

to publish the statement elsewhere and to add that it had been refused by me, Editor of *ASR*. I terminated the correspondence by writing that if he did, he should add that the Editor had submitted the statement to every associate editor and that each one had recommended against printing it. I never learned if he attempted to publish it elsewhere.

Sometimes scholarly rivalry corrupts reason. New directions of research interest have so distressed some sociologists that they look for means of obstructing them. On one such occasion a veteran of the ASA was asked how this could be accomplished. The old man smiled and simply quoted his favorite Biblical sage, Gamaliel, who had been asked a similar question. He answered, "And now I say unto you, Refrain from these men, and let them alone; for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to naught; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it . . ." (Acts 6:38-39).

Such incidents as the above are, of

course, trivial in comparison with the achievement of workers in sociology. Over the years we have steadily gained in knowledge and in the respect by other scientists and by the general public. Our old-timers remember serving at the bottom of the prestige scale in universities, and enduring scoffs from members of other disciplines, as well as being asked by strangers such questions as "Sociology, what's that? Socialism?" One measure of our progress is the listing of sociologists in the *World Who's Who In Science*, and others are the recognition of the discipline by the National Science Foundation and by the National Academy of Sciences. It would seem that if sociologists and their national organization, ASA, hold to the course that has been so rewarding up to the present, always trying to steer clear of domination by doctrine while encouraging the development and use of objective methods along with rational theory, this success could flourish.

## THE ASA IN 1961-1962: BRINGING IN MANAGERIAL SKILLS\*

ROBERT O. CARLSON\*

*Adelphi University*

EXECUTIVE OFFICER, 1961-1962

The American Sociologist 1981, Vol. 16 (February):52-55

The first Executive Officer of the American Sociological Association was Professor Mitilda White Riley who served with professional dedication and a sensitivity to the changing needs of its members from 1949 through 1960. These were formative years in shaping the organizational structure of the Association and in responding to the bewildering array of new services required by its rapidly growing membership. Dr. Riley, almost working as a committee of one, was responsible for the astonishing increase in

the membership of the Association over those years.

When Professor Riley elected to relinquish her post in 1960, it was filled on an interim basis by Professor Robert Bierstedt of New York University. At that time, the NYU Washington Square campus served as the administrative headquarters for the Association. He served the Society with devotion from late 1960 through August 1961. During his tenure the Council of the Association designated as his Administrative Officer a fellow sociologist at New York University, Professor Janice H. Hopper.

Sometime during the Summer and Fall of 1961, I had a number of conversations with members of a Search Committee in-

\* Address correspondence to: Robert O. Carlson, Dean; Schools of Business; Adelphi University; Garden City, Long Island NY 11530.

cluding Professors Mitilda and Jack Riley, the late Professor Talcott Parsons (Secretary of the Association) and the late Professor Paul F. Lazarsfeld, President-elect of the American Sociological Association for 1962. These conversations dealt with the possibility that I might assume a part-time, unpaid position as Executive Officer of the Association and work closely with the President-elect, the Council of the Association, and the Administrative Officer, Dr. Hopper. Sometime in the late Summer and early Fall of 1961 we came to a general agreement that I would undertake this assignment on a one year trial basis contingent upon approval of this job concept by the full membership of the Council of the American Sociological Association.

My notification that the Council had approved my designation as a part-time, unpaid Executive Officer and ex-officio member of the Council came in the most exotic of settings. At that time, I was a full-time executive of Standard Oil Company (N.J.) (now EXXON) and was on a field trip in the oil-producing province of Khusestan, in southern Iran. On a particularly hot October's day in 1961, I had been visiting our oil production sites in that province by helicopter and returned to our home base of Ahwaz to learn that there was an urgent telephone call from the Oil Consortium's headquarters office in Tehran. I contacted our Tehran office by radio-telephone to learn that they, in turn, had received a cable inviting me to accept the position of Executive Officer of the American Sociological Association effective immediately. I cabled back my acceptance and there then followed a most interesting year that I still remember with fondness as well as a few personal regrets.

Memory is at best an elusive research tool and many of the important persons who were party to this appointment have died. Thus I must emphasize that my account of my stewardship as Executive Officer is based upon as much objectivity and completeness as retrospective thought can give me after these twenty years. Essentially, the objective in my appointment was to bring "a management consultant from industry" and a certified sociologist (Ph.D. from Columbia

University—Robert K. Merton and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, thesis advisors) who might help with the growing pains of administering a fast growing and diverse professional society.

My full-time employment was as a senior executive with EXXON Corporation (as it is known today) dealing with political and economic problems associated with our operations in the Middle East, North Africa, the Far East, and Western Europe. In theory, the managerial skills required in the performance of these corporate duties were thought to be transferrable to working out guidelines and long-range planning for the growth of the American Sociological Association. This concept had intellectual merit and I would like to believe that some of the results were a justification of the faith of those who asked me to take on this part-time job.

After I became acquainted with the day-to-day administrative needs of the Society, it was clear to me that our headquarters office was woefully understaffed in terms of professional support personnel and budget. Dr. Janice Hopper never fully received the well-deserved recognition from her colleagues in the Association for the dedicated work and overtime that she gave to serving the immediate and the long-range needs of members of the Association during this period of its inordinate growth and change.

The Executive Offices of the Society were at the Washington Square Campus of New York University. However, inasmuch as the President of the Society for 1962 was Paul E. Lazarsfeld, both Paul, Janice, and I thought that it would be useful to provide Dr. Hopper with a part-time office at the old Bureau of Applied Social Research building on the Columbia University Campus. In retrospect, this decision probably was a mistake for it tended to confuse her institutional identification in the minds of many members since sometimes they reached her at her Washington Square office and other times at her Columbia University office.

Already in the early part of 1961, there were strong efforts within the Council, and the membership at large, to consider the merits of moving the entire headquar-

ters operation of the Association from New York City to Washington, D. C. The rationale for this move was sound. Other comparable professional academic associations already had begun to recognize that federal government research funding and related legislation would play an important rôle in the growth of professional academic societies in the decades ahead. The Association needed a listening post in our nation's capital as well as a forum from which it could represent the various regional and specialized professional interests of its members. Moreover, it was apparent that the various regional sociological societies that made up the membership of the American Sociological Association needed the kind of clearinghouse to coordinate their activities and annual regional meetings that only Washington, D. C., could offer.

In addition, there was growing evidence of a feeling among some members of the Association that its governance was perceived as being too closely associated with certain universities representing "the Eastern Establishment." Whether this perception did, in fact, obtain and whether it resulted in a bias in making appointments to important committees of the Association is an academic point today. Paul Lazarsfeld, Talcott Parsons, Mitilda and Jack Riley, and I, in various conversations regarding the organizational needs of the Association, recognized that a move of headquarters operations to Washington, D. C., was inevitable and desirable.

During much of 1962, I found myself reporting to meetings of the Council of our Association the need for a larger, full-time professional staff and a more adequately funded budget for headquarters operations. I don't recall any substantial opposition to these recommendations, but there was an honest concern about "where will we find the money." Moreover, the sheer logistical headaches associated with implementing these recommendations and the proposed move to Washington, D. C., were apparent to all Council members. After serving over nine months of my term as a part-time Executive Officer, it was clear to me that the job of Executive Officer could no longer be justified as a

part-time, unpaid position in view of the growing size and diverse needs of our membership. In retrospect, I have real personal regret that I probably did not give the day-to-day supportive counsel to Dr. Hopper that she deserved in carrying out her duties as Administrative Officer of the Society.

Together we tried to devise more effective lines of organizational structure to insure that our headquarters office maintained timely and systematic liaison with the regional sociological societies and the specialized sections that provided the backbone of our membership. I recall, too, that in the interest of increasing our income we spent considerable time in trying to devise ways of increasing advertising revenues from the publications sponsored by the American Sociological Association. While these discussions were well-intended and met with limited success, the plain fact of the matter became apparent to all of us in Headquarters that our basic income was, and would continue to be, derived from dues paid by members of the Association. Even at that time we considered the merits of some graduated scale of dues based upon the earnings of members at various stages of their professional growth.

By mid-1962, I was persuaded that it was a disservice to the Association to indulge in the fantasy that a part-time Executive Officer truly could serve the needs of the Association. In discussions with Talcott Parsons, Paul Lazarsfeld, the Rileys, and Janice Hopper, as well as members of the Council, I urged that consideration be given to creating a full-time, paid position of Executive Officer for the Association. This recommendation met with general concurrence from the Council although implementation of it was delayed until such time as the American Sociological Association actually moved its headquarters from New York to a permanent home in Washington, D. C.

In the twenty years that have passed since I served as Executive Officer of the Association, I have seen the Society grow and mature in its administrative sophistication and the scope of services it offers to its members. Clearly, the move to Washington and the creation of the position of a

full-time Executive Officer with an adequate full-time professional staff have been validated by the growth and academic stature achieved by the Association in the last two decades.

The editor of *TAS*, in inviting me to make this retrospective review of my brief tenure as Executive Officer of the Association, also invited all of us who had served as former Executive Officers to address ourselves to new areas in which we believe the Association might direct its activities. As a dean of a growing School of Business Administration and School of Banking and Money Management, I am particularly mindful of the extent to which our undergraduate and graduate programs of study call upon the writings of social scientists in discussions of managerial theory and practice. I am struck, however, in reviewing the reading lists and the syllabi of the management courses that we offer our students, with the time lag that is evident in the sociological studies and new theoretical concepts that our students of business and management are receiving in traditional courses in management theory and organizational behavior. Many of the text books and supplemental readings produced by leading scholars of management and the management sciences do not include reference to recent research findings and theoretical concepts that sociologists, psychologists, and social psychologists are currently giving top priority.

I suggest that there is real merit in encouraging a more formal exchange of ideas and research findings via seminars and workshops between faculty from traditional departments of sociology and social psychology and faculty teaching management theory and organizational behavior in schools of business. Something important is lost when the basic findings of major writers in one discipline (for example, sociology) are interpreted in a second-hand fashion by leading scholars in the field of management theory writing

for the specialized interests of their students in school of business and management.

I am not suggesting that the traditional courses offered by sociology or social psychology departments be transferred lock, stock, and barrel into the curricula of traditional schools of business. Neither party would be happy or comfortable with such an arrangement. On the other hand there are many university campuses at which the faculty of schools of business operate in splendid isolation from the research activities and theoretical interests of their social science colleagues. The special irony of this parochial situation is that each academic constituency is committed to developing better research tools for understanding the behavior of people in all of the environments in which they live and interact.

As a first bureaucratic step in initiating a dialogue between sociologists and the teachers of management in schools of business, I suggest that consideration be given to the creation of a liaison committee between the American Sociological Association and the American Association of Collegiate Schools of Business to discuss this problem and the possible positive results that might be forthcoming from a more formal exchange between these two academic communities.

It is my conviction that there is a time lag of between five to ten years between the leading edge of current sociological research and theory (as it is reported in our professional journals) and the time these findings are incorporated into text books on management theory and organizational behavior used in most business schools today. Surely it is worth making an effort to find ways of reducing this time lag between the significant publications of the members of the American Sociological Association and use of these materials and case studies in related curricula areas offered by schools of business and management.