

THE NEWSLETTER OF THE
**SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH INSTITUTE
AT DUKE UNIVERSITY**

SPRING 2007, VOLUME 1, ISSUE 1

g[•]ist

from the Mill

inside features:

- 4 **SOCIAL SPREAD
OF EPIDEMICS:**
Faculty Fellows Search for the Answers
to Some of Today's Biggest Issues
- 6 Americans Have Fewer Friends
Outside the Family
- 9 Exploring What Divides Us
- 10 The New Face of Social
Psychology at Duke University



greetings from the co-directors

WELCOME TO THE INAUGURAL ISSUE of *Gist from the Mill*, the newsletter of the Social Science Research Institute (SSRI) at Duke University. This newsletter is designed to inform the social and behavioral science community about interdisciplinary research and training activities, especially those located within SSRI and its affiliated programs.

The newsletter marks culmination of an important period of growth. Only three years ago, John Aldrich was working essentially by himself in a couple of offices with only one full-time staff member. His enthusiasm for what the institute could provide to Duke scholars and students spurred Wendy Wood to join him as co-director. And with the guidance and support of key administrators, especially Peter Lange, George McLendon, Susan Roth, and Sarah Deutsch, SSRI assumed its current broad mission. In short, it's designed to catalyze innovative interdisciplinary research and teaching in the social and behavioral sciences across the University and Medical School.

The publication of *Gist from the Mill* also denotes the beginning of another period of innovation for social and behavioral scientists at Duke. We view SSRI as an umbrella. It's an inverted umbrella in the way that a small administration provides infrastructure support to affiliated interdisciplinary centers and to faculty and students within departments. SSRI provides infrastructure ranging from the practical, including fiscal/administrative assistance for investigators seeking extramural support, through the tangible, such as research and teaching space and data analytic and experimentation facilities, to the inspirational, in the faculty fellows program, speaker series and other SSRI forums promoting new interdisciplinary connections among scholars and students.

SSRI helps Duke attract the top faculty and students. The best scholars are attracted by innovative programs that push fields forward in new ways. SSRI is pleased already to have served as

a helpful partner in the recruitment of prominent new social and behavioral scientists to Duke. In combination with departments, interdisciplinary programs already affiliated with SSRI, and other of the university's interdisciplinary centers, we promote areas of strength in the university as well as ones targeted to achieve greater prominence in the social and behavioral sciences.

SSRI assists current faculty and students. Faculty at Duke are expected to excel at both teaching and research and to devote substantial amounts of their time to service. The infrastructure that we provide is designed to make this high level of contribution possible. Faculty and students can stop by Erwin Mill to consult on writing a grant proposal, get statistical advice on a data analytic problem, set up an experiment to collect data in the DIISP experimental labs, and talk over their latest work in the Monday night seminar series. Also, the year-long faculty fellows program provides an opportunity for faculty to retool in new areas and be challenged by colleagues from outside their disciplines. It enables these activities by providing relief to faculty from other responsibilities during the fellow's year.

SSRI also promotes the application of scholarship across disciplines. Our innovative centers and interdisciplinary programs address broad themes such as globalization and the economy, social transmission of disease, child policy, and the demographics of societies. In so doing, they facilitate Duke's mission of placing knowledge at the service of society.

A significant strength of SSRI is that we are part-time directors but full-time faculty. SSRI is a faculty and student-driven initiative, and as such it is growing responsively to the needs of the social and behavioral scientists at Duke. We invite you to join us. //



John Aldrich and Wendy Wood

John Aldrich | Wendy Wood

WILLIAM JULIUS WILSON

Lewis P. and Linda L. Geyser University Professor
 Director, Joblessness and Urban Poverty Research Program, Harvard University

THE PROMINENT SOCIOLOGIST visited Duke University to give a lecture on his latest book, *There Goes the Neighborhood: Racial, Ethnic and Class Changes in Four Chicago Neighborhoods and Their Meaning for America*. The talk was co-sponsored by SSRI. Here he gives his answers to some of the questions we'd all like to ask.

Q: Let me open with the most obvious question: Why race relations?

A: During my last two years as a graduate student in the mid-1960s, like most African Americans, I was caught up in the spirit of the Civil Rights Revolution and was encouraged by the changes that led to increasing opportunities for black Americans.

Q: When did you decide to specialize in race relations?

A: When I accepted my first full-time academic job as Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, in the fall of 1965.

Q: Do you think being African American affects your research—does it influence the questions you ask?

A: Definitely. My experiences as a successful black professional led me to often wonder how my life differs from that of the black poor. African Americans are not a monolithic socioeconomic group so it is difficult to speak of a single black experience when the black population ranges from those who are affluent to those who are impoverished.

Q: Affirmative action is brought up a lot in the media. Do you think most Americans agree with affirmative action?

A: It all depends on what type of affirmative action. On the one hand, if you are talking about affirmative action programs that emphasize quotas and numerical guidelines, then a majority of Americans

are opposed. On the other hand, a majority of Americans support affirmative action programs that emphasize procedural fairness and equal opportunity.

Q: What is the difference between neighborhoods where people are poor and working and neighborhoods where people are poor and jobless?

A: Neighborhoods with people who are poor and jobless tend to be plagued by all of the problems associated with joblessness such as crime, gangs, drug trafficking, family dissolution, welfare receipt, low levels of social organization, and so on. These problems are less prevalent in neighborhoods in which people are poor and working.

Q: What do you hope America learns from your research?

A: That inequality in America has risen not only between racial and ethnic groups, but within these groups as well, that racial and ethnic antagonisms are products of situations: social situations, economic situations, and political situations, and that the economic problems in the African American community should not be viewed separately from national and international trends affecting all American families and neighborhoods.

Q: Any words for your critics?

A: Not really, except to remind them of George Bernard Shaw's comment that "it is better to be criticized and misunderstood than to be ignored." //



Social Spread of Epidemics:

Faculty Fellows Search for the Answers to Some of Today's Biggest Issues

SSRI'S YEAR-LONG faculty-in-residence program brings Duke faculty members from multiple departments and schools together in a stimulating intellectual setting to explore cutting-edge research questions with the goal of creating and communicating new knowledge through research publications and in the classroom. Each year's Faculty Fellows program is organized around a coherent topic chosen through solicitation of ideas from the community and from discussion with SSRI's advisory Board.

Together with seminar co-conveners Phil Costanzo and Frank Sloan, SSRI's seven Faculty Fellows undertook a remarkably successful plan of study during the 2005-2006 year. The fellows included Kerry Haynie, Margaret Humphrey's, Miller McPherson, Truls Ostbye, Emilio Parrado, Barak Richman, and Lynn Smith-Lovin. Drawing on their backgrounds in Economics, History, Law, Medicine, Political Science, Psychology, Public Policy, and Sociology, members of the group divided into teams examining different aspects of the selected topic, the *Social Spread of Epidemics*.



MYTH: Expanded benefits packages will help those in greatest need. The more generous the benefits, the more they will help lower-income employees and ethnic minorities, groups who historically have exhibited poorer health outcomes.

FACT: Higher-income and white employees are more likely to consume certain benefits—specifically, pharmaceutical benefits and mental health care—than other employees. That means that lower-income and non-white employees are paying for benefits that, it turns out, they do not consume.

MYTH: The prevalence of type 2 diabetes has always been higher among African Americans than among whites.

FACT: We find that, in contrast to the late 20th century, the rates of diagnosed diabetes among African American Civil War veterans living circa 1900 were lower than the diagnosed rates among white civil war veterans. This suggests that the contemporary pattern, which indicates that the prevalence of diabetes among blacks is at least 50% higher than it is among whites, is of relatively recent origin.

MYTH: Latina women are “liberated” upon migrating to the U.S. Because they come from countries that have a more patriarchal cultural background, they are assumed to be empowered by migration to the U.S., where they encounter greater opportunities for paid employment and a more egalitarian gender ideology.

FACT: While migrant women make gains in some aspects of gender inequality, they actually lose ground on others. For instance, the precarious position of migrants in the U.S. setting can actually undermine women's power within relationships, particularly in the realm of sexual negotiation and decision making. These findings have numerous implications for HIV risk among the migrant population. //

Meet Linda Burton

Sociologist Talks about Her Fieldwork with America's Poorest Families

by Lisa M. Dellwo

A FEW THINGS you should know about Linda Burton: She's a city dweller who loves camping. She is a game show fan who has appeared on *The Price is Right*, *Joker's Wild*, and *Dream Home*. And she remembers every family she has interviewed in her 30-year career as a sociologist studying poverty in America.

Burton joined the sociology department as a professor in 2006 after 22 years at Pennsylvania State University. "Linda Burton is an incredibly important senior hire for Duke Sociology," says S. Philip Morgan, chair of sociology and SSRI faculty fellows convener. "We expect her to be a focal point for interdisciplinary research collaborations at Duke."

Burton is involved in a number of research projects and is currently co-principal investigator of the ethnography component of a major research investigation into the effects of the Welfare Reform Act of 1996 on children and families. Using intensive interviews and observation, her team has studied 256 families in Boston, San Antonio, and Chicago for four to seven years in one of the largest ethnographic research projects ever.

Ethnography is a methodology that yields enormous insights because of the intimate, long-term, and in-depth nature of the fieldwork.

During the course of the study, an ethnographer will visit families frequently and observe them, asking open-ended questions and being receptive to any information the family wishes to share. Attending weddings, baby showers and other parties or going on outings to the movies or a park allows the ethnographer to observe the families in different contexts. "It's not just what they say, but what they do that is important," says Burton.

It takes six or seven months just for a researcher to develop the family's trust. "At that point, you often see a shift," Burton says, "and they're not just telling you what they think you want to hear." Once trust is established, the data recorded is deeper

and more accurate than the earlier results.

"The families get out of this experience the incredible opportunity to be heard," says Burton. "For some of them, it's the first time anyone has ever listened to them. That's important."

The process can have an impact on the researchers as well. "You can't do this kind of work and not have it affect you," says Burton. It can be depressing, but "in the long run, this work

has such an important purpose, and that overrides times when I feel overwhelmed by the poverty."

Although she keeps the boundaries between researcher and subject clear, Burton has stayed in touch with families she has studied, watching children grow up and have kids of their own.

Burton, who moved to Durham with her husband Keith Whitfield, a research professor in Duke's department of psychology and neuroscience, has also conducted research on the rural poor, comparing populations in North Carolina and Pennsylvania. She plans to teach courses on ethnographic field methods and poverty and to build collaborations with faculty at Duke, North Carolina Central University, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

The game show veteran is also pressing her case to appear on *Deal or No Deal*. What would she do with her earnings? "I would find a way to help the kids and families I've worked with over the years." //

Linda Burton is the Director of two projects housed at SSRI: Welfare, Children & Families: A 3-City Study and The Family Life Project.

"You can't do this kind of work and not have it affect you."



Linda Burton

Americans Have Fewer Friends Outside the Family, Duke Study Shows

SHRINKING SOCIAL NETWORKS COULD LEAD TO LESS CIVIC ENGAGEMENT

AMERICANS' CIRCLE of confidants has shrunk dramatically in the past two decades and the number of people who say they have no one with whom to discuss important matters has more than doubled, according to a new study by sociologists at Duke University and the University of Arizona.

“The evidence shows that Americans have fewer confidants and those ties are also more family-based than they used to be,” said Lynn Smith-Lovin, Robert L. Wilson Professor of Sociology at Duke University, SSRI Faculty Fellow, and one of the authors of “Social Isolation in America: Changes in Core Discussion Networks Over Two Decades.”

“This change indicates something that’s not good for our society. Ties with a close network of people create a safety net. These ties also lead to civic engagement and local political action,” she said.

The study, published in the June issue of *American Sociological Review*, is based on the first nationally representative survey on this topic in 19 years.

It compared data from 1985 and 2004 and found that the mean number of people with whom Americans can dis-

cuss matters important to them dropped by nearly one-third, from 2.94 people in 1985 to 2.08 in 2004.

Researchers also found that the number of people who said they had no one with whom to discuss such matters more than doubled, to nearly 25 percent. The survey found that both family and non-



family confidants dropped, with the loss greatest in non-family connections.

The study paints a picture of Americans’ social contacts as a “densely connected, close, homogeneous set of ties slowly closing in on itself, becoming smaller, more tightly interconnected, more focused on the very strong bonds of the nuclear family.”

That means fewer contacts created through clubs, neighbors and organizations outside the home—a phenomenon

popularly known as “bowling alone,” from the 2000 book of the same title by Robert D. Putnam.

The researchers speculated that changes in communities and families, such as the increase in the number of hours that family members spend at work and the influence of Internet communication, may contribute to the decrease in the size of close-knit circles of friends and relatives.

General Social Survey Measures Americans’ ‘Discussion Networks’

The data come from the General Social Survey (GSS), one of the nation’s longest running surveys of social, cultural and political issues. The survey, which has been conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at

the University of Chicago since 1972, is composed of face-to-face interviews with Americans over 18 who are not living in institutions.

There is a standard set of questions asked each time the survey is conducted; additional questions are added for specific studies, such as this one.

The last survey on confidants was done in 1985. In the 2004 GSS, the questions were repeated to measure how people’s social networks had

changed over time. This study, comparing the data, was funded by the Human and Social Dynamics Program at the National Science Foundation and the CIRCLE Foundation.

In the survey, 1,467 people were asked to give the first names or initials of the people with whom they had discussed matters that were important to them in the past six months. Researchers

us, both in terms of routine tasks and also of extreme emergency. Americans have become much more dependent on a small number of very close family contacts—usually spouses or partners or parents—for that kind of help,” she said.

The researchers also found that Americans are stratified according to education and race when it comes to these social networks. African Americans

The researchers also suggest that changes in work and the geographical scattering of families may foster a broader, shallower network of ties, rather than the close bonds measured by this study.

Research also shows a decline in the number of groups that people belong to and the amount of time they spend with these clubs and other organizations. Members of families spend more time

The trend toward social isolation mirrors other class divides. Non-whites and people with less education tend to have smaller networks than white Americans and those with higher educational levels.

followed up with questions about the gender, race, education and age of their confidants, as well as family ties, the length of their relationship and frequency of contact.

The answers measure what the researchers call “core discussion networks” and provide “a window into an important set of close, routinely contacted people who make up our respondents’ immediate social circle,” the study said.

The dramatic drop in the number of people in these discussion networks was not anticipated by the researchers, who have plans to follow up with more surveys in the future.

Other Findings Show Racial Diversity, Disparity in Social Networks

Most sociologists consider these “discussion networks” to be an important social resource, providing counseling and other valuable help in people’s lives.

Hurricane Katrina showed how important these resources are, Smith-Lovin said. “They make up a safety net of people who will help and support

and other non-white Americans have smaller networks of confidants than white Americans. African-American men older than 60 have seen the biggest decline, from 3.6 people in 1985 to 1.8 in 2004.

People with more education have larger networks than people with less education, though the network size has dropped for this group as well: High school dropouts in the 1985 survey were in the range of someone with a college degree in 2004.

“People who are disadvantaged in various ways are especially likely to have smaller, more family-based networks,” Smith-Lovin said.


Why such a large change?

While this study did not uncover the reasons behind this social change, the researchers offer some ideas based on other research.

One possibility is that people interpreted the questions differently in 2004 than they did in 1985. What people define as “important” might have changed, or people might not equate emailing or instant messaging with “discussing.”

at work and have less time to spend on activities outside the home that might lead to close relationships.

And new technology, while it allows people to connect over larger distances, might diminish the need for face-to-face visits with friends, family or neighbors, the study said.

“Group membership is very important in creating ties to people outside the family,” Smith-Lovin said. “But those ties may be more superficial now. If people spend less time in groups, they may talk to people, but just about matters that involve the club, and they may be less likely to share personal troubles or triumphs with them.” 

Lynn Smith-Lovin is a faculty affiliate of SSRI.

Doctoral Student Investigates What Makes Voters ‘Tick’

by Beverly Schieman

THESE DAYS, it's hard to remain neutral when it comes to politics. However, Jacob Montgomery makes it his mission to do just that, at least when he's on the job. Montgomery, a political science doctoral student at Duke University, has been working on two projects with the Social Science Research Institute (SSRI) to help figure out what makes voters behave the way they do.

Montgomery especially wants to know what keeps voters returning to the polls year after year. One project he is collaborating on with SSRI co-directors Wendy Wood and John Aldrich has him looking at whether voting is habitual, and what that long-term participation means for the voters and the politicians.

“It has been well established in political research that those groups that are highly involved in the system tend to get a disproportionate amount of attention from candidates and campaigns,” Montgomery explains, “so understanding participation is a really important question.”

Montgomery is currently involved in conducting secondary data analysis for this project, which is still in the planning stages. This background work will help to illuminate the data they will collect, and Montgomery is thrilled that Aldrich, his advisor, asked him to join in the study.

“One of my biggest interests in political science has always been about why some people become involved in politics and others do not,” Montgomery says, “and voting is the most common way that people take action to affect politics. It has really been very exciting to look at this question from a new point of view.”

No one can deny that besides voting, money also has a huge effect on politics. Montgomery has his hand in research involving this trend as well. This summer, he assisted

Aldrich, Professor Michael Munger, and SSRI Administrative Director Alexandra Cooper on a presidential donors mail survey, gathering and processing information about who donated the big bucks, and to which candidates, in the 2004 election. He is hoping this groundbreaking research will shed some new light on a previously cloudy subject.

“We don't know a lot about donors, and political donation is an important form of activism,” Montgomery says. “We would like to understand that activity a lot more than we do right now, and this data will allow us to test out some theories as to why some people give and some choose not to.”

The surveys are extensive, including questions on how religion, socioeconomic factors, and even new finance reform laws affect donors' choices. The team of researchers intends to discern which social groups line up to back certain candidates, and how that changes over time.

Montgomery hopes that all this research will lead to not only a better understanding, but also actual change in political policy. “If we can understand why activists are involved, maybe we can design policies to get the broader population involved, not just the highly educated or very wealthy,” he says. “Making voting a positive experience and making voters want to do it several times so it just keeps happening... that could be an important outcome of this research.”

And as far as remaining politically neutral, Montgomery says it's actually quite easy to do. “My questions are about how things work, not how they should work,” he insists. “We can all agree that people should vote, it's not really that controversial. Questions about who should win should not enter into it. I just try to stick with the puzzle and answer the unanswered questions.” //



Jacob Montgomery

Exploring What Divides Us

REGSS tackles race, ethnicity,
and gender across disciplines

by Frith Gowan



Paula McClain and Kerry Haynie

PAULA MCCLAIN thinks big. As co-director, with Kerry Haynie, of the Center for the Study of Race, Ethnicity, and Gender in the Social Sciences (REGSS), she has set her sights on developing the center into nothing less than a major force in cross-disciplinary race and ethnic studies, an East Coast version of Stanford's Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity.

McClain, political science professor and director of the Ralph Bunche Institute, and Haynie, political science associate professor and associate department chair, aim to make REGSS a place where scholars across disciplines who might not otherwise meet each other can come together to engage in discussions about race and ethnicity—and gender within these constructs—and collaborate on their research. Already the center boasts faculty affiliates from the history, sociology, public policy, psychology, law, and environmental policy departments, among others.

“It becomes a synergistic place,” McClain says. “Most scholars are located in departments. And you read a lot of work, but a lot of times you don't know

who in a corollary department may be interested in the same questions, but from a different perspective. There are people who have met each other who have been on this campus for awhile |and didn't know that another person was doing a similar kind of research.”

Founded two and a half years ago, the center, an affiliate of SSRI, has made tremendous progress toward its goals. It hosts a lunchtime colloquium on the third Thursday of most months and at least two major lectures each year. Speakers, including sociologist Lawrence Bobo, political scientist Jennifer Hochschild, and social psychologist Claude Steele were such a big draw that the center was not prepared to accommodate the large audiences. Last April it hosted a conference, “Whither the Voting Rights Act?” which discussed the debate over the renewal of the landmark Voting Rights Act and drew presenters from across the country.

“REGSS is fast becoming a center where social scientists at Duke and surrounding universities routinely come together to explore the issues,” says Haynie.

McClain and Haynie look forward to

R · E · G · S · S
RACE, ETHNICITY, and GENDER in the SOCIAL SCIENCES
Social Science Research Institute, Duke University

developing the center, housed in a suite of SSRI offices. REGSS is advertising a post-doctoral fellowship named for Samuel Dubois Cooke, the first black faculty member at Duke and at any private Southern university. Also under consideration are a working paper series and a 2008 conference on comparative race. And eventually, McClain and Haynie hope to support graduate and undergraduate student research and offer small research grants to REGSS faculty affiliates.

“Race, ethnicity, and gender are among the most salient and significant cleavages in all of American politics and social life, and they have been ever since Europeans first arrived on the continent,” says Haynie. “I believe that it is important for social scientists to be aware of and work to explain and understand how racial, ethnic, and gender considerations have shaped and continue to shape human interactions in the U.S. and elsewhere.” //

The New Face of Social Psychology at Duke University



WHY DO YOU LOVE your partner, what purpose is served by stereotypes of people from other groups, and how advertising works—all of these are questions asked by social psychologists. In broad brush, social psychologists study how individuals are influenced by others and how they in turn influence those others.

But Duke had no formal training program in social psychology for the past few decades. This is surprising given Duke's rich history in social psychology. The Duke Psychology Department was founded in the 1920s by William McDougall, who wrote the first textbook in social psychology. During the 60s and 70s, Duke emerged as one of the pre-eminent centers for scholarship and graduate education in social psychology. Under the creative stewardship of Edward Jones and Jack Brehm, Duke became a wellspring of cutting-edge theory and research in social psychology. The departures of Jones to Princeton and Brehm to Kansas marked the beginning of a decline in this landmark program.

After an external review concluded that Duke Psychology would never be top-tier without a social psychology program, the administration committed to providing the resources necessary to rebuild. Phil Costanzo, a longtime Duke faculty member and former department chair, and Tim Strauman, the current co-chair of the department, took on the task of fashioning a first-class training program in experimental social psychology.

Wendy Wood was recruited in 2003 from Texas A&M University to head the program. It quickly became apparent that, while social psychology within

the psychology department had declined, it had prospered in other units across campus. To take advantage of this opportunity and leverage it into a more efficient and focused entity, she created an interdisciplinary initiative to pull together these dispersed resources. Thus was born the Duke Interdisciplinary Initiative in Social Psychology, or DIISP. As a fortuitous turn of events, Wood became co-director, with John Aldrich, of the Social Science Research Institute. And DIISP became a founding affiliated program.

DIISP immediately flourished. Three noted social psychologists had recently been hired in other programs—Harris Cooper, Director of the Program in Education, Tanya Chartrand, Associate Professor in Fuqua, and Rick Hoyle, Research Professor, then at the Center for Child and Family Policy. They were joined by Laura Smart Richman, Assistant Research Professor in Psychology and Neuroscience. David Neal, Director of DIISP Labs joined to help build and direct the new experimental labs. In short order followed James Shah, Associate Professor, from the University of Wisconsin, and Mark Leary, Professor, from Wake Forest University. In 2006, Leary became Director of DIISP. These seven faculty, along with Costanzo and Strauman, form the core of the program. DIISP also lays claim to another nearly dozen noted social psychologists in various programs across campus. //

DIISP is located in Erwin Mill, which also houses the DIISP state-of-the-art laboratory facility for experimental social and behavioral science research.

by Lisa M. Dellwo

HARRIS COOPER ON HOMEWORK

HARRIS COOPER is professor of psychology and director of the Duke's education program, through which 20 to 30 Duke students are licensed to teach in elementary or secondary schools every year. Cooper is interested in applying social and development psychology to educational issues, most notably homework. His research on homework has appeared in notable scholarly journals, and he has written about homework in the op-ed pages of major U.S. newspapers. The third edition of his book, *The Battle Over Homework: Common Ground for Administrators, Teachers, and Parents*, appeared in 2007.



You refer in your book to 30-year cycles of opinion about homework. Where do we stand now? We are in a “too much homework” part of the cycle. A lot of concerns are being raised by parents that homework is crowding out other opportunities for their kids.

Are they right? In some circumstances, they might be. The national PTA and National Educational Association have released guidelines that suggest kids should be assigned roughly 10 minutes of homework per grade level.

What are the downsides of too much homework? It can be counterproductive. Homework does affect achievement positively, but evidence shows that spending more time doing homework does not necessarily improve academic outcome.

You write that the amount of homework can vary depending on developmental level and home circumstances. How does that play out? Well, for instance, assigning homework that involves the use of a computer in a school whose students come primarily from poor neighborhoods, and therefore might not have access to a computer at home, would not be advisable.

But can teachers assign different homework to different children in the same class? It's possible. If parents tell a teacher that the homework assigned is too difficult for their child, the teacher could suggest that the child try doing every other problem.

How involved should parents be in homework? They should make sure the child has a good place to do homework, express a positive attitude towards homework, monitor for signs of fatigue or burnout, and act as a mentor when requested.

Harris Cooper is a member of the Advisory Board of SSRI.

LAB PROVIDES BOOST

for Experimental Social Science Research

EXPERIMENTAL WORK in social sciences at Duke has received a significant boost recently with the construction of a 5,000 square foot laboratory facility.

The DIISP lab is housed above SSRI in the historic Erwin Mill Building and is available to social scientists across the university. One of SSRI's affiliated programs, DIISP is the new face of social psychology at Duke and is part of an ambitious initiative aimed at creating connections across the social sciences.

The lab supports a wide array of research paradigms spanning questionnaires, small group interactions, computer-based protocols, and psychophysiology. With this broad array in a single facility, researchers can pursue questions in novel



A research participant being briefed before an experiment in the new DIISP Laboratory

and powerful ways.

Rebecca Miller, a psychology undergraduate, is working with faculty advisor Rick Hoyle and graduate student Michelle Sherrill in a project that seeks to understand why acts of self-control feel physically depleting. They are using the lab's psycho-

physiology equipment to measure heart rate and physiological arousal while participants exert self-control over their thoughts and behavior. In a different vein, political science Ph.D. candidate Monique Lyle is using the DIISP lab to explore the effects of political elites upon people's endorsement of subtle racial prejudice. Monique will measure participants' implicit race-based attitudes based on their reaction times to visual stimuli presented via computer. The goal is to better understand how political leaders' framing of racial issues can penetrate and influence broader public discourse.

In addition to functioning as a data collection site, the DIISP lab serves as the location for periodic workshops and small group meetings. It also maintains its own database of student and community research participants. Built through funding provided by the College of Arts and Sciences, the Office of the Provost, and the Office of the Vice Provost for Research, the lab is available for use free of charge to faculty and students at Duke. //

To learn more, please visit the DIISP Web site housed under www.ssri.duke.edu. Inquiries can be directed to the Laboratory Director, Dr. David Neal (dneal@duke.edu).

workshops

BELOW IS A LIST OF WORKSHOPS offered in the spring 2007. Workshops are open to all. Please visit the SSRI Web site to get a detailed description of each workshop and to see the schedule for fall 2007.

RSVP to: <http://RSVP.ssri.duke.edu>

All workshops are from **3:00-5:00 p.m.**
(unless otherwise noted)

Erwin Mill Building, Room B140

JANUARY 23

Introduction to SPSS

Chongming Yang

JANUARY 30 (Session 1), **FEBRUARY 1** (Session 2)

Time Series Analysis and Forecasting

Mike Munger

FEBRUARY 8

Web-Based Surveys—Viewsflash

Mike Brady

FEBRUARY 13

GIS: Introduction and Overview of Social Science Applications

Mark Thomas

FEBRUARY 22

Methods for Handling Missing Data in Social Science Research

Jerry Reiter

FEBRUARY 27

Introduction to STATA

Beth Gifford

MARCH 20

Introduction to Structural Equation Modeling

Rick Hoyle

MARCH 22

Introduction to Mplus for Structural Equation Modeling

Chongming Yang

APRIL 5

Introduction to Endnote

Carson Holloway

Non-Profit Org
U.S. Postage
PAID
Durham, NC
Permit No. 60



P.O. BOX 90420 | DURHAM, NC 27708

SPRING 2007, VOLUME 1, ISSUE 1

WWW.SSRI.DUKE.EDU

gist
from the Mill

Editor:
Courtney Packard Orning

Contributors:
John Aldrich
Mark Leary
David Neal
Wendy Wood

Designer:
Regina Barnhill-Bordo
www.bdesign-studio.com

Gist from the Mill is printed with soy inks on chlorine free paper containing 10% post-consumer fiber.

Please recycle.