In the struggle to improve public education in America’s cities, identifying and rewarding effective teaching is a hot strategy. This wave of school reform creates incentives for teachers whose students learn the most, as measured by standardized tests.

But Chicago economics professor Derek Neal has found unanticipated negative consequences: by placing teachers in competition with each other, such systems can discourage the sharing of precious teacher expertise. Neal’s current research looks instead to model an incentive system that rewards not only teachers who succeed but those who help their colleagues succeed.

Put an economist (or a sociologist, psychologist, mathematician, or policy professor) in the same room with public-school teachers and administrators, and good ideas crop up. That’s what the Division’s Committee on Education does—and what a recent $5 million gift from University trustee Charles Ashby Lewis and his wife Penny Bender Sebring will help it do even better.

Founded in 2006, the Committee on Education works closely with the University’s Urban Education Institute (UEI) and the four charter school campuses UEI runs on the South Side of Chicago. Lewis and Sebring’s January gift to UEI was only the family’s most recent. Their nearly $15 million of support over the past ten years has been a key driver of UEI’s development into a model for school reform in cities across the United States.

The Committee consists of nine faculty members in the social sciences, one in mathematics, and one in public policy, along with the directors of UEI and the director of the Consortium on Chicago School Research (CCSR). Many of them conduct research that informs practice in the schools, draw on the expertise of teachers and other UEI practitioners to inform their research, or both.

Several faculty also work with CCSR, the arm of the institute that, since 1990, has maintained and analyzed an exhaustive collection of data from Chicago Public Schools. Sebring cofounded CCSR with former U of C sociology professor Tony Bryk and later became involved with the Social Sciences Division when she and Lewis joined the Visiting Committee in 2000.

In the early days of the University of Chicago Charter School, before UEI or the Committee existed, Lewis says, he and Sebring were in constant conversations with Richard Saller (then dean of the SSD and later provost of the University) about how to build on the work Bryk was doing to improve urban public schools.

“There were three things that we thought were critical,” Lewis says. “Based on my experience as an investment banker, I first named two pieces: long-term, dedicated leadership and a sound financial foundation.” They later added to these requirements...
ments the need for a committee on education “because,” Lewis recalls, “this work had to be grounded in the faculty and owned by them if we wanted it to persist.” Lewis and Sebring endowed a professorship in SSD in order to help attract an outstanding leader to the Committee, a venture that was different from any existing department or school of education. It was the anticipation of the Committee’s unique structure and especially its bloodlines to UEI that drew that leader, Stephen Raudenbush, to Chicago from the University of Michigan in 2005: “The idea of building interdisciplinary scholarship in education that would be closely in collaboration with ambitious practical work going on in the schools was an exciting idea to me.” And it’s an exciting reality, says Raudenbush, who’s now the Lewis-Sebring Distinguished Service Professor in Sociology and the College.

“What makes the Committee different,” Raudenbush says, “is that it’s deeply embedded in the disciplines at the University of Chicago. Schools of education—particularly those in research-intensive universities—often become isolated from the social sciences disciplines. But we integrate with them.” The Committee isn’t formally married to UEI, and its faculty members aren’t required to work with UEI. But the opportunity to do so is one that professors with an interest in education find hard to pass up. Part of their foundation’s most recent gift, Sebring and Lewis hope, will be used to create incentives for faculty to forge more collaborations with UEI.

The current work of Susan Goldin-Meadow and Susan Levine on early language development is one example. The psychology professors began following the children in the study at age one and will continue through age ten. “This unusually wide scope will allow them to observe links between early language acquisition and the emergence of reading comprehension. Reading comprehension is the culmination of learning to read, and solid literacy education is an imperative that too many urban public schools fail to provide.” Because of the UEI-Committee partnership, Goldin-Meadow and Levine are taking their basic research a step further. At a recent meeting of Committee faculty, they shared five hypotheses, based on their work to date, of early interventions in children’s education that could significantly improve their language development and, later, their reading skill. While the interventions

Report from the Dean

A year makes a difference. Twelve months ago, the economy was in free fall and the University of Chicago was cutting its budget to cope with the effects. We are now living with less, and we will be living with less for a while longer. All of us are hoping for better times soon.

But we are also moving forward. Last fall, President Zimmer announced the University’s intention to proceed with a select set of strategic initiatives. Foremost among them is the expansion of the University of Chicago faculty. As I write, a committee of the arts and sciences deans is evaluating proposals for 72 new faculty positions from 34 different departments and programs. In the spring, we anticipate, the provost will authorize searches for 22 new assistant professors across the Social Sciences, Physical Sciences, Humanities, and the Divinity School. The University also plans to make strategic hires at the senior level, taking advantage of an opportunity to bring transformative scholars into the divisions. Talk about tough decisions—but exciting ones!

Behind the president’s decision is the belief that the University can invest more in its faculty, even in hard times. Last year, the University’s leadership showed its ability to make tough, disciplined, unflinching choices, adjusting our current commitments to our diminished resources and earning the confidence of the board of trustees. Even more important is the University’s conviction that it must expand the faculty. The size of the arts and sciences faculty at Chicago has been constant for four decades, even as new fields of inquiry have opened, even as peers have grown, and even as the Chicago student body has increased from 9,000 students in the early 1970s to 15,000 now. We must expand the faculty to keep up with the demands, to maintain pace with our competitors, and to stay in front of scholarly developments.

And now is the time. Other universities are freezing their faculties, or reducing them. Meanwhile, outstanding young scholars are completing their studies and entering the most uncertain academic employment market in memory. We have the chance now to recruit the best of the next generation to the University of Chicago, to place them in the most stimulating intellectual community on the planet, and to share in the excitement as they grow into the leading social scientists of their day. We will seize it.
are truly hypothetical, Raudenbush says, even the possibility of bringing their basic science research to bear on the education of real children is inspiring to faculty.

“A lot of this,” says Lewis, “is knitting things together. The Committee is a new model for how faculty with appointments in the disciplines can come together to work on common intellectual interests. And the collaboration between UEI and the Committee is a new model for how a research university can build knowledge about how to do urban schooling better.”

Besides helping to multiply conversations between researchers and practitioners, Lewis and Sebring’s generosity will benefit up-and-coming social scientists by extending support to the Committee’s flourishing predoctoral fellowship program. “The strengths of what we’re doing are using the highest standards of social science to come to bear on the improvement of education, on the one hand,” Raudenbush says. “On the other hand, we work closely with people who are deeply engaged in creating terrific schools and others who are trying to make existing schools better. I think that basic strategy is potentially very powerful for generating new knowledge and for encouraging educational innovation.”

Monetary Matters

Markovitz Dissertation Fellowships help students link economics and social life.

Social sciences graduate students Erica Coslor, AM’05, and Marc Teignier-Baque, AM’05, are working to illuminate the links between social and economic behavior—and they are both 2009–10 recipients of the Michael C. Markovitz Dissertation Fellowship. Established by Michael Markovitz, AM’73, PhD’75, in 1997, the fellowship provides one or two annual dissertation-year awards to social sciences graduate students exploring “the connection between the social/cultural and commercial spheres of life.”

Coslor arrived in the sociology department in 2002 planning to study nightlife and entertainment, but switched tracks. “I wanted to focus on the intersection of money and values, something that was a problematic market,” she says. “And then I realized that the art market is complicated because of the relationship between aesthetic values and market values. I started going to auctions in Chicago and fell in love with the topic.”

Through ethnographic research in New York and London, Coslor’s dissertation traces the interest in art investment over the past 40 years. What started over 300 years ago as speculative interest—purchasing a piece of artwork and positing that it might be worth more down the road—has evolved, she says, into rational, calculated investment that is even acceptable to hedge-fund managers. Supporting that shift, financial professionals and economists have developed technical evaluation measures and ways to legitimize financial investment in art. Examples include art price indices that compare against the Standard & Poor’s 500 and private equity funds that purchase a portfolio of artwork and sell shares to potential investors.

But while such resources now exist, Coslor notes that the art market is more complex than it appears on the surface. Potential investors run into trouble, she explains, when they assume that auction sales adequately represent the market’s overall direction. “I interpreted the criteria for receiving a Markovitz Fellowship as conducting research that helps inform how the social sciences contribute to economic understandings,” Coslor says. “Using ethnographic research to uncover the disconnect between auctions and galleries is where sociology can contribute to economic understanding of the art market. One example is the price protection measures used by galleries. If art collectors or funds want to sell their works, the gallerists representing those artists will often step in. If the owner really wants to sell and the gallery doesn’t think it’s a good time—if, for instance, the market is not doing well—the gallery might try to arrange a private sale rather than have the work go to auction where it gets a publicly visible price. If the owners don’t follow the gallerist’s advice, they could be subject to sanctions, such as that particular gallery never selling to them again.” This is because gallerists must manage price levels at the same time that they manage artistic careers: a low price at auction can sometimes create a permanent black mark on a young artist’s perceived career.

While Coslor developed a new research focus as a graduate student, Marc Teignier-Baque returned to a field he studied as a Barcelona undergraduate: international trade and economic growth. His dissertation explores international trade’s effects on structural transformation and economic development in the United Kingdom and South Korea. A country that is self-sufficient yet unproductive in terms of agriculture, he noted, is forced to allocate a large fraction of its labor resources to the agricultural sector. As a result, that nation’s aggregate productivity is low, even if its productivity outside the agricultural arena is high. Teignier-Baque theorized that agricultural imports would...
enable such countries to reduce labor in agriculture and reallocate it to more productive areas, thereby increasing capital accumulation and accelerating the rate of economic growth.

Creating a model to test his hypothesis, Teignier-Baque quantified the importance of international trade for the UK during the 19th century. His results showed that importing food was critical to industrialization because it spurred a reduction in agricultural employment—and thus moved human resources into nonagricultural sectors with more potential for productivity. He then ran the data for South Korea since 1963. He chose South Korea because the country has had “a fast industrialization process, and has been an agricultural importer for the past 47 years. I thought that perhaps one of the reasons they were able to industrialize so fast is that they imported food from abroad.” In an interesting twist, he found that South Korea had actually enacted legislation to protect the agricultural sector—agricultural import tariffs existed throughout his entire sample period, and in the early 1970s, the country introduced subsidies for agricultural producers.

Thus, social behavior directly affected economic growth. “My model shows that South Korea benefited less from agricultural imports than the UK did, but only because the South Korean government protected the agricultural sector so strongly,” he explains. Without those restrictions, he argues, its industrialization process would have been even faster. “I predict that my model can be applied to other countries, those that still have the majority of their resources in an unproductive agricultural sector. In poor countries, the leadership seems to be concerned about dependency on foreign agricultural imports, so agricultural trade is not all that important. But if a country that has bad land is attempting to independently provide food, then it’s going to get into trouble.”

Teignier-Baque and Coslor agree that having a Markovitz Fellowship has focused and invigorated their dissertation research. “I used to do land-planning consulting on top of teaching,” remembers Coslor. “The Markovitz Fellowship has allowed me time to write, and that has made an enormous difference.” Seconds Teignier-Baque: “I had been working as a teaching assistant and a lecturer. Very interesting experiences, but experiences that absorbed a lot of time. I’m not sure I would be able to graduate this spring without the support.”

The benefactor behind that support, Michael Markovitz, earned a doctorate from the Department of Psychology and then became a licensed clinical psychologist. He practiced for several years before starting the Illinois School of Professional Psychology. The first private, independent school to award the Doctor of Psychology (PsyD) degree, it grew into a university of 27 campuses with almost 15,000 students before Markovitz sold the business in 2001.

That success enabled him to endow a divisional fellowship. “I couldn’t have had the career I’ve had without the benefit of the fine education I got at Chicago,” Markovitz says. “When I asked the dean at the time, Richard Saller, how I could help, he told me that the Division needed dissertation-year fellowships. I designated the gift for research looking at the connection between social and economic behavior because I realized that psychology, where I started out, and business, where I ended up, are closely related to one another. Money doesn’t behave by itself—it acts through the medium of people doing things with it. I predicted that providing targeted scholarship funding would encourage people to pursue this area of research. And I think it’s worked out that way.”

Road to Learning

An alumna explores how teacher leaders can help pave the way toward school improvement.

Arriving at the College from a public high school in St. Paul, Sara Ray Stoelinga, AB’95, AM’01, PhD’04, was a tutor at Sue Duncan Children’s Center, working with Chicago Public Schools. “I considered myself to be from an urban area,” she remembers. “The public schools in St. Paul were of high quality. When I saw the contrast to some of the Chicago Public Schools, I was shocked.” She knew then that she wanted to dedicate her professional life to improving urban public schools.

Stoelinga earned a doctorate from the Department of Sociology, established a career in education reform, and this January published Examining Effective Teacher Leadership: A Case Study Approach (Teachers College Press, 2010). The book focuses on the preparation of instructional teacher leaders—former classroom teachers who mentor and support their colleagues.

In Examining Effective Teacher Leadership, Stoelinga illuminates the teacher-leader role and the challenges often associated with it—convincing skeptical teachers that instructional support has value, balancing diverse duties, navigating complex school environments rife with internal politicking and strife. Coauthored with Melinda Mangin, an assistant professor of educational administration at Michigan State, the book is a resource for those who are preparing teacher leaders or for leadership studies more generally. It includes case studies gleaned from the authors’ fieldwork and theoretical lenses and activities to interpret those cases. The book follows on the heels of Effective Teacher Leadership: Using Research to Inform and Reform (Teachers College Press, 2008), an edited volume that takes a
theoretical approach to examining the challenges and nuances of the instructional teacher-leader role.

Stoelinga has worked in education for 15 years. After graduating from the College, she “camped out on the doorstep” of the Center for School Improvement (a precursor of the Urban Education Institute) until she convinced the center founder and former Chicago education and sociology professor Tony Bryk to hire her as an intern. She eventually moved into a research assistant position at the Consortium on Chicago School Research.

While continuing to work at the Consortium, Stoelinga began the sociology doctoral program in 1999. Her adviser was Charles Bidwell, AB'50, AM'53, PhD'56, the William Claude Reavis Professor Emeritus in Sociology and the College. “Charles is an amazing scholar who published a seminal work in sociology of education and received the Waller Award for distinguished scholarship,” she says. “But he also cares deeply about students and mentors faculty. It’s admirable and rare to have those scholarly and personal qualities in one individual.”

Also on Stoelinga’s dissertation committee was Richard Taub, the Paul Klapper Professor in the Social Sciences and then-chair of the Department of Comparative Human Development. “Like Charles, Richard has had a strong influence on me. Richard is very plugged into the practical and applied realities of complex urban environments. I benefited deeply from looking at urban schools through his perspective. I was motivated by his relentless questioning, his push for consideration of possible interpretations of my data.”

Stoelinga’s dissertation examined the institutionalization of instructional teacher leadership at the school level through qualitative methods—interviewing, document and calendar analysis, shadowing—combined with quantitative network analysis, which gave her “a picture of social relationships within a school. It allowed me to analyze how central a given teacher leader was within the social fabric and then hypothesize about how those factors influenced the character and effectiveness of the role.” She discovered that how deeply teacher leaders penetrate into the school, and thus their influence on instructional improvement, depends on the extent to which the assumptions behind their position conform with a school’s goals and norms—for example, how willing teachers are to have their instructional practice observed and critiqued. She also found that teacher leadership is not a stand-alone reform: to be effective, teacher-leader roles must be integrated within a school’s broader instructional improvement efforts.

The third member of Stoelinga’s dissertation committee, Mark Smylie, a professor in educational policy studies at University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC), introduced her to coauthor Melinda Mangin, who was also a graduate student at the time and shared Stoelinga’s research interests. The two clicked and they coedited the first book of the Effective Teacher Leadership series, and then it was on to the next: “As opposed to being a research volume, the second book includes instructional materials. We used case studies of teacher-leaders in real schools. We envisioned that the cases and teaching notes could be used in different contexts, such as in university courses for teacher leaders or in district professional development for educators already in a leadership role. The cases are also useful to study leadership or school reform efforts more generally”

To test-drive the materials for Examining Effective Teacher Leadership, Mangin used them with a group of teacher leaders at Michigan State, and Stoelinga did the same while conducting professional development sessions with specialists and coaches in Chicago Public Schools. “We made a lot of changes based on those experiences,” says Stoelinga. “You think people are going to understand the nuances of a case. But then when they actually read and interpret the case, sometimes it just doesn’t translate the way you think it’s going to.”

After earning her doctorate in 2004, Stoelinga was an assistant research professor at UIC and conducted evaluation in Chicago Public Schools. She returned to the University in 2007 as a senior researcher at the Consortium. Last September, Stoelinga began a new position as the Urban Education Institute’s director of planning and program development. The institute, which includes research, urban teacher preparation, and the University Charter School, is led by Tim Knowles, the John Dewey UEI Director and Clinical Professor in the Committee on Education, whom Stoelinga describes as a visionary leader.

“I am incredibly grateful to have the opportunity to span the work of the institute under his leadership. I believe the institute is contributing to improving urban schools, both locally and nationally.” In her job, Stoelinga leads research at the Consortium and teaches a foundations course for aspiring teachers in the Urban Teacher Education Program, along with broader responsibilities across the institute. She also advises undergraduate and graduate students on bachelor’s and master’s theses and teaches courses on education and urban communities in the human development department.

Now that Examining Effective Teacher Leadership has debuted, what does Stoelinga predict its impact will be? “I hope that this book, and the first one too, will deepen understandings of instructional teacher leadership and contribute to broader conversations about school reform. That’s the purpose of the books, and of all my work: to promote conversations and pathways to improve urban schools.”
Sitting at a table in his first-floor office in the Department of Comparative Human Development, John Lucy, PhD'87, chuckles as he recalls arriving at the University of Chicago “a long time ago.”

Lucy moved to Hyde Park in 1972 as a PhD student in the Committee on Human Development. A year later, he married Suzanne Gaskins, PhD'90, who began a doctoral program in the Department of Education soon thereafter.

Lucy’s dissertation was published in two volumes: *Language Diversity and Thought: A Reformulation of the Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis* and *Grammatical Categories and Cognition: A Case Study of the Linguistic Relativity Hypothesis* (both Cambridge University Press, 1992). After earning his doctorate, he became a Harper Fellow in the College and then an assistant professor at the University of Pennsylvania. In 1996, when Gaskins joined the psychology faculty at Northeastern Illinois University, Lucy accepted a faculty position in Chicago’s Department of Psychology.

Now the William Benton Professor in Comparative Human Development, Psychology, and the College, Lucy is also chair of the Department of Comparative Human Development. He spoke with *Dialogo* about his career path and his ongoing work with Gaskins in the Yucatán Peninsula.

For a comparative study of languages, such as your dissertation, you need to work with at least two languages. One of yours was English. How did you pick the other one?

I study the relation of language and thought. I’m interested in how different languages might lead to different ways of thinking or different modes of cognition. For example, a language’s counting system might lead its speakers to pay more or less attention to numbers within the experienced world. To pursue that line of research, I needed to work with a language that’s dramatically different from English or other European languages. And as a developmentalist who was interested in eventually studying children over the long term, I didn’t want to conduct ongoing work in a far-off part of the world. I set out to find a research area in North America with people speaking a language that met my particular requirements.

Suzanne does comparative child development—we have separate careers that have interacted in a common field site. During graduate school in the summer of ’74, the two of us did preliminary fieldwork to find a permanent research location. We traveled for two weeks down through Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador. We narrowed our research area to the Maya region. The next summer, we went down again, visited the Yucatán Peninsula and decided to conduct our research there.
After returning to Hyde Park, we learned Yucatec Maya here at Chicago. The course was taught by anthropology and linguistics professor Norman McQuown.

Suzanne and I went back to the Yucatán in '77. We stayed there for two years while I collected dissertation data. The project involved conducting psychological experiments with adult male subjects, both in America and in the Yucatán. I was looking at how English and Yucatec compare in terms of what one is required to include in a sentence.

Could you explain that to us?

For example, Yucatec speakers build their vocabulary up around reference to material, not to shape or function. Take the word they would use to refer to a wooden table. It would refer to the wood, not to the table shape. One must then indicate what kind of wood so the meaning is understood. In contrast, the word for “table” in English refers to the object’s shape and function. For us the table doesn’t have to be made of wood—it can be any flat thing. So if English speakers want to indicate the table’s material, we have to add that information in.

Based on these differences, I hypothesized that Yucatec speakers would be more attentive to material commonalities among things than English speakers, while English speakers would be more attuned to shape commonalities. In the experiments, that’s exactly what happened.

What were the broader implications of your findings?

The main goal of the research was methodological, that is, to design a method for doing this sort of research. This work has provided a model that has since been emulated by other researchers exploring a range of language and thought connections. In terms of specific substantive findings, the research suggests that speakers of other languages with the same or similar structural type will show similar cognitive patterns. This has proven true, most notably in the case of Japanese.

In terms of broader implications within the culture, the findings are in accord with the labeling of new objects, which are tagged by their materials; exploring new objects with a special attention to material composition; and emphases on materials in medical, religious, mythic, and other contexts.

Is there a competing way of thinking about language and cognition that your findings provide evidence against?

There are two other dominant views. One is that language and thought are pretty much unconnected. From this viewpoint, language diversity does not matter because we all see the world more or less the same regardless of our language. A second view is that the two are connected, but that the influence runs the other way: thought shapes language.

You mentioned earlier your plans to study children over the long term. Did you ever pursue this line of research?

Once I established these differences in task performance among adults, the next question was: when do they emerge? Suzanne and I have separate research interests—she studies childhood play and how it varies by culture—but we did collaborate on a major study to explore that question. I worked with Suzanne because I thought the differences would begin appearing at around three or four years, and she’s an expert on that age group. As it turned out, the children were making word choices based on the inferences of their language at four or five, but they weren’t guiding their general cognition by it. At some point language and thought connect so that language is used to guide one’s general thinking—we observed this change around eight years of age, plus or minus a year. When we studied seven-year-olds in America and the Yucatán, the two groups showed similar results. But when we studied nine-year-olds, the populations looked different.

What is the significance of language beginning to influence thought at around eight years?

As a developmentalist who focuses on cultural effects, I’m arguing that, yes, important traits that are universal and biological—for example, the cognitive abilities that we are all born with—are what get kids everywhere started. But that doesn’t mean that other important traits don’t emerge later, traits that are culturally and socially shaped. The seven-year-olds in our study tested alike, but they didn’t test alike a year or two later. It’s a kind of psychology that emphasizes the social impact as well as what’s sometimes called the mediational means—that is, the intellectual tools you use shape the thinking based on them.

You and Suzanne have been going to the Yucatán for more than 30 years. How has it changed?

When we went in '77, we spent six weeks scouting things out. We found a village we liked; we built a house, that is, a one-room stick hut. We still have a couple of houses there. All in all, we’ve spent three full years and almost every summer in this village. We’ve been part of the community for a long time. We’ve seen children born, and some of the people we’ve known have died. When we first went, it was extremely isolated. It was a four-hour walk, at best, to the road, and 12 hours to our supply town. There was no electric power, no running water. Now, 30 years later, there’s a paved road; there’s electricity; water runs a few times a day. Once in a while, there’s Internet in the town hall.

When Suzanne and I retire from teaching, we’ll probably dedicate a number of years to writing a monograph describing the social change we’ve observed.
Is it difficult to strike that balance at the moment? I’m a little more focused on cycling during racing season, but I’ve always got my research on the brain. It may take me a little longer to finish my dissertation but that’s a good trade-off for being able to pursue my passion at the same time. I think it’s good to keep busy.

Road racing is in the spring, but in the autumn it’s Cyclo-cross, which involves racing on an obstacle-laden track; its iconic image is a rider carrying her own bike up a muddy hill. What appeals to you about such a mentally and physically challenging sport?

I always tell people it’s fun. Some people get it and others just give me weird looks. The more elements on a course, the bigger the challenge and the more fun it is to do.

If someone asked you for an elevator speech, would you describe yourself as an athlete or an economist?

I see myself as both—a nerdy athlete. A cool economist, maybe. They’re two different worlds. The rest of my team is a pretty well-educated group too. I’m not an anomaly here. I think I may be more of an anomaly in the economics department.

Devon Haskell pedals hard during a team training camp in Carpinteria, California.

Devon Haskell, AM’07, a doctoral student in applied microeconomics and the economics of education, is a championship bicyclist now winning races in her first pro season. Haskell spoke with Dialogo from Santa Cruz, California, her home base with her fiancé, economist and UCSC assistant professor Aspen Gorry, AM’06, PhD’09.

You’re heading to Belgium and the Netherlands in April with team Tibco, and you spent a month last summer racing in France on the U.S. development team. Is Europe the center of cycling right now?

There’s a good cycling scene in the United States, but the biggest and hardest races are in Europe. It’s been our goal to develop a team that can, hopefully, compete in the 2012 Olympics or in World Championships.

You’re working on your dissertation at the same time?

Yes, that’s what I’m trying to do! I’m studying the effects of school sports on academics and educational outcomes. It aligns with all of my interests. I always played sports growing up, which offered a good balance and helped me stay focused on my studies.

Economics student Devon Haskell moves from athletics to academics and then back again.

You're working on your dissertation at the same time?

Yes, that’s what I’m trying to do! I’m studying the effects of school sports on academics and educational outcomes. It aligns with all of my interests. I always played sports growing up, which offered a good balance and helped me stay focused on my studies.
Evelyn Stefansson Nef, 1913–2009

Evelyn Stefansson Nef, author, lecturer, patron of the arts, philanthropist, Arctic explorer, and psychotherapist, died December 10 at her home in Washington, DC. She was 96. Nef was the widow of John U. Nef, the University of Chicago economic historian who founded and chaired the Division’s famed Committee on Social Thought. Along with her husband, Nef was a generous and longtime supporter of the committee.

Born Evelyn Schwartz on July 24, 1913 in New York City, Nef married puppeteer Bil Baird at age 19 and performed as a principal in his marionette performances until their divorce in 1936. She sang at Romany Marie’s restaurant and was an active participant in the Greenwich Village cultural scene.

While working at the Gotham Book Mart, Nef was hired as a research assistant by the Arctic explorer Vilhjalmur Stefansson, whom she married in 1941. They lived mainly in Hanover, New Hampshire, where she worked with him as a researcher and librarian of his extensive polar library until his death in 1962. She was active in the Polar Studies Program at Dartmouth College and taught its Arctic Seminar for two years. Her best-selling book, Here Is Alaska, was published by Scribner in 1943. During World War II, Nef and Stefansson worked as Arctic consultants for the Navy and War departments.

In 1963 Nef moved to Washington, DC, where she served as administrator of the American Sociological Association. The following year she married John Ulrich Nef, who had founded the Committee on Social Thought in 1941. Over the years, the committee has served as the intellectual home for many illustrious scholars, including Saul Bellow, Allan Bloom, PhB’49, AM’53, PhD’55, Edward Shils, Hannah Arendt, David Grene, Friedrich Hayek, J. M. Coetzee, Frank Knight, and Harold Rosenberg.

John Nef died in 1988. In recognition of his lifelong association with the Committee on Social Thought, as well as his widow’s continuing interest in and commitment to advancing its cause, it was renamed the John U. Nef Committee on Social Thought in 2008.

“Evelyn Stefansson Nef was as memorable and wise a person as I have ever met,” said Robert B. Pippin, the committee’s current chair and the Evelyn Stefansson Nef Distinguished Service Professor in Social Thought, Philosophy, and the College. “A striking, formidable woman of great taste, intelligence, humor and warmth, she was also deeply committed to the ideals of the University of Chicago and the John U. Nef Committee on Social Thought and was an extraordinarily generous patron of both.”

—William Harms

Nathan Keyfitz, PhD’52, 1913–2010

Nathan Keyfitz, a leader in the field of mathematical demography, pioneer in the application of mathematical tools to the study of population statistics, and a past board member and life trustee of the National Opinion Research Center (NORC), died on April 6.

Born in Montreal, Keyfitz graduated from McGill University in 1934 with a degree in mathematics. Two years later, he began working as a research statistician for the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in Ottawa, where he remained for 36 years. He earned a doctorate in sociology from Chicago in 1952 and taught at the University from 1964–68. In 1972 he was appointed Ande-lot Professor of Sociology in the Harvard University Faculty of Arts and Sciences and of Demography in the Harvard School of Public Health. He remained in this post until 1983.

Norman Bradburn, Tiffany and Margaret Blake Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus, Department of Psychology, the Harris School, the Booth School of Business, and the College, recalled Keyfitz as a NORC board member: “Nathan was an active and supportive board member for over 20 years. He was always interested in the new things NORC was doing and made many helpful suggestions. Even after he retired and moved to Austria, he continued to follow what we were doing and to be an enthusiastic supporter.”
Divisional News

Sonnenschein Honored
Hugo Sonnenschein, the Adam Smith Distinguished Service Professor of Economics and president emeritus of the University, received the 2009 BBVA Foundation Frontiers of Knowledge Award in Economics, Finance, and Management. He shared the honor with Andreu Mas-Colell, professor of economics at Barcelona’s Pompeu Fabra University. Sonnenschein and Mas-Colell were recognized for their collaborative research that has “changed the way in which economics is taught all over the world.” The jury specifically cited their perfecting of general equilibrium theory and authorship of the modern theory of aggregate demand.

Pippin Links Westerns to Philosophy
Robert B. Pippin, the Evelyn Stefansson Nef Distinguished Service Professor in Social Thought, Philosophy, and the College, published Hollywood Westerns and American Myth: The Importance of Howard Hawks and John Ford for Political Philosophy. Through close readings of three classic Hollywood Westerns—John Ford’s The Man Who Shot Liberty Valance and The Searchers as well as Howard Hawks’s Red River—Pippin explores classical problems in political psychology, including the status and authority of law and the nature of political allegiance.

Tenorio-Trillo Named Director of the Center for Latin American Studies
The Center for Latin American Studies welcomed its new director, Professor of History Mauricio Tenorio-Trillo, whose work focuses on modern urban and cultural history in Mexico, Spain, the United States, and Latin America. Tenorio assumed the role in January, when Associate Professor of History Dain Borges stepped down after nearly seven years of leading the center.

Johns Publishes Book on Piracy
Adrian Johns, professor of history and chair of the Committee on Conceptual and Historical Studies of Science, published Piracy: The Intellectual Property Wars from Gutenberg to Gates. The book explores the intellectual property wars from the advent of print culture in the 15th century to the digital age of the 21st. Jones argues that piracy has long stood at the center of human attempts to reconcile creativity and commerce—and that piracy has been an engine of social, technological, and intellectual innovations as often as it has been their adversary.

Conzen Receives Endowed Professorship
Kathleen Conzen, an expert on the social and political history of the United States in the 19th century, has been named the Thomas E. Donnelley Professor of American History and in the College. Conzen studies immigration, religion, ethnicity, Western settlement, and urban development. She is the author of Germans in Minnesota (Minnesota Historical Society Press, 2003) and numerous articles on German immigration to the United States.

Social Sciences Faculty Named to Leadership Roles at the Center in Beijing
As announced in the fall 2009 Dialogo, in September the University will open the Center in Beijing, a home for Chicago students and researchers working in China.

Dali Yang, professor in political science and the College, will serve as the first Center in Beijing faculty director. Yang, a leading scholar of political institutions and political economy in China, chaired the faculty committee that recommended creating the center. He was appointed to a three-year term as founding faculty director by Provost Thomas F. Rosenbaum.

“The opportunity to help create a permanent base in China for Chicago scholars is a tremendous honor,” Yang said. “The center will position the University at the forefront of U.S.-China educational exchanges, and I am thrilled to work with faculty from across campus on this exciting venture.”

In addition to Yang’s appointment, three social sciences faculty were named to the Center in Beijing steering committee: Gary Becker, University Professor in Economics and Sociology; James Hevia, professor of international history and in the New Collegiate Division; and Judith Farquhar, Max Palevsky Professor of Anthropology and in the College. The steering committee is helping shape the center’s intellectual direction and programming.

Dialogo asked Farquhar, an expert on traditional medicine in China, how the Center in Beijing will benefit the University and the Division. “We predict that the center will be useful for University scholars in the biological and physical sciences as well as sociologists, political scientists, historians, literary theorists, art historians, and others who work in different parts of the world,
including America and Europe,” she said. “We hope it will help scholars who thought their research would never be related to China to discover that there’s a lot in Asia they can learn from and contribute to.”

Alumni News


Stuart Rockefeller, AM’87, PhD’03 (Anthropology), lecturer in Columbia University’s anthropology department, published *Starting from Quirpini: The Travels and Places of a Bolivian People* (Indiana University Press). Through ethnographic research, Rockefeller documents the movements and travels of the people of Quirpini, who visit each other’s houses, work in their fields, go to nearby towns for school, market, or official transactions, and trek to Buenos Aires for wage labor. He describes how these places become intertwined via the movement of people, goods, and information.


Food for Thought

Evan Schulman, AM’01, and his wife, Glorianna Davenport (standing side by side on the far left), appear in this snapshot from a recent alumni trip to the Galapagos Islands. The sea lions crept in close and managed to sink their teeth into the U of C banner. (Photo by Irving Birkner.)

Judith Farquhar and Chinese scholar Lili Lai will use the Center in Beijing as they work on a collaborative project examining China’s state-led systemization of ethnomedicines. Here, they meet with an interviewee in Beijing in 2004.

If you have news to share with other social sciences alumni or comments on *Dialogo*, please contact Nina B. Herbst in the Office of the Dean, Division of the Social Sciences, at nherbst@uchicago.edu or call 773.834.9067.
Visit campus for Alumni Weekend 2010 and learn more about the work of the Committee on Education and the Urban Education Institute. The Division will host a number of events on Chicago’s current work in K–12 education with speakers featured in this Dialogo—Stephen Raudenbush, Timothy Knowles, Penny Bender Sebring, and Sara Ray Stoolinga, AB’95, AM’01, PhD’04. Sponsored by the Urban Education Institute, the Committee on Education, and the Social Sciences Division, the events will take place Friday, June 4 and Saturday, June 5.

Please visit alumniweekend.uchicago.edu for more information or contact Nina B. Herbst (nherbst@uchicago.edu, 773.834.9067).

SSD at Alumni Weekend 2010

Friday, June 4
3:00–4:15 p.m.
UnCommon Core Session II,
Stuart Hall
Organizing Schools for Improvement

4:30–6:00 p.m.
Reception for Education Alumni & Friends,
Social Science Quadrangle
Reconnect with faculty and fellow alumni and mingle with others in the education field.

Saturday, June 5
10:00–10:30 a.m.
Alumni Banner Procession
Step-off behind the SSD banner from Bartlett Quadrangle, 57th Street and University Avenue.

1:30–2:45 p.m.
UnCommon Core Session III, Stuart Hall
K–12 Education, a Model for the Future

(Saturday continued)
10:30–11:30 a.m.
Alumni Convocation in Rockefeller Memorial Chapel
Celebrate as University Professor of Economics and Sociology Gary Becker, AM’53, PhD’55 (Economics), Warren Winiarski, AM’62 (Social Thought), and Cristian Larroulet, AM’80 (Economics), receive awards during Alumni Convocation.

1:30–2:45 p.m.
UnCommon Core Session III, Stuart Hall
K–12 Education, a Model for the Future