)
- 2006 Directeur d'Etudes and Keynote Speaker, Centre d'Etudes Nord-Americaines (Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris); December 2006
- 2006 Keynote Speaker, Israel Anthropological Association Annual Meetings (June)
- 2002-2007 Collegiate Fellow in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (U. of Iowa)
- 2001 The Monica Wilson Lecturer, U. of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa
- 2001-05 (Co-PI) Rockefeller Foundation grant to extend IFUSS' collaboration with Latin American specialists on the U.S. **(\$150,000)**
- 2001 Salgo Chair in American Studies @ Eotvos Lorand Univ, Budapest, (Jan.-June)
- 1999 Co-recipient of the "Reciprocal American Studies" section of the 3-year Ford Foundation's "Crossing Borders" grant to the U. of Iowa **(\$75,000)**
- 1998 Obermann Center for Advanced Studies, 1998 Obermann Faculty Research Seminar (June 15-July 2 1998) entitled "Legacies of 1898: Sovereignty and Colonialism in Puerto Rico, Guam, Cuba, Hawai'i, and the Philippines, and their Impact on the U.S." (Co-Director; **\$39,000**)
- 1997 U.S. Department of Education, Title VI institutional grant in interdisciplinary "Int'l Studies" (Principal Investigator; **\$871,463** for 1997-00)
- 1996 Regents Award for Faculty Excellence (one of 6 awarded to U. of Iowa Faculty by the Iowa Board of Regents)
- 1995-99.1 Rockefeller Foundation Humanities Residency Institutional Grant to establish the International Forum for U.S. Studies, (co-PI: **\$250,000**)
- 1995 Ford Foundation grant to the U. of Iowa & Grinnell College for inter-Institutional collaboration & development of international studies (1995-1998); Co-PI; **(\$209,000)**
- 1994 Selected to be the 1995 Morgan Lecturer (University of Rochester)
- 1994 Selected to be a C.I.C. Academic Leadership Fellow for 1994-95; U. of Iowa
- 1993 Center-wide Research grant, East-West Center, Honolulu **(\$14,100)**
- 1990 People as Subject. People as Object. nominated for Victor Turner Prize in Ethnographic Writing
- 1987 White By Definition named one of Choice's OUTSTANDING ACADEMIC BOOKS of 1986
- 1986 & 1990 Nominated for Duke's Distinguished Alumni Teaching Award
- 1984-85 Fulbright Visiting Professorship, Hebrew University, Jerusalem
- 1981-82 The Caribbean & Its Implications for U.S. nominated for Bolton Prize in Latin American History
- 1981-82 Melton Foundation Fellowship in the Humanities (full academic year salary)
- 1981-82 Social Science Research Council grant-for fieldwork in Israel

## *Curriculum vitae*

### **ULF HANNERZ**

Born June 9, 1942, in Malmö, Sweden

Home address: Kronobergsgatan 9, S-112 38 Stockholm, Sweden

Office address: Department of Social Anthropology, Stockholm University,  
S-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

E-mail: ulf.hannerz@socant.su.se

---

#### **Degrees**

1963 Candidate of Philosophy (BA), Stockholm University

1966 MA, Department of Anthropology, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana, USA

1969 Ph D, General and Comparative Ethnography, Stockholm University

#### **Positions**

1970-1981 Assistant professor, associate professor, Stockholm University

1981-2007 Professor of social anthropology, Stockholm University

2007- Professor emeritus of social anthropology, Stockholm University

1963-64 Graduate Fellowship, African Studies Program, Indiana University, USA

1966-68 Project Anthropologist, Urban Language Study, Center for Applied  
Linguistics, Washington, DC

1971-72 Visiting associate professor, Department of Anthropology, University of  
Pittsburgh, USA

1976 Simon senior research fellow, Department of Social Anthropology,  
University of Manchester, England (January-May)

1981 Distinguished visiting lecturer, Department of Anthropology, University  
of California, Berkeley, USA (March-April)

1984-85 Fellow, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Stanford, USA

1987 Visiting professor, Department of Anthropology, University of Adelaide,  
Australia (September-October)

1988 Fellow, Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in the Social  
Sciences, Uppsala (January-June)

1989 Visiting professor, Graduate Program in Anthropology, City University of  
New York, USA (January-May)

1991-94 Director, Swedish Collegium for Advanced Study in the Social Sciences  
(SCASSS), Uppsala

1991 Visiting professor, Centrum voor Grootstedelijk Onderzoek, University of  
Amsterdam (October-November)

1998 Fellow, International Center for Advanced Studies, New York University  
(November-December)

1999 Fellow, ESRC Transnational Communities Programme, Institute of Social  
and Cultural Anthropology, Oxford University (October-November)

2003 Distinguished Visitor, Suntory and Toyota International Centres for  
Economics and Related Disciplines (STICERD), London School of  
Economics (October)

2004 Visiting Professor, Department of Cultural Anthropology, University of  
Tokyo (January-March)

2005 Sackler Scholar, The Mortimer and Raymond Sackler Institute of Advanced  
Studies, Tel Aviv University (January-March)

2007-08 Senior Fellow, Internationales Forschungszentrum Kulturwissenschaften,  
Vienna (October-January)

2008 Wei Lun Visiting Professor, Department of Anthropology, Chinese  
University of Hong Kong (March)

### **Committee memberships, honors etc**

- 1975-86 Member of the editorial committee, *Urban Anthropology*, New York  
1978 Advisor, Swedish Commission on Immigration Research, Ministry of Labor, Stockholm
- 1978-80 Member of temporary program committees for immigration research and the sociology of culture, Swedish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences (HSFR), Stockholm
- 1979-93 Editorial advisor, *Social Analysis*, Adelaide, Australia
- 1979- Member of the international editorial committee, *Ethnology*, Pittsburgh, USA
- 1981-84 Member of working committee on historical anthropology, Swedish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences (HSFR), Stockholm
- 1983-89 *Ethnos*, Stockholm (Member of the editorial board 1973-1982)
- 1983-89 Member of the board, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), Geneva, Switzerland
- 1987- Member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences
- 1988- Honorary fellow, Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland
- 1994- Honorary foreign member, American Academy of Arts and Sciences
- 1995-96 Chair, European Association of Social Anthropologists (Member of the Executive Committee 1997-98)
- 1995-99 International Advisory Committee, Collegium Budapest
- 1997-2001 Section editor for Anthropology, *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences* (published in 2001 by Elsevier, Oxford)
- 1998- Member of joint committee on human rights, Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences and Royal Swedish Academy of Letters, History and Antiquities
- 1998-2002 Member of Advisory Board, Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) Programme on Transnational Communities, Oxford
- 2000 Lewis Henry Morgan Lectures, University of Rochester, USA
- 2005 Doctor philosophiae honoris causa, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Oslo, Norway
- 2007 Honorary member, European Association of Social Anthropologists (EASA)
- 2008- Member of International Advisory Board, Max-Planck-Institut für Ethnologische Forschung, Halle (Saale), Germany

### **Field studies**

- Washington, DC, USA 1966-1968
- Cayman Islands, British West Indies 1970
- Kafanchan, Nigeria 1974-1975, 1980, 1983
- Project on newsmedia foreign correspondents  
(New York, Los Angeles, Washington, DC, Jerusalem, Capetown, Johannesburg, Hongkong, Frankfurt, London, Stockholm, Tokyo) 1995-2000

### **Books**

- 1969 *Soulside: Inquiries into Ghetto Culture and Community*. New York: Columbia University Press. (Second edition, with new afterword, University of Chicago Press 2004.)
- 1973 ed., *Lokalsamhället och omvärlden*. Stockholm: Rabén & Sjögren.
- 1974 *Caymanian Politics: Structure and Style in a Changing Island Society*. Stockholm Studies in Social Anthropology, no. 1.
- 1980 *Exploring the City: Inquiries toward an Urban Anthropology*. New York: Columbia University Press. (Translated into French, Spanish, Italian, Polish.)
- 1982 ed., with Rita Liljeström and Orvar Löfgren, *Kultur och medvetande*. Stockholm: Akademilitteratur.
- 1983 *Över gränser: studier i dagens socialantropologi*. Lund: Liber.
- 1990 ed., *Medier och kulturer*. Stockholm: Carlssons.

- 1992 *Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning*. New York: Columbia University Press. (Translated into Italian.)
- 1996 *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. London: Routledge. (Translated into Spanish, Italian, Polish.)
- 2000 ed., with Kjell Goldmann and Charles Westin, *Nationalism and Internationalism in the Post-Cold War Era*. London: Routledge.
- 2001 ed., *Flera fält i ett: socialantropologer om translokala fältstudier*. Stockholm: Carlssons.
- 2004 *Foreign News: Exploring the World of Foreign Correspondents*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. ed., *Antropologi/Journalistik: Om sätt att beskriva världen*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.

**Michael Hout**

Professor of Sociology  
University of California, Berkeley

**Address**

Survey Research Center  
2538 Channing Way  
Berkeley, California 94720-5100  
e-mail: mikehout @ berkeley.edu

**Phones**

Office: (510)643-6874  
Fax: (510)643-8292  
Dept: (510)642-4766

**Education**

1976 Ph.D. Indiana University [Sociology]  
Dissertation: Determinants of Marital Fertility in the United States, 1960-1970  
1973 M.A. Indiana University [Sociology]  
1972 B.A. University of Pittsburgh [Sociology and History]

**Employment History**

2006- University of California, Berkeley, Professor of Sociology & Demography  
1988-2006 University of California, Berkeley, Professor of Sociology  
1991 University College, Dublin, Ireland, Visiting Professor of Sociology (summer)  
1985-88 University of California, Berkeley, Associate Professor of Sociology  
1983-84 University College, Dublin, Ireland, Visiting Professor of Sociology  
1982-85 University of Arizona, Associate Professor of Sociology  
1976-82 University of Arizona, Assistant Professor of Sociology

**Honors and Fellowships**

2007-08 Visiting Scholar, Office of Population Research, Princeton University  
2007 Otis Dudley Duncan Award, for Century of Difference,  
Population Section of the American Sociological Association  
2006 Elected to the American Philosophical Society  
2003 Elected to the National Academy of Sciences  
2000 Distinguished Graduate School Alumnus, Indiana University  
1998 "Outstanding book" on Human Rights, Gustavus Myers Center,  
for Inequality by Design  
1997 Elected to American Academy of Arts and Sciences  
1996-97 Russell Sage Foundation Visiting Fellowship  
1996 Population Association of America Clifford C. Clogg Memorial Award  
"In recognition of distinguished contributions to the collection, modeling,  
and analysis of census and survey data."  
1989 Elected to Sociological Research Association  
1985-86 John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Fellowship  
"Occupational Mobility in Ireland"  
1972-76 National Institute of Mental Health Training Fellowship  
"Training in Quantitative Methods"

## Books

- 2006 Fischer, Claude S., and Michael Hout. *Century of Difference: How America Changed in the Last Hundred Years*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Greeley, Andrew, and Michael Hout. *The Truth About Conservative Christians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 1996 Fischer, Claude S., Michael Hout, Samuel R. Lucas, Mart.n S.nchez Jankowski, Ann Swidler, and Kim Voss. *Inequality by Design: Cracking the Bell Curve Myth*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 1989 Hout, Michael. *Following in Father's Footsteps: Occupational Mobility in Ireland*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- 1983 Hout, Michael. *Mobility Tables*. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

## Journal Articles and Book Chapters by Topic

### Inequality and Stratification

- 2008 Hout, Michael. "How Class Works in Popular Conception: Most Americans Identify with the Class Their Income, Occupation, and Education Implies for Them." Ch. 2 in *Social Class: How Does It Work?*, edited by Annette Lareau and Dalton Conley. New York: Russell Sage Foundation. forthcoming.
- 2007 Hout, Michael. "Maximally Maintained Inequality Revisited: Irish Educational Stratification in Comparative Perspective." Ch. 2 in *Changing Ireland in International Comparison*, edited by Betty Hilliard and Maire NicGhiolla Phadraig. Dublin: Liffey Press.
- 2006 Hout, Michael, and Thomas A. DiPrete. "RC28's Contribution to Knowledge: An Assessment and an Agenda for the Future." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 24: 1-20.
- Beller, Emily, and Michael Hout. "Welfare States and Social Mobility." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 24: 353-365.
- Beller, Emily, and Michael Hout. "Intergenerational Social Mobility: The United States in Comparative Perspective." *The Future of Children* 16: 19-36.
- Hout, Michael. "Economic Change and Social Mobility." Pp. 112-130 in *Inequalities of the World*, edited by Goran Therborn. London: Verso.
- Hout, Michael. "Maximally Maintained Inequality and Essentially Maintained Inequality: Crossnational Comparisons." *Riron to Hoho [Sociological Theory and Method]* 21: 235-252.
- 2004 Hout. "Tightening Up: Declining Class Mobility during Russia's Economic Transition." *American Sociological Review* 69 (October): 677-703.
- Hout, Michael. "Social Mobility and Inequality: A Review and an Agenda." Ch. 26 in *Social Consequences of Growing Inequality*, edited by Kathryn Neckerman. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hout, Michael. "Educational Progress for African Americans and Latinos Since the 1950s." Pp. 262-297 in *Ethnicity and Social Mobility in Comparative Perspective*, edited by Glenn Loury, Tariq Modood, and Steven Teles. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2003 Hout, Michael, "The Inequality-Mobility Paradox." *New Economy* 10: 205-207.

- 2002 Hout, Michael, "Test Scores, Education, and Poverty." Pp. 329-54 in *Race and Intelligence*, edited by Jefferson Fish. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- 2000 Fischer, Claude S., Michael Hout, Mart.n S.nchez Jankowski, Samuel R. Lucas, Ann Swidler, and Kim Voss). "Inequality by Design." Chapter 2 in *Social Stratification* (second edition), edited by David B. Grusky. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. [reprinted again in Grusky & Szelenyi (2006), *The Inequality Reader*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.]
- Hout, Michael, and Harvey S. Rosen. "Self-employment, Race, and Family Background." *Journal of Human Resources* 35: 670-693.
- Hout, Michael, "Social Mobility." 840-841 in *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World* (2nd edition), edited by Joel Krieger. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

### **Political Sociology**

- 2007 Hout, Michael, and Benjamin Moodie. "The Realignment of U.S. Presidential Voting, 1948-2004." Pp. 567-575 in *The Inequality Reader: Contemporary and Foundational Readings in Race, Class, and Gender*, edited by David Grusky and Szonja Szelenyi. Boulder CO: Westview Press.

### **Religion**

- 2004 Hout, Michael, and Melissa J. Wilde. "The Denominational Society in the United States: A Reappraisal." Pp. 19-49 in *Patterns and Processes of Religious Change in Modern Industrial Societies: Europe and the United States*, edited by Alasdair Crockett and Richard O'Leary. London: Edwin Mellen.
- 2003 Hout, Michael. "Demographic Methods for the Study of Religion." Pp. 145-154 in *Handbook of the Sociology of Religion*, edited by Michele Dillon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2002 Hout, Michael, and Claude S. Fischer, "Explaining the Rise of Americans with No Religious Preference: Generations and Politics." *American Sociological Review* 67: 165-190.
- 2001 Hout, Michael, Andrew M. Greeley, and Melissa J. Wilde, "The Demographic Imperative in Religious Change." *American Journal of Sociology* 107: 468-500.
- 2000 Hout, Michael, "Alienation Among Divorced and Remarried Catholics in the United States." *America*.

### **Methodology**

- 2004 Evans, William R., Susan Mayer, and Michael Hout. "Inequality Effects" Ch. 27 in *Social Consequences of Growing Inequality*, edited by Kathryn Neckerman. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- 2001 Goodman, Leo A., and Michael Hout. "Statistical Methods and Graphical Displays for Comparing How Two-Way Associations Vary Among Countries, Among Groups, or Over Time, Part II: Some Simple Extensions and Simple Examples." *Sociological Methodology* 31: 189-211.

## **Demography**

- 2005 Fischer, Claude S., and Michael Hout. "The Family in Trouble? Since When? For Whom?" Pp. 120-140 in *The Family Transformed*, edited by Steven M. Tipton, and John Witte, Jr. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- 2004 Fischer, Claude S., Gretchen Stockmayer, Jon Stiles, and Michael Hout. "Distinguishing the Levels and Dimensions of U.S. Metropolitan Segregation, 1960-2000." *Demography* 41: 37-59.

## **Other Publications**

- 2007 Hout, Michael. "Otis Dudley Duncan's Major Contributions to the Study of Social Stratification." *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 26: forthcoming.
- 2005 Brady, Henry, Michael Hout, and Jon Stiles. *Return on Investment: Educational Choices and Demographic Change in California's Future*. Berkeley: Survey Research Center.
- 2004 Hout, Michael, and Andrew M. Greeley. "A Hidden Swing Vote: Evangelicals." Op-ed article in *N.Y. Times*, 4 September 2004
- Hout, Michael, "Bush's Jobs Deficit." Op-ed article in *L.A. Times*, 1 March 2004.
- Hout, Michael. "Houses Divided: Review of *The Hidden Cost of Being African American* by Thomas M. Shapiro." *Washington Post Book World*, 15 February, p. 3.
- Hout, Michael. "Review of *The Pecking Order* by Dalton Conley." *Contexts* 3 (Spring): 37.
- 2003 Hout, Michael, and Claude S. Fischer. "Oh, Be Some Other Name: Reply to Marwell and Demerath." *American Sociological Review* 69.
- 2000 Hout, Michael, and Andrew M. Greeley. "Getting to the Truths That Matter: Reply to Stolzenberg." *American Sociological Review* 66: 152-158.



May 6, 2008

## **CURRICULUM VITAE**

**Richard Swedberg**

### **PRESENT POSITION:**

Professor of Sociology at Cornell University, Department of Sociology (since July 1, 2002).

### **OFFICE ADDRESS:**

Cornell University  
Department of Sociology  
328 Uris Hall  
Ithaca  
NY 14853-7601  
Phone: 607-2554325  
E-mail: rs328@cornell.edu

### **PRIVATE ADDRESS:**

623 Highland Road  
Ithaca, NY 14850  
USA  
Phone: 607-2575666

### **CIVIL STATUS:**

Swedish citizen

### **SPECIALTY :**

**Economic Sociology, including Economy and Law; Sociological Theory, especially the Classics**

### **EDUCATION:**

MM.L. ("Juris kandidat"), Faculty of Law, Stockholm University June 1970;  
Ph D, Department of Sociology, Boston College May 1978.

### **EARLIER POSITIONS:**

Before Cornell, I worked at the Department of Sociology at Stockholm University since 1984. In 1996 I was appointed "Professor of Sociology, especially Economic Sociology" at Stockholm University.

## BOOKS

*Tocqueville's Political Economy*. Forthcoming in 2009 on Princeton University Press.

**Principles of Economic Sociology**. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003. Translated into Italian (EGEA of the University of Bocconi, 2003), Chinese (China Renmin University Press, 2005; and Chu Liu Book Company, 2007), Croatian (MaTe and the Zagreb School of Business, 2006), German (forthcoming) and Hungarian (forthcoming). Also reprinted in 2004 by Rawat Publications in New Delhi, India.

*Max Weber and the Idea of Economic Sociology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998. Forthcoming trans. in Japanese (Bunka Shobu). Translated into Portuguese in 2004 and into Chinese (Commercial Press of Beijing in 2007). Elected one of “*Choice's* Outstanding Academic Books of 1999”.

*Joseph A. Schumpeter: His Life and Work* (1991, Princeton University Press in the United States and Polity Press in England). This work has been translated into German (Klett-Cotta 1994), Japanese (Mineruba Shobo 1994); Italian (Bollati Boringhieri, 1998) and Chinese (Jiangsu People's Publishing House, 2005).

*Economics and Sociology: On Redefining Their Boundaries. Conversations with Economists and Sociologists* (Princeton University Press, 1990). Reprinted in 1991 by Oxford University Press for India, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka. An Italian translation by Donzelli Editore appeared in 1994 and one into Chinese [with a new preface] in 2003 by The Commercial Press of Beijing. Individual chapters have been reprinted in *Society* (USA) in 1990 and in *Metapolitica* (Mexico) in June 1999.

## EDITED VOLUMES

(ed. with Victor Nee), *On Capitalism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007. (I have written a chapter on Tocqueville's analysis of American capitalism in the 1830s and, together with Victor Nee, the introduction).

(ed. with Victor Nee), *The Economic Sociology of Capitalism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005. (I have written Ch. 1, “The Economic Sociology of Capitalism: An Introduction and Agenda”, pp. 3-40 – a somewhat different version of which also appears as “Towards an Economic Sociology of Capitalism”, *L'Année Sociologique* 55[2005]:419-50).

(ed. with Neil Smelser), *The Handbook of Economic Sociology*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 2005. I co-wrote (with Neil Smelser) a new version of the introduction as well as a new version of the chapter “Markets in Society”. Princeton and New York: Princeton University Press and Russell Sage Foundation. Forthcoming in China on Hua Xia Publishing House.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **List of People who Met with the Committee**

The President, Prof. Menachem Magidor  
The Rector, Prof. Haim Rabinowitch  
The Vice-Rector, Prof. Miri Gur-Arye

Head of Academic Review for the Humanities, Social Sciences and Law,  
Prof. Jacob Metzger

Dean of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Prof. Boas Shamir

Current Head of the Department of Sociology & Anthropology, Prof. Zali Gurevitch  
Incoming Head of the Department of Sociology & Anthropology, Prof Gad Yair

Emeriti Faculty: Prof. Shmuel Eisenstadt, Prof. Don Handelman, Prof. Victor Azarya,  
Prof. Yehudit Shoval

Senior Faculty: Prof. Eyal Ben-Ari, Prof. Yoram Bilu, Prof. Eva Illouz, Prof. Amalya  
Oliver, Prof. Tamar El-Or, Prof. Barbara Okun, Prof. Michael Shalev

Junior Faculty: Dr. Nurit Stadler, Dr. Alex Weinreb, Dr. Guy Stecklov, Dr. Aziza  
Khazzoom

Outside Teachers: Dr. Chaim Noy, Dr. Tal Kochavi

Adjunct Teacher: Dr. Israel Katz

Others: Prof. Ruth Gavison, Prof. Itamar Gati, Prof. Yisrael Yuval, Prof. Esther Cohen,  
Prof. Tamar Rapoport, Dr. Mimi Ajzenstadt, Prof. David Weisburd

Advisors: Dr. Yehuda Goodman (BA), Dr. Jona Schellekens (MA),  
Dr. Gideon Aran (PhD)

BA Students - 5

MA Students - 7

PhD Students - 6