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Each year the voting members of the ASA Elect four members-at-large from a slate of eight nominees to serve three-year terms on the all-important Council of the ASA.

Constitutionally, and in practice, the Council is responsible for the formulation of policy and the direction of the affairs of the Association. This includes the power to make major appointments and to allocate the resources of the ASA.

Persons who are elected to serve on the governing body are required to devote long hours over several meetings (quarterly in 1973-74) each year to policy and management matters. Service is not uncommon; deliberations are intense; decisions are painful. No compensation is received other than the reward of service and stimulation from the combat of ideas generated among colleagues as they shape the direction of the Association.

This year, eight sociologists, each with distinguished professional records, have accepted the call to election from the Committee on Nominations. The ballot, to be sent to the membership during the Winter, will contain information about their achievements. For the present, we merely note the names of the nominees, the place and year of their degree, and their current affiliation:

Richard M. Emerson (PhD, Minnesota, 1951), Professor, University of Washington, Seattle.
Joseph H. Fichter (PhD, Harvard, 1947), Professor, Loyola University of the South, New Orleans.
Renée C. Fox (PhD, Harvard, 1954), Professor and Chairman, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
Travis Hirsch (PhD, UC Berkeley, 1966), Professor, University of California, Davis.
Charles E. King (PhD, Chicago, 1951), Professor, North Carolina Central University, Durham.
Melvin L. Kohn (PhD, Cornell, 1932), Chief, Laboratory of Social-Environmental Studies, NIH, Bethesda, Maryland.
Gary T. Marx (PhD, UC Berkeley, 1961), Lecturer, Harvard.
Albert J. McQueen (PhD, Michigan, 1959), Associate Professor, Oberlin College.

Candidates for Committee on Committees

The Council of the ASA meeting in New Orleans devoted considerable time to discussing how to improve committee work in the Association. One problem is how to broaden the base for effective participation. The central mechanism for recruiting talent to the effort is the Committee on Committees. This elected body is charged with preparing names of members to the Council who might serve on various committees when such selection is specified in the Constitution or By-Laws. The Council instructed the Executive Officer and the Committee on Committees to solicit from the membership, before each Annual Meeting, suggestions for nominations to committee openings. This will be done at the appropriate time through the columns of The American Sociologist.

In the meantime, six new members of the Committee on Committees are to be elected for two-year terms in the 1973 election. The slate of candidates, one to be elected from each voting district, as announced by the Nomination Committee, is as follows:

District 1
Phillip E. Hammond (PhD, Columbia, 1961), Professor, University of Arizona.
Milton K. Mykytovich (PhD, UC Berkeley, 1967), Associate Professor, University of Hawaii.

District 2
Nicholas Babeck (PhD, Washington University, St. Louis), Professor, University of Nebraska.
Warren Bloomberg (PhD, Chicago, 1951), Professor, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee.

District 3
Harlan J. Friedson (PhD, Texas, 1950), Professor, North Texas State University.
Donald E. Muir (PhD, Vanderbilt, 1961), Professor, University of Alabama.

District 4
Dickie E. Balter (PhD, Columbia, 1952), Professor, University of Pennsylvania.
Eleanor P. Wolf (PhD, Wayne State, 1959), Professor, Wayne State University.

District 5
James D. Cowig (PhD, Michigan State, 1954), Deputy Director, Div. of Social Systems and Human Resources, NSF, Washington, D.C.
Rosabeth Moss Young (PhD, Michigan, 1967), Assistant Professor, Brandeis University.

District 6
Elmer G. Barber (PhD, Harvard, 1951), Program Officer, Ford Foundation.
Jacques Delafy (PhD, University of Paris, 1971), Professor, University of Montréal.

Nominees for Nominations Committee

In the forthcoming election, the voting members of the ASA will elect six new members from one district for two-year terms on the Nominations Committee of the Association. This committee, composed of 12 elected members and chaired by the Vice-President Elect, has the important job of preparing a slate of candidates (six major offices or committees of the ASA including, President, Vice-President, Secretary, Council, Publications Committee, and the Committee on Committees.

The ballot for 1973 will contain the following two nominees from each district as selected by the A-I-A Members of the Council:

District 1
Rodolfo Alvarez (PhD, Washington, 1966), Associate Professor, UCLA.
Richard J. Hill (PhD, Washington, 1953), Professor, University of Oregon.

District 2
David J. Bordua (PhD, Harvard, 1957), Professor, University of Illinois.
Jack Ladinsky (PhD, Michigan, 1962), Professor, University of Wisconsin.

District 3
Bruce K. Eckland (PhD, Illinois, 1964), Professor, University of North Carolina.
James D. Thompson (PhD, North Carolina, 1950), Associate Professor, Vanderbilt University.

District 4
Elton F. Jackson (PhD, Michigan, 1960), Professor, Indiana University.
Helen Butler (PhD, New York, 1930), Professor, Cleveland State University.

District 5
Albert D. Bajerman (PhD, Chicago, 1964), Associate, Bureau of Social Research, Washington, D.C.
Helen MacGill Hughes (PhD, Chicago, 1937), Cambridge, Mass.

District 6
Eugene Weinstein (PhD, Northwestern, 1954), Professor, SUNY, Stony Brook.
Harrity Zuckerman (PhD, Columbia, 1965), Associate Professor, Columbia.

Sociologist Elected to NAS Institute of Medicine

Professor Eliot Freidson of New York University was among the 51 new members recently elected to membership in the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences. The Institute now has 235 active members.

Members are elected for 5-year terms from within and outside of the health profession, and commit themselves to dedicating a substantial portion of their time to the "protection and advancement of the health of the public."

The Institute now has in progress a series of studies including examination of the costs of educating health professionals and an exploratory study to identify key issues for study in relationships of health and human values.
Oligarchic Complaint Proposes Selective Constraint To Counter Editorial Ecologies

How are the Editors of the ASA selected?
According to the Constitution of the ASA, the Board of Editors of the ASA shall be composed of an Editor elected by the Executive Committee, and not fewer than eighteen Associate Editors. Associate Editors shall be appointed by the Executive Committee and may be removed at any time, for cause, in accordance with the recommendation of the Editor for three-year terms, at least six of which shall expire each year. The number of Associate Editors beyond eighteen shall be determined by the Editor, with a view to technical competence. The Editor shall be Chairman of the Board of Editors.

Recently, in New Orleans, dissatisfaction with the alleged result of this procedure surfaced at the annual meeting of the ASA. The new President, James F. Short, Jr., of Washington State University, received his PhD at Chicago in 1974. Following the convention, he wrote the American Sociologist to inform the membership that the resolutions that had been passed at the meeting had been voted against. Furthermore, the membership is urged to send the Executive Office any suggestions they might have for future appointments. Six new appointments will be made at the next Annual Meeting in New York. Names received from members will be transmitted to the Publications Committee for their consideration.

The current chairman of the ASA is James F. Short, Jr., of Washington State University. He was a PhD student at Chicago in 1974. Following the convention, he wrote the American Sociologist to inform the membership that the resolutions that had been passed at the meeting had been voted against. Furthermore, the membership is urged to send the Executive Office any suggestions they might have for future appointments. Six new appointments will be made at the next Annual Meeting in New York. Names received from members will be transmitted to the Publications Committee for their consideration.

The current chairman of the ASA is James F. Short, Jr., of Washington State University. He was a PhD student at Chicago in 1974. Following the convention, he wrote the American Sociologist to inform the membership that the resolutions that had been passed at the meeting had been voted against. Furthermore, the membership is urged to send the Executive Office any suggestions they might have for future appointments. Six new appointments will be made at the next Annual Meeting in New York. Names received from members will be transmitted to the Publications Committee for their consideration.

The current chairman of the ASA is James F. Short, Jr., of Washington State University. He was a PhD student at Chicago in 1974. Following the convention, he wrote the American Sociologist to inform the membership that the resolutions that had been passed at the meeting had been voted against. Furthermore, the membership is urged to send the Executive Office any suggestions they might have for future appointments. Six new appointments will be made at the next Annual Meeting in New York. Names received from members will be transmitted to the Publications Committee for their consideration.

The current chairman of the ASA is James F. Short, Jr., of Washington State University. He was a PhD student at Chicago in 1974. Following the convention, he wrote the American Sociologist to inform the membership that the resolutions that had been passed at the meeting had been voted against. Furthermore, the membership is urged to send the Executive Office any suggestions they might have for future appointments. Six new appointments will be made at the next Annual Meeting in New York. Names received from members will be transmitted to the Publications Committee for their consideration.

The current chairman of the ASA is James F. Short, Jr., of Washington State University. He was a PhD student at Chicago in 1974. Following the convention, he wrote the American Sociologist to inform the membership that the resolutions that had been passed at the meeting had been voted against. Furthermore, the membership is urged to send the Executive Office any suggestions they might have for future appointments. Six new appointments will be made at the next Annual Meeting in New York. Names received from members will be transmitted to the Publications Committee for their consideration. "
Recent Trends in Graduate Training: Preliminary Results of a Survey

Robert W. Harestein
University of Missouri—Columbia

The American Sociologist 1972, Vol. 7 (November): 3-9

In the first week of March, 1972, a three-and-a-half-page questionnaire was sent to the author by the 102 United States Ph.D-granting departments listed on pages 1-167 of the AAA’s 1971-72 Guide to Graduate Departments of Sociology. Seventy-six of these, about three-fourths, were returned, usually by the director of graduate studies of the responding department, but occasionally by the department chairman. A thorough analysis of the responses is planned for the next academic year. All comments are here reported in order to give colleagues some information about recent developments in Ph.D.-granting programs in the United States. In the past three years...

1. Graduate training programs in sociology have been undergoing change. Almost twice as many departments as are scoring along with present programs are enlisting on or have already enlisted on programs of substantial change. Of the nearly two-thirds of the departments that are pursuing change, a heavy majority reported change in both the M.A. and the Ph.D. level. Very few departments concerned themselves with the M.A. level only.

2. The changes are almost unrelentingly varied. However, three types of change are discernible: (a) minor changes—additions and subtractions—with little planned growth; although some growth might occur through simple accretion; (b) substantial changes that follow program review and changing ideas about the character of graduate training and the mission of the department; and (c) development of new fields, specialties, and on occasion (in about one-seventh of the cases) new degree programs initiated. Attempts to alter programs to take into account disadvantaged minority groups were noted by about one-sixth of the departments reporting.

3. The ideological grounds for change are varied and multidirectional. Upgrading, desegregating, diversifying, and streamlining are key descriptive terms. The dominant but by no means only concern is on changing the M.A. degree so as to be broader the ways that achieve a degree and to make the degree quicker if not easier to get—or, in a few cases, to make it of a higher theoretical quality or, secondarily, of a more applied nature. In a few cases the M.A. degree has been dropped altogether. Little enthusiasm is shown for a Ph.D. of the character of the Ph.D., but reduction of the graduate student “stretch-out” of the training period is a matter of increasing concern, with more than a quarter of the departments admitting efforts to streamline the Ph.D. program and reduce its time-consuming requirements. Despite the hurried up, a “hard hat” emphasis on quality for the Ph.D., even strengthening and upgrading it, is the dominant trend, with 30 percent of the departments willing to sacrifice quantity for quality. Nearly no departments want to jettison their present regular and special programs, however updated, for a simple return to the “good old days” of graduate training.

4. A willingness to change (tinker’s) is accompanied by a noticeable determination to reduce the number of entrants who will be affected by (suffer) the specific changes. Nearly all the changes will have some impact on the number of entrants that can be accommodated, yet not all departments know by April or May how many graduate students will report for duty. Nevertheless, there is a trend toward restricting enrollment, with not many major departments willing to see more than twenty-five or thirty new faces at the start of the academic year. If it has been the case that the already restrictive “top ten” departments have been the first to cut back, the rest of the departments, for whatever reasons and for whatever reasons, are beginning to restrict entry also. The mechanisms for control vary from making requirements for entrance more stringent to cutting back on teaching assistantships in other forms of graduate student support to simply adopting a cut-back figure and, when it is reached, closing the door to all further applicants. Paradoxically, many of the departments that are cutting back are making special arrangements to admit disadvantaged, usually minority, applicants.

5. Screening devices are fairly hexually used. The devices vary from “early-warning” qualifying examinations to longer, fewer and more demanding expectations for new entrants. At some universities, a student’s successful completion of an M.A. degree no longer assures automatic acceptance at that school for work toward the Ph.D. With varying degrees of academic theory and method “core” courses or core seminars are relied upon to ground the student in the theoretical essentials of the discipline and/or to screen that student’s potential to meet the major trends of the tax-tune, high-standard, hurdle-jumping, ladder-trapping style is seen in efforts of a few (humanities-oriented) members and some institutions to devise terminal exams or theses or to develop substitute programs that range from creative projects to papers submitted for publication (professional training) with a student’s advisor’s approval of the handling of an individual portfolio, and the like. Graduate students now face such a salutary bowl of courses, styles, models, emphases, programs, of diversity without a clear comprehension of the whole departments as to confound rational comprehension.

6. In danger of changing, perhaps, is the dominance and the relative autonomy of the student’s Ph.D. advisory committee. Area committees and examining committees made up of persons other than those on students’ advisory committees are also (unequivocally) getting into the act. In other words, the bureaucratisation of the advisory, testing, and examining procedure is happening, and further, nearly a quarter of the responses referred to a general departmental bureaucratisation, with a proliferation of committees, subcommittees, subcommittees etc. Specialisation may not be rampant here, but it is likely to be blurred, as with an added “speciality,” the generalist option precipitating out as the college teachers’ alternative.

7. Multiobjective programs accommodating a diversity of goals and anticipated end-products are evident. This observation relates to the willingness-to-tolerate syndrome common to most departments. There seems to be a specialization threat that transcends mere change and tends toward a strict transformational change. The titles of the dissertation of graduate training. In particular, speciality or substantive fields are being added: medical sociology, occupational sociology, political sociology, urban sociology, family sociology, deviance, and law society. Still other specialties, many with outside funding and interdisciplinary involvements (such as grants from the National Science Foundation) are supported by many departments, with about one-third to one-fifth of the departments involved in graduate or special degree programs. Tolerance of diversity without a clear comprehension of what diversity means or how it is best achieved and resistance to curtail expansion in the scope, the effort, or the role of the departments have been the stimulus responses of departments to the post-Sputnik efflorescence of financial support by governmental and nongovernmental agencies.

8. Graduate students do not share equally or nearly equally in departmental governance. Nevertheless, graduate students are fairly well represented in governance, particularly on committees, and to a limited extent (they participate in decision making. It is as unlikeliness that students “step out of it” with regard to departmental affairs as it is that they will have “equal voice in all respects.” The noticeable efforts of a few years ago for participatory democracy in governance have worn thin and apparently among many faculty as well. If there is any direction of faculty and student voice and behavior toward governance in individual universities, there is a strong growth of pushing forward. It remains to be seen whether the faculty and student voice and behavior in governance have been made will persist and whether the apparently isolated individual initiatives, the layoffs, the aggravations of participation in the everyday matters of graduate training, and the pressures for research and publication...

(Continued on page 5)
Failing ASA Membership

As a new (1972) and failing international associate member of the American Sociological Association (ASA), I have a possible reason for the growth of ASA membership has slowed in recent years (Report of the Executive Officer, to the annual meeting, August 1972:23). Assuming that the intelligently stimulated provision of the three main ASA sociology journals, the American Sociological Review, The American Journal of Sociology, and the principal benefit of ASA membership, may be lagging because as enough television is shown in two of these journals.

The American Sociological Review, although rightly employing great esteem, does not currently appeal (as compared to several British sociological journals) to reflect a number of the concerns of professional sociologists. In particular, general theoretical and methodological articles are lacking, as are reports of research conducted using fieldwork methods. This may merely reflect a stronger commitment to engage middle-class theory with socialization “hard” and “concrete” investigations, but it squares oddly with the rich and extremely varied outpouring of sociology books published in North America.

The American Sociologist, from past reading a most stimulating source of professional debate, has in the last two issues been replete with articles to that a British eye is curiously parceled. The prestige ratings of sociologists, graduate sociology departments, sociological research other disciplines, and specialties within the discipline have naturally a certain fascination, but this is not a famous kind of novelty that has been of more substantive interest to the profession in recent years.

To a non-American, the content of the above two journals suggest that Sociology is Contemporary Sociology is markedly ethnocentric. Sociology in the United States is so large that it can be itself. The smaller numbers of professional sociologists in Britain and in other European countries have tended to be more eclectic in their sources of inspiration, and the enrichment from other national sociologies has been correspondingly greater. Judging from the American sociologists who visit Europe, eclecticism in the personal field. Could it not somehow be reflected more adequately in the ASA’s journals?

M.A. BUERGER
University of Durham, England

A Silent Scientific Speaks

Jerry G. Amall’s article, “The Silent Science” (The American Sociologist, May 1972:3, 5-6) uncharacteristically strung a reactive note in no one’s sociologies. Undoubtedly it issued the pen and the scissors. Of course our discipline is guilty of scholasticism. That identifying sociologists with (1972:6) “(i.e., research) calls for reprieve are not likely to affect sociological evaluation. What sociologist scholar is not trying to be flower in a semantic jungle nurtured by a pseudo-harmonious? Bond is not the first, nor will he be the last, to remind us that sociology has been weighed and found wanting. Robert Park, C. Wright Mills, and others have periodically called us back to the faith. But, the Sociological Imagination. Hamlet concluded: “the ASA or the Royal Societies has failed to indulge in the annual ritual of reposing the discipline to purity and relevance.

But the silent person, then, has no real exemplar left gone, find they the folks are pretty much like they be- cause, in a sociological convention or a journal article likely to be more instrumental in affecting the direction of things? For all said this not because I disagree with Bade but because I think he’s being a dead head. In sociology we have a public collector, extrapolation will not revise it. Maybe sociology isn’t worth saving. But if it is, the best way to do it is to use as facile or inadequate sociologists who labor in the Paradigmatic view. It does little good to bewail the status and record systems in sociology. The sociologist who wants to save the public should move in—and should accept the consequences as an autonomous human being. For me, at least, to be an autonomous human still takes priority.

Bond aptly (p. 3), “as long as sociological norms assign negative status in achieving prestige in academic books or journals, who daren publish in them” I do, for one. I don’t like to write journal articles. They bore me, and, frankly, I’m not very good at writing them. But writing for the public excites me far beyond description. And I’m reasonably good at it.

So I have accepted my baptism to the sociological hierarchal at the price of my own torment and sense of purpose. When I list Metamorphoses, The New Woman, Sociology, The National Report, Human Relations, and The Status of the on a page, prospective academic employers vibrate like cold rain on a hot roof.

It could enough sociologists that the established reward systems of the discipline are not worth the effort, the public may not recog- nize that sociology really has something to say worth hearing. But sociologists, sociologists may discover that sociology is saying something.

ERING R. CLAYTON
William Jewett College

Undergraduate Training Standards

For several years I have been teaching sociology in small liberal arts colleges and have witnessed such problems as choosing textbooks, justifying budget items to administrators that neither understand nor appreciate the nature of sociology, agi- lizing for improvements in sociology curricula over the objections of examiners who preach a variety of social doctrines under the guise of sociology, and justifying the hiring of persons trained in sociology who are not. I am interested in the post-1945 sociology within colleges and universities and at the difficulties small college sociology departments have in attracting the better students. Recent events which, in my opinion, are a shameful commentary on our discipline, have prompted me to write this letter. A typical case follows (I know of at least two other similar cases):

A small, conservatively oriented liberal arts college that I know had a combined department offering majors in psychology, sociology, and “sociology with a concentration in social work” (1972:3). Until a year ago the department faculty consisted of two full-time and two part-time instructors in psychology, two full- time instructors and one part-time instructor in sociology, and one part-time instructor for all the social work courses. The three persons teaching sociology were trained sociologists and the social work teacher had an MSW and a great deal of practical experience. The new major consisted of a two-year sequence of courses in social work combined with courses in sociology; the one part-time social work instructor was enough to teach the specific social work courses.

When new standards were imposed by the social work profession, combining the college, in order to be approved, was re- quired (and this was fine) to change the name of the new major to “social work” (but not to change any course offerings) and to hire at least one full-time social work teacher. In order fully to utilize the full-time social work teacher, the college assigned him to teach sociology half-time. The department now has two sociology courses a quarter taught by someone not trained specifically in sociology. The sociology taught is not to present this change, trying to compromise the administration (and even the chairman of the de- partment, who was a psychologist) that sociology and social work are different disciplines with different goals, different methods, and different bodies of knowledge—but to no avail.

The ASA holds to my knowledge no standards or guidelines for undergraduate training to indicate that it would disapprove an event of this kind. Even the official ASA statement of standards for graduate training is a non-partisan generalization. Still, it is better than nothing: it is a start. But isn’t it time for our professional society to follow the lead of other professional societies in developing and trying to implement standards for undergraduate train- ing? Are we not self-reporting and ready enough to be able to agree at least on a few facts? Surely we have enough data to make officially what we believe in and what we are doing. There should be standards below which we will not tolerate intrusions into the profession.

Professional guidelines would especially benefit persons in soci- ology where budgets in tight and departments have to compete for funds, space, equipment, personnel, and students. I suggest that the ASA give this matter serious consideration, and that other sociology teachers make their concerns and interest known to the proper committees of our association.

DARWIN D. GATES, graduate student
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Correction

Despite my best efforts at proofing my article “Correlation as a Principle of Social Science” (The American Sociologist, May 1972) I am in less a one error slip through. On page 13, column 3, line 27 (3th line below table 1) "K/V-6" should be "K/V-60." My apologies for letting this error through.

WERNER E. SCOMON
State University of New York, Oerken

--

INSTRUCTIONS TO AUTHORS OF MANUSCRIPTS AND LETTERS

Send manuscripts and letters to Editor, The American Sociologist, 815 Cherry Lane, Davis, California 95616.

The American Sociologist reserves the right to exclude or edit all texts.

Manuscripts

Submit three copies on white standard paper. Leave wide margins. Double-space all matter including notes and line numbers. Leave at least one blank line between paragraphs. Do not staple. Refer to the American Sociologist for more complete instructions. Use separate pages for abstract, table of contents, and references.

COVER PAGE. Include title, author’s name, institutional affiliation. For anonymous reviewing process send name and affiliation from manuscript.

ABSTRACT. Include summary of two hundred words or less.

FOOTNOTES. Number consecutively from one and appear on separate page. Use for substantive source citations.

TABLES. Appear on separate pages at end of manuscript. Where appropriate in text, insert a table.

REFERENCES. Include all sources cited as shown below. Do not use ibid., op. cit., or, self, instead, repeat previous citations.

Examples:

1. "Undergraduate Sociology in Small Liberal Arts Colleges," (1976), other unpublished material; (1976:149-161); Cloward, (1969:160-63); Warner, (1979) stated the same..." (List authors alphabetically, separate authors from year by comma, separate years by paren., pages from up. paper, textbook; use by each other than by both. Use: "a", "b", "c", etc. for more than one in a year.

2. It has been found (research, 1969; Simon and Simon, 1968:218) that... (Use "and" for two authors, "or all" for three or more but include all authors in references following text.)

3. "A recent statement by the American Psychiatric Association (1952:67) shows that... select occupational data (United States Bureau of the Census, 1966:11-17) indicate that all of these factors (1972:19-20) in first publication, supply minimum identification from beginning of complete citation.

REFERENCES: Publishing Title, Double-space all matter, include all authors alphabetically with their publication titles in chronological order; Avoid using initials. Give last name and initials of authors, year of publication, title of article (lower case, underlining for, quotation marks), name of journal, volume number, page numbers, dates.

Manuscripts. Give last names and initials of authors, year of publication, title of article, number of pages, quirk market, name of journal, volume number, page numbers, dates.

Letters. Type double-spaced with wide margins. Leave two copies and supply a short title. References must be fully documented in text—not one footnote.
antagonism toward higher education and that a change in public opinion may lead to considerable institutional change. In some states, of course, the intervention of state legislatures into the policy-making of universities is already past history. While probably a minority of the responding directors of graduate study or chairmen feels concerned about the public's lack of understanding of intrauniversity and interdepartmental relations, even fewer show concern for potential internal upheavals and/or radical changes initiated for the sake of change itself.

10. Responses are about equally divided on whether to move toward a stronger professional organization, including unionization, or to maintain only the usual AASU involvement. Only a small minority is currently represented by a union, nearly all in one state university system, but the relatively recent decision of the AASU to engage in collective bargaining activities for its members is likely to have noticeable effect. The impression gained, partly from a fairly large percentage of "no answers," is that there are mixed feelings within departments and that a chairman or director of graduate study feels (in answering the questionnaire) hesitant to try to generalize for the departmental faculty as a whole. Short of drastic changes, pressures, threats, or assaults on the basics of occupational security, it is unlikely that the shift to unionization is in the near offing. But in the offing, sometime, it most likely is.

NEW EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGIST

The Committee on Publications and Council announce the selection of Leon H. Mayhew of the University of California, Davis, to succeed Harold W. Plautz as editor of The American Sociologist.

All manuscripts for forthcoming issues and all letters pertaining to published articles should be addressed to:

Dr. Leon H. Mayhew
The American Sociologist
815 Cherry Lane
Davis, California 95616

Copy for all other matters should be addressed to the Executive Office, American Sociological Association, 1722 N. Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

AMERICAN SOCIETY

Quantitative and Collaborative Trends in American Sociological Research

Narse Patel
Indiana State University

The American Sociologist 1972, Vol. 7 (November): 5-6

American sociology is characterized by an indelible effort on the part of its practitioners toward making it scientif

ic. In the beginning of this century William Graham Sumner regretted the state of sociology when he said, "Sociology seems now to be largely speculative and nonversial. I should like to see a group of scholars at work to get it down to normal growth on a scientific method, dealing with concrete things" (quoted in Bernard, 1969).

Sumner's statement was a vision, as much as a wish, pointing to collective research and quantification as the directions sociology would take in the decades to follow.

At the subject of investigation in the present study is the trend of quantification in sociological research and the extent to which collaboration has emerged along with quantification. A fuller statement of research collaboration—its nature, growth, and rationale—in the seven decades of American sociology may be found elsewhere (Patel, 1967).

Here, data on quantification and the relation of quantification to authorship collaboration will be analyzed.

Table 1: Quantitative Articles in Sociological Journals, 1895-1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Sociology</td>
<td>58 (428)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64 (351)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33 (294)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>210 (1,460)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Forces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Sociological Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Sociology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total articles and mean percentages</td>
<td>58 (428)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64 (351)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33 (294)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>518 (1,298)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures in parentheses are the total articles in the journals.

Measuring the Extent of Quantification

Quantification in sociological research is gradually coming of age, despite philosophical reservations and methodological obstacles. The debate today is not whether quantification is or is not essential to a science, or whether it should or should not be restricted to measurable social units at the descriptive level. Quantification in its generic sense means assigning numerical values in accordance with certain rules. It cannot escape being both descriptive and analytical-explanatory: descriptive in reference to numerical data used to illustrate a point and analytical-explanatory in its use for verifying hypotheses. Our concern is in both terms are recognized in scientific output, and it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between them. It remains to see to what extent quantitative analysis is found in sociological research literature.

Under the assumption that researchers seek professional journals as vehicles of scientific expression and learning, four representative sociological journals were selected for this study: American Journal of Sociology (AJJS), Social Forces (SF), American Sociological Review (ASR), and Rural Sociology (RS). AJJS, having begun publication in 1895, is the oldest sociological journal; it was the official journal of the American Sociological Society from 1906 to 1936, when ASR became the new official journal of the society; SF started publication in 1926 and is the official analysis the data were divided into seven decades from 1895 to 1965.

A simple operational definition of quantification was utilized: if the body of the article contained numerical data, either as tables or in a less formal way, the article was described as quantitative; otherwise it was described as non-quantitative. Whether each article was single-authored or multiple-authored was also recorded.

Findings

Journal literature in the first three decades (1895-1925) was relatively lacking in "concrete things," that is, quantitative analysis was found in only 14 percent of the articles in the first decade and 18 percent and 11 percent of the articles in the second and third decades respectively (table 1). In the next two decades (1926-45) two of every five articles were quantitative. In the post-war decades the balance tilted in favor of quantitative analysis. Of the total articles in the sixth decade (1946-55) one in every two was quanti-
Table 2. Multiple-Authorship in Sociological Journals, 1895-1965

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Journal of Sociology</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Forces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Sociological Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total articles</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
<td>294</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures in parentheses are the total articles in the journals.

Table 3. Types of Articles in American Journal of Sociology, Social Forces, American Sociological Review, and Rural Sociology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-authored</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonquantitative</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-authored</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-authored</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonquantitative</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-authored</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple-authored</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trend toward quantitative articles is greater than the trend toward jointly authored articles. In the three decades from 1895-1925, hardly more than 1 percent of the articles were multiple-authored (table 2), whereas quantitative articles in those three decades (table 1) were 14, 18, and 31 percent. In the next two decades (1925-1945) multiple-authored articles rose to 5 to 10 percent, while quantitative articles increased to 40 and then to 42 percent. Multiple-authored articles in the last two decades (1946-1965) were 17 and 32 percent, while quantitative articles were 51 and 69 percent.

The rise in multiple-authored articles in the last two decades (1946-1965) was 26 percent, while quantitative articles increased 26 percent. In the last two decades, multiple-authored nonquantitative and multiple-authored quantitative articles each constituted 23 percent of all the articles. The rise in multiple-authored quantitative articles is sharper than the rise in single-authored quantitative or multiple-authored nonquantitative articles.

Summary

From a humble beginning, quantification has come to a predominant place in sociology journals—articles using quantitative analyses outnumbered articles without quantitative analyses by a margin of two to one in the last decade. In one out of three cases between 1955 and 1965, quantitative articles were products of collaborative effort. When authors collaborated the chances were four out of five that their article would be quantitative. This indicates that more and more scholars have started dealing with "concrete things" and teaming up with each other for the advancement of sociology.

Quantification has taken long strides in American sociological research. Our crude measure of quantification has indicated a growth from 14 to 69 percent over a seven-decade period. Though the measure was limited in scope, the trend it reveals is unmistakable. Sociologists and other social scientists confront numerous difficulties in quantification. Some are skeptical of the claims made regarding the desirability or success in quantifying qualitative variables. However, the quantitative trend found in the four sociology journals reflects a growing emphasis on empirical data in American sociology, although this by itself may not suffice as proof of the transformation of sociology from an antiquated naturalistic discipline.
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In the criticism of the scope of the various measures of productivity, doubt has been raised regarding the utility of the different weighting schemes. The Miers (1958) procedure of assigning 1 point for an article and 18 points for a book, because the average book has sixteen chapters, has been criticized by Struβ and Radcliff (1969:1) as giving disproportionate credit to book publications. The weighting system proposed by Kenudson and Vaugn (1965) has been criticized in several discussions. Keel and Hare (1969) argue that the chooses to the points value of an article in ASR is worth two articles in SF. Glenn and Vilemiz (1970:244) point out that the Knudsen-Vaugn index is the result of subjective judgments and does not represent a consensus of sociologists. The proponents of a third weighting scheme (Stu1dings and Snahal, 1976:421) readily admit to the arbitrary nature of their scale but justify it on the basis of the argument that even a subjective weighting system is better than using no weights at all since it is "obviously that different types of publication should receive differential credit.

The Measure
We believe an effort to attain consensus on an index of sociological productivity is overdue. One measure with potential as an index of publication quantity was developed by Glenn and Vilemiz (1970); see also Glenn, (1974) in research concerned with the productivity of American Graduates.

The respondents were told that a weight of 10 had been arbitrarily assigned to an article in the ASR and the latter to assign weights to other types of publications using the average "important to the discipline" of an ASR article as their standard.

Table 2 presents the categories of publications and the weights assigned by Glenn and Vilemiz. The GVC1 defines six distinct indexes of publications productivity: (1) number of articles; (2) number of books; (3) total publications (articles plus books); (4) article points; (5) book points; (6) total points (article points plus book points).

A number of arguments can be made for the use of the GVC1 as a measure of productivity. One is that it is composed of a broad range of journals and circulations mostly general sociological work as well as important specialty areas within the discipline. Another argument for its use is that it has a considerably wider scope than most previous indexes and yet is not eclectic. In an attempt to anticipate the criticism that the GVC1 discriminates against some specialties, we have drawn data from our ongoing study of the productivity of 2,203 members of the ASA (1970) who received a Ph.D. in sociology during the period 1950-66. The two-volume journals in the GVC1 were searched by the author for the years 1940-70. Over five thousand publications were counted. The breakdown for the 2,203 sample members by the thirty-three areas used by the ASA (1970: 81) to classify its members is presented in table 3.

Table 1. Measures of Productivity Applied to Bibliography of a Hypothetical Sociologist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Productivity Study</th>
<th>Operational Measure</th>
<th>Bibliographical Hypothesis</th>
<th>Publications Counted*</th>
<th>Credits Granted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miers (1958)</td>
<td>1 point for articles and edited books, 18 points for single-authored books, partial credit for coauthored books</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e, f, g</td>
<td>32 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarev and Tleitzen (1958)</td>
<td>1 point each for (a) dissertation, (b) publishing 1 or more articles, (c) publishing 1 or more books, (d) reading at least 3 papers at professional meetings</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e, f, g</td>
<td>2 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axelsson (1959)</td>
<td>Articles in ASR, AJ, SF; partial credit for co-authored books</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e, f, g</td>
<td>1.5 articles 3 books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axelsson (1960)</td>
<td>Articles in ASR, AJ, SF; partial credit for co-authored books</td>
<td>a, b</td>
<td>1.5 articles 3 books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baloun and Bures (1962)</td>
<td>Articles in 13 different journals</td>
<td>a, b, c, d</td>
<td>4 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struβ and Radcliff (1969)</td>
<td>1 point for articles in ASR, AJ; 4 points for books reviewed in ASR, 2 points if edited, 4 points if co-authored, 6 points if sole authored</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e, f, g</td>
<td>11 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knudsen and Vaugn (1965)</td>
<td>17 points for articles in ASR; 12 points for articles in AJ, 8 points each for articles in SF or research notes in ASR. For books reviewed in ASR 18 points if edited, 24 points if text, 40 points if monograph</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e, f, g</td>
<td>96 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stu1dings and Snahal (1970)</td>
<td>15 points for book; 12 points for coauthored book, 9 points for edited book, 7 points for coauthored article, 5 points for single-authored article</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e, f, g</td>
<td>47 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn and Vilemiz (1970)</td>
<td>Weighted scale of 22 journals (see Glenn and Vilemiz, 1970:256). For books reviewed in ASR 30 points if monograph, 15 points if text, 10 points if edited</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e, f</td>
<td>75 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lightfield (1971)</td>
<td>1 point for articles, 1 point for edited books, 1 point per 100 pages of original book</td>
<td>a, b, c, d, e, f, g</td>
<td>11 points</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See text for key to hypothetical publications.

As the data in table 3 indicate, no area of competence appears to be markedly overrepresented or underrepresented on the GVC1. The difference between publishers and nonpublishers is greater than 2 percentage points for only three areas and reaches 3 percent for only one specialty: applied sociology. Since applied sociology is the first choice of only 2.7 percent of the total sample we do not see this difference to be a major problem. Rather, we would argue that these data strongly support the position that the GVC1

Part of this research was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health. I am indebted to Richard B. Sturgis for comments and suggestions.
adequately represents most special areas within sociology. Though the fact that one-third of the sample did not have any publications on the GVCI implies that the measure misses a lot of publication activity we are not disturbed with this finding. Previous research in the area of scholarly productivity (Robinson and Rukey, 1962; Price, 1963; Stockley, 1957) has demonstrated that most members of most disciplines are low publishers or non-publishers. Thus, even if they were expanded, the distribution as general would likely remain the same.

A third argument for the use of the GVCI is made by Glenson and Vilenmez (1970-245). They point out that, unlike previous weighting systems, the GVCI represents a consensus among a group of professional sociologists rather than the arbitrary opinion of one or two researchers.

Finally, the GVCI is flexible. Both the book and journal aspect of the measure can be expanded. In fact, the book index should probably be expanded to include all books received for review by ASR as well as those actually reviewed. Olsen and Turk (1970) have pointed out that a number of important books were never reviewed in ASR and Fullam and Anderson (1970) found only a 24 percent overlap between books reviewed in ASR and books reviewed in JFS. Using books received would merely expand the measure, not change it, because books reviewed in ASR (or now in the new book review journal, Contemporaries in Sociology) are taken only from books reviewed (Olsen, 1970).

Just as the book dimension of the index is readily expandable, so the article dimension is flexible. In the recent paper, Glenson (1971) reported additional data and weights for sixty-three journals. For the research purposes the authors more than that allowed by the original list of twenty journals there is now a set of weights for almost three times the previous number.

One cautionary remark which must be made in regard to the GVCI is that it is a measure primarily of output rather than of quality. Although Glenson and Vilenmez (1970-245) told their respondents to use “importance to the discipline” as a guide in assigning weights, the measure is only a very gross indicator of quality. A far better index of quality would be the number of citations a sociologist’s work receives in the literature. Unfortunately, the implementation of citation counts has been inhibited by pragmatic considerations (Bayer and Folger, 1966). As the Coles (1967-378) point out, there seems to be no practicable way to employ citation counts for a large number of individuals.

<p>| Table 3. Distribution by Area of Competence for Sample, All Publishers and Non-Publishers (in percent) |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Competence</th>
<th>Sample*</th>
<th>All Publishers</th>
<th>Non-Publishers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sociological Services</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Sociology</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Psychology</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological Research</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological Theory</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Sociology</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From table 1 of Glenson and Vilenmez (1970-246).

The time and funds required to collect such data are beyond the scope of most projects. However, the concept of the Science Citation Index has been used in this major sociology journals (see Cole and Cole, 1971). This applies to only a few of the most prestigious journals; however, and reliance upon this limited range may generate the spurious relations between eminence and productivity discussed earlier (see Strauss and Rudolph, 1969). The conclusion: The use of disparate measures has operated to inflate (or) generalization of the productivity of sociologists. We have demonstrated that diverse and inconsistent conclu-

cence is generated by the use of disparate measures. An attempt has been made to provide some empirical justification for the GVCI as a measure of the quantity of sociological output. Hopefully, future research in the area will incorporate the GVCI or a similar measure, and then progress toward the real goal of the study of productivity—social-scientific productivity—will begin.

ADDENDA TO LIST OF PH.D.s

Alberta, University of

(1919-70)

(Grant file of E. Laron who was correctly listed under the University of Oregon in the August listing.)

California, University of; Berkeley

(1967-70)


Michigan, University of

(1970-71)

Discernment in Quality of Metropolitan Housing. G. S. Benham. (B. Arch., Univ. of New Mexico; M.A., Univ. of Michigan).


(1970-71)

A Typology of Socioeconomic Status. H. N. Moskher-je. (B.Sc. and M.Sc., Univ. of Calcutta)

Editor

November 1972
In studies dealing with the productivity of sociologists and the evaluation of academic departments of sociology, the relative values of sole and joint authorship of scholarly publications have varied, but jointly authored publications invariably appear to yield more credit for authors and departments than would be the case were publications assigned a fixed calorie to be divided among the authors and departments. Stallings and Singhal (1970) for example, gave sole and joint authors, respectively, 15 and 12 points for books and 3 and 2 points for articles; coauthorship credit did not vary with the number of coauthors. Using a more common method of handling coauthored publications, Glenn and Villeneuve (1970:245) gave full credit to an institution if an article or book was authored or coauthored by one of the institution’s sociologists because “a department probably derives almost as much prestige from a publication one of its members has coauthored as from a publication one of its members has authored alone.” Lichtblau (1971) also gave each coauthor full credit for joint publications.

In light of the quantification of evaluation in the above-mentioned studies, coauthored publications appear to gain as brightly, or nearly as brightly, on a scholar’s vita as do solo publications. It is the purpose of this paper to provide data on the coldness of this assumption by presenting the reactions of professional sociologists to a mail questionnaire.

Sample and Method

A random sample of members of the American Sociological Association was drawn from the ASA Directory of Members, 1972. Excluded from the sample were student members, emeritus members, members residing outside the United States and Canada, and persons unaffiliated with a department of sociology. Of 225 questionnaires sent in January 1972 to members of the sample (with stamped, self-addressed return envelopes) 148 were returned in time for processing. Of these 148 returned questionnaires, 4 had not been delivered to the addressee, 36 were returned as a result of a leasing a working sample of 126, or 56 percent of the target sample.

Data on publishing background, age, possession of degree, and rank of respondent were requested in the questionnaire. Similar data were compiled from the ASA Directory of Members, 1970 (for nonmembers).

Members of the sample had a median of 6.5 publications. Sixty-nine percent of the respondents were associate or full professors compared to 55 percent of nonrespondents. The median age of respondents was 43, for nonrespondents it was 41. Seventy-eight percent of the respondents and 71 percent of the nonrespondents had earned doctorates. Seventy-three percent of respondents were teaching in departments with tenured tracks compared to 69 percent of nonrespondents. Of those respondents and nonrespondents, only 59 percent of nonrespondents were affiliated with such departments (as listed in the ASA Guide to Graduate Departments of Sociology, 1977-78). Nonrespondents’ institutional affiliations, of course, were obtained from the 1970 directory, while data on respondents were obtained from the questionnaire, which in a number of cases had been forwarded to respondents new locations. Some respondents (and nonrespondents) can be assumed to have moved to graduate departments after receiving their doctorates, which would account for much of the discrepancy between figures for respondents and nonrespondents.

In all cases, differences between respondents and nonrespondents (as measured by the percentage points) and these differences may be at least partially artifactual. We believe that the sample of respondents was representative of both the target sample and the ASA population in which we are interested.

Respondents to the questionnaire were asked to indicate the number of articles each of a number of authors had coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa). The respondents were asked to indicate the number of authors coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa). The respondents were asked to indicate the number of authors coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa). The respondents were asked to indicate the number of authors coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa). The respondents were asked to indicate the number of authors coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa). The respondents were asked to indicate the number of authors coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa). The respondents were asked to indicate the number of authors coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa). The respondents were asked to indicate the number of authors coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa). The respondents were asked to indicate the number of authors coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa). The respondents were asked to indicate the number of authors coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa). The respondents were asked to indicate the number of authors coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa). The respondents were asked to indicate the number of authors coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa). The respondents were asked to indicate the number of authors coauthored, and the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa).

Hypotheses and Tests

Hypotheses were tested by means of one-tailed t-tests, with statistical significance defined in terms of the .05 level of probability.

The first hypothesis—that coauthored publications would yield a total of more than 100 points for the teams of authors—was not supported. The total number for two-author and three-author articles were, respectively, 151.04 (w = 39.25) and 195.88 (w = 77.97), both of which differ significantly from 100. Only one respondent awarded less than 100 points for coauthored publications, while 79 percent gave a total of more than 100 points for two-author and 83 percent gave a total of more than 100 points for three-author articles. A modal 29 percent gave the maximum of 200 points for two-author and 300 points for three-author articles.

The second hypothesis—that senior and junior authors of two-author publications would receive more than 50 points apiece—was also supported. They received mean sums of 81.67 (w = 19.58) and 68.40 (w = 23.03) respectively, both of which differ significantly from 50 points. The third hypothesis—that senior authors of two-author publications would receive more credit than junior authors—was supported, for 81.67 is significantly higher than 68.40.

The fourth hypothesis—that senior, second, and junior authors of three-author publications would receive more than 33.33 points apiece—was supported. They received mean sums of 74.38 (w = 23.63), 61.41 (w = 28.54), and 58.17 (w = 30.23) respectively, all of which are significantly higher than 33.33 points.

The fifth hypothesis—that senior authors of three-author publications would receive more credit than second authors, who in turn would receive more credit than junior authors—received partial support. Significantly more credit was awarded to the senior author than to either of the other authors, but the junior author was awarded virtually the same credit the second author was awarded.

The sixth hypothesis—that evaluation of the worth of a publication to colleagues would vary positively with the proportion of coauthors’ publications that were coauthored—received minimum support. Restricting the analysis to the eighty-seven individuals with four or more publications, the proportion of coauthored publications (X = Xn) and the proportion of coauthored articles (X = Xa) correlates .18 and .08 with credit to senior and junior authors of two-author articles and .13, .07, and .09 with credit to senior, second, and junior authors of three-author articles. All correlations were positive, as predicted, but most were trivial and only one (the highest) was statistically significant.

Conclusion

Whether one considers the modal response of 29 percent of the sample giving a full 100 points to coauthors of an article or the mean sums of 151 and 195 points given to coauthors of two-author and three-author articles, the conclusion is clear: coauthorship is an efficient form of academic gatekeeping. As long as publication credit is reasonably attributable (w = 39.25), the institution must conclude that it is expeditious to collaborate with colleagues, in form if not in fact, in an article the work of only one author, sharing authorship with colleagues in a useful strategy, resulting in a mean credit gain of 56 percent for every three publications “coauthored.”
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Academicists in various disciplines are perennially interested in the nature and distribution of the publication patterns of persons in their own field. For sociologists, such assessments are not only intrinsically interesting, but they contribute to the literature concerning the sociology of occupations and the sociology of complex organizations. Research by the authors explores sociological productivity as measured by the publication of journal articles by Ph.D. sociologists.

Review

Weissler (1966) found that in an eleven-year period almost 40 percent of all articles in the American Sociological Review were the work of graduates of four major graduate departments. Between 1956 and 1969, 26 percent of all Ph.D. graduates during that period, twenty-one departments had published at least once, among the top ten departments that contributed articles and research notes to the American Sociological Review. Lewis (1968) studied the top seventeen departments as ranked by Weissler. He collaborated in 1968 to determine the productivity of sociologists at forty-five American universities in the four-year period 1965 through 1968. Glenn and Villeneuve (1970) evaluated the productivity of sociologists at forty-five American universities in the four-year period 1965 through 1968. Glenn and Villeneuve (1970) used their method and slightly modified the Kneser-Vaughan index, and they developed a comprehensive index of their productivity, but for a shorter span of time, 1960-64. Their measure of productivity included articles not only in the American Sociological Review but in the American Journal of Sociology and Social Forces; it also included books reviewed in ASA and reports to employers and other publications. The measures are not used. The authors modified the Kneser-Vaughan index, and they developed a comprehensive index of their productivity.
own based on authors' publications in books and in twenty-two journals. There were separate indexes for journals and books based on responses to a questionnaire they sent to professors and associate professors of sociology. Many changes were observed in the standings of departments when Cibulka and Villeneuve compared their index with the Krueger-Vaughan index. The sociologist's level of productivity showed them as being more productive.

In a different vein, Ostrom (1970) divided sociology departments into prestige categories in order to determine "anachronistic indices" of varying prestige levels. He found that staff recruitment was much more influenced by the prestige of the department where doctoral training was acquired; almost three-quarters of the faculty in "disqualified" departments, for example, received their degrees from "distin-guished" departments.

Published too late to influence our research was a contribution by Lightfield (1971). Lightfield's focus was on the relations between productivity and the career of individual scholars. From a sample of two hundred sociologists who earned their Ph.D.s between 1934 and 1963, Lightfield collected complete publication records; he then assigned equal weight to various journals and variables weights for different types of books. In addition, he obtained qualitative ratings for each sociologist through the technique of counting citations of published works. He concluded that the sociological recognition system operates less clearly than has been presumed: peer recognition, for instance, was influenced more by quantity of output than by quality of output; the prestige of a person's academic appointment was influenced by the prestige of the department of graduate training and by the quality, rather than the quantity, of research output. In both quantitative and qualitative terms, sociologists in the more prestigious departments were more likely than others to be productive.

Sociologists unproductive during their first five years, when they were seeking a junior post, also became productive in the next five years.

**Method**

First, we make no assumption that "productivity" is synonymous with "meritocracy." We acknowledge important roles for academic reputation: no one can complain that the system is not elitist. We assume, however, that publicism, as the most visible professional activity, tends to infer peer recognition and is important in prestige perceptions of individuals and departments.

Questionnaires for our study were sent to the chairmen of the twenty top graduate departments of sociology as rated by Carter (1966). Each chairman was asked to list the five journals as peer outlets in which he would like to see his staff members publish; he was then asked to designate the next five outlets in which he would like to see articles by members of his department. Responses were received from all but three departments.

In the questionnaires returned, twenty-nine journals were mentioned. When a journal was listed at least twice, we did not consider it; journals not in continuous publication during the 1959-68 period also were not considered. Major journals (as detected by our searches) were included by the list of editors of each of the remaining twelve journals was allocated two points each time it was listed among the five most preferred journals and our point count for each journal was tabulated on the basis of three criteria: order of preference, order of choice, and order of frequency. The points were totaled and used as weights in determining productivity scores. The resultant weights were:

- American Sociological Review: 20
- American Journal of Sociology: 17
- Social Forces: 13
- Sociometry: 8
- Social Problems: 5
- Public Opinion Quarterly: 2
- Sociology and Social Research: 3
- Sociological Quarterly: 3
- Social Science Quarterly: 2
- Pacific Sociological Review: 2

In a study made by Balchuck and Kates (1962), eight of our twelve journals accounted for about 35 percent of all the journal articles produced by 326 sociologists. If our results still hold, our twelve journals publish more than three-fifths of the sociology articles written by American-trained sociologists currently affiliated with Ph.D.-granting departments in the United States and Canada.

Each issue of the twelve journals was examined, and all articles, whether singly or jointly authored, were recorded on a card entitled for each author. Two productivity scores were tabulated for each individual and for each department. The first, referred to as the "standard productivity," allocated the full weights each time the name of the individual was listed as author or coauthor. The second, the "modified productivity," was calculated for each entry by the number of authors of the article, using the number whole names in case of fractionation.

---

**Table 1. Measures of Sociologists' Productivity, 1959-1968**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Where Sociology Graduates Were Produced</th>
<th>Number of Ph.D.s</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
<th>Mean Modified Score</th>
<th>(\delta)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3,868</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2,199</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1,933</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California at Berkeley</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington (Seattle)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa (Iowa City)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern California</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State College of Washington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New School for Social Research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New School for Social Research</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY, Buffalo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic University of America</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California atSanta Barbara</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulsa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi State</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Louis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Illinois</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\delta\) Total score divided by the number of productive Ph.D.s.

\(\delta\) Adjusted for joint authorship.

---

**Table 2. Intraj and Interj Correlations of Variables Relating to Sociologists' Journal Productivity (Spearmans' Rho) from Intensive Perspective (X=853)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Journal Articles</th>
<th>Total Articles Authors</th>
<th>Total Journal Points</th>
<th>Number of Articles Points</th>
<th>Chronological Age</th>
<th>Professional Age</th>
<th>Prestige of Degree-Granting Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\delta\) Based on Roe and Andersen (1970).

\(p<.001\)  \(p<.05\)
One of the continuing debates in higher education concerns the validity of the publish-or-perish doctrine. Despite the fact that the sociology of education has been more concerned with research in higher education than with research in other subfields of sociology (Fried, 1968:248), while it is more or less agreement that for the sake of scholarship, work and that for the sake of the future, and that for the sake of the field, our work should be published and not published in academic journals. The purpose of the present study is to suggest methods of obtaining the evidence necessary to bring the argument toward empirical closure.

Key questions about the publish or perish doctrine are:
1. What is academic evaluation, in what academic ranks, and to which academic disciplines is the academic, not crucial?
2. What is the motivation for the publish or perish doctrine (Levin, 1967)?

While some observers argue that publish an academic advancement depends heavily on the academic discipline, others argue that scholarship should be scrutinized, but not to the point of being an influence that the academic discipline. The main point on which both sides agree is the need for convincing evidence of the correlation, or lack of correlation, between academic publications and empirical academic mobility. The purpose of the present study is to suggest methods of obtaining the evidence necessary to bring the argument toward empirical closure.

The 1964 study of graduate students by Genrich (1966) supports the belief that the departments that publish the most prestigious journals are the departments whose members publish most widely and most frequently. In political science, for example, Carpenter (1965:144) found that the departments with high scores on這些 indexes are the ones that publish frequently and frequent publishers do not.

**Background**

The 1964 study of graduate students by Genrich (1966) supports the belief that the departments that publish the most prestigious journals are the departments whose members publish most widely and most frequently. In political science, for example, Carpenter (1965:144) found that the departments with high scores on these indexes are the ones that publish frequently and frequent publishers do not.

**Conclusion**

The present paper suggests a method of relating productivity to changes in academic rank, a dimension overlooked by previous studies.

Paul Woodring (1964) summarizes well the argument that publication is essential to academic mobility. He cites the celebrated case of Assistant Professor Woodrow Wilson, who was dismissed from the faculty of Tulane University in 1964 for failing to fulfill "the promise of publication." Woodring (1964:14) claims that "the faculty members on hundreds of campuses must be informed of the pattern of research for the sake of the present and no one ever heard about it." He finds that most institutions of higher education "must promise to retain faculty members largely on the basis of publications," and that even a "top-flight teacher is held back if he does not publish."

Caplow and McGuire (1965:69-70) have written along similar lines:

"In neither an overgeneralization nor an oversimplification to state that in the 1960s and 1970s, the evaluation of productivity is based almost exclusively on publication of scholarly books or articles in professional journals as evidence of research activity. Throughout the interviews for their study Caplow and McGuire found productivity explicitly defined in terms of publication. Respondents were specifically evaluated from productivity such that the faculty members on hundreds of campuses must be informed of the pattern of research for the sake of the present and no one ever heard about it."

In a study of 802 faculty members at Indiana University between 1858 and 1937 A. B. Hollingdale (1940:385)
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found the chances approximately "fewer to one that a person appointed to the faculty below the full professorial rank will not become the university's professor, that is, become a professor or from an assistant to associate professor. The higher the rank, the more likely a person was to have published.

Meade (1967) mentioned that "it is little doubt that writing and academic rank are positively correlated to a high degree (far below the .001 level of significance), thus supporting hypothesis 1."

In table 1 of column 1, the number ranking Glenn and Vivenez (1970) for book productivity during the period 1965-1968. The Glenn and Vivenez rankings that appear in column 1 have been converted from the authors' original 41-point scale to a 20-point scale because 1 studied only the top 26 of the 45 professors whose names appeared at the 26th and 27th positions on the rankings that were obtained by Glenn and Vivenez. The correlations between the rankings obtained by Glenn and Vivenez (column 1) correlated .60 with the rankings that were obtained in the present study (column 2). A Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient of .60 is surprisingly high when one considers that the sample and methods were quite different in the two investigations. Had the number of professors that were ranked by me been increased, my rankings would have correlated .77 with the rankings of Glenn and Vivenez.

Column 2 of table 2 shows the person-productivity rankings Glenn and Vivenez gave the departments in their study (1970:25), table 4. Again, the rankings in column 2 were used to construct the rankings in a 20-point scale. There is a Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient of .11 between the rankings obtained by Glenn and Vivenez and those that were obtained in the present study. The difference between the rankings obtained in the two investigations is certainly not as large as the difference between the rankings obtained in the present study and the rankings obtained by Weid and the 530 social scientists.

TABLE 1. VARIABLES CONCERNING BOOK PRODUCTIVITY OF 95 FULL PROFESSORS OF SOCIOLOGY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Year Ph.D. Acquired</th>
<th>Year Prof. Status Attained</th>
<th>Age When Ph.D. Acquired</th>
<th>Number of Books in Print</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>When Ph.D. Acquired</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Computed by subtracting year of birth from year of Ph.D. acquired.

*Computed by subtracting year Ph.D. acquired from year full professorship attained.

*Names of the 530 persons from the 95 full departments in the sample were loaded into the 1970 author index of the Social Science Citation Index and by adding all of the published books and book chapters of each person. Each faculty member was assigned one point for each book single authored or edited. One-half point was assigned for each book coauthored or coedited. No faculty member was allowed to earn more than six points, even if he had written more than six books. Without this upper limit the mean productivity of the 530 social scientists in our sample of departments would have been inflated excessively by one or two "stars" who had edited a large number of series. Only 7 out of 530 were allotted by the maximum score criteria.

*It is important to note that this study defines productivity solely in terms of book publication. Equally legitimate measures of productivity were not studied. My basic purpose was to compare productivity across academic ranks, not to question the legitimacy or importance upon the progress of social science departments.

*It is also important to note that the publication score does not indicate the extent to which individually has written—only books written and in print according to the publishers' 1970 trade list. Limiting the selection to books printed in the United States allows comparisons of productivity between young sociologists and older sociologists.

*The findings are noted by hypotheses in this study are supported with data, while the existing literature is not the same true of mine.

Column 4 of table 2 presents the sum of the books produced in the 30 departments that have 9 or more full professors of sociology, other full-time departmental faculty members (instructors, lecturers, etc.) lived in the 1971-72 ASA year.

In figure 6 of column 4 divided by the number of full-time faculty members in each department. Each figure is in an arithmetic mean, it is subject to different criteria in the number of full-time faculty members in each department. Columns 6 and 7 must therefore be interpreted with caution.

Column 3 of table 2 is intended to be divided by the square of the department: one can expect high total productivity from a large department like Wisconsin, with forty-nine members. Moreover, the indexes tend to be higher for departments with high proportions of full professors who are more productive than faculty in lower ranks.

The correlation between year of birth and number of books in print (table 2) is .14 for the sample of 95 full professors. Those born before 1940 (X = .49) had a mean of 1.95 books in print; those born after 1929 (X = .38) had a mean of 1.44 books in print, a difference significant at the .14 level. Hypothesis 2 is thus supported.

For example, as shown on table 1, the correlation between age when Ph.D. was acquired and number of books in print is .03. Full professors who received their Ph.D.s before 1970 (X = .49) had a mean of 1.87 books in print; those who received Ph.D.s after 1970 (X = .44) had a mean of 1.38 books in print. Differences between the two groups are significant only at the .38 level. Hypothesis 3 supports hypothesis 2 but not at a statistically significant level.

Hypothesis 4. The mean age of full professors in the four most productive departments—Chicago, Ohio State, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania—is 63.2 years; in the four least productive departments—Washington, Pennsylvania, and California—is 51.5 years. Washington is then less productive than Pennsylvania and California—53.2 years old; full professors in the least productive departments of California (1971:37), Washington (1970:32), and Pennsylvania are 52.5 years old. The difference in age between professors at the most productive departments and professors at the least productive departments is too small to be significant. There is no support for hypothesis 4 in these figures.
Hypothetical. The average sociologist at an elite institution achieves the rank of full professor within ten years after acquiring a Ph.D. degree (table 1). Previous studies of less prestigious departments have reported higher figures. Hollingshead (1949, p. 387) found the mean years in his sample to be fifteen. (1937-24:242), who studied 588 sociologists in forty-nine departments with diverse prestige ratings, found that this level of professor had achieved the rank of full professor within ten years of the Ph.D. degree. Today nearly 50 per cent of the full professors in the sociology departments can lay claim to this achievement. Hypothetical is thus attributed to five years.

One unexpected discovery was the tempo of 36.5 between years Ph.D. was acquired and number of years before attainment of full professorship. Further analysis disclosed a trend toward more rapid acquisition of the academic ladder than was possible in the past. Sociologists who earned their Ph.D.s before 1945 (N=38) became full professors at a faster rate than those who earned their Ph.D.s after 1945. (N=32) and only 3.5 books in print. The difference is significant at the .05 level. One of the more difficult questions for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years. The mean number of books in print (2.4 books) tends to fall into two groups (mutually exclusive) (1) fast academic climbers—persons who achieve full professorship within seven years after acquiring a Ph.D. and (2) slow-time full professors—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years. The most difficult question for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years.

One of the more difficult questions for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years. The most difficult question for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years.

Table 1 was constructed in an effort to minimize the variable of age without reducing the sample size of any academically

ic rank to an unacceptable level. (Matched sampling was not feasible because of the close relation between rank and age.) Exemplifying data from tables 2 and 3, we find that the rank of mean productivity among full professors and assistant professors is greater for the 218 sociologists who received the Ph.D. after 1939 (table 3) than for the entire population of 330 sociologists (table 2). The data for mean number of books in print between full professors and assistant professors lists in table 3 is 1.44 to 0.9, or 1.61. The ratio between full professors and assistant professors lists in table 1 is 1.66 to 12, or 1.41.

My research shows that even in a sample of recent Ph.D.s it is difficult to separate the effects of age on academic rank from the effects of productivity on academic rank. The question still unanswered is what extent academic attainment and promotion are a function of productivity and to what extent they are a function of seniority or a reward for teaching or other dedicated service to the department or to the discipline.

Professors with the greatest mean number of books in print (2.4 books) tend to fall into two groups (mutually exclusive) (1) fast academic climbers—persons who achieve full professorship within seven years after acquiring a Ph.D. and (2) slow-time full professors—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years. One of the more difficult questions for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years.

One of the more difficult questions for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years. One of the more difficult questions for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years. One of the more difficult questions for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years. One of the more difficult questions for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years. One of the more difficult questions for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years. One of the more difficult questions for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years. One of the more difficult questions for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years. One of the more difficult questions for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years. One of the more difficult questions for department chairmen to answer involves the problem of institutional norms for instructional positions in sociological pedagogy. The data from this study suggest that a sociologist’s publication record is established in the first six to eight years after acquiring a Ph.D. and that it is a long-time full professor—persons who have been full professors more than fifteen years.

Table 3: Productivity of Elite Sociologists Who Received a Ph.D. After 1959

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Year</th>
<th>Mean Number of Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Rank</td>
<td>Achieved Mean Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor (N=41)</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor (N=67)</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor (N=108)</td>
<td>1968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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One topic of professional interest to sociologists that has been studied extensively is the ranking of departments of sociology in the United States. Hughes (1925), Kenton (1939), Carter (1946), Goughan (1947), Wenderer (1948), Lewis (1956), Knausen and Vaughan (1969), Glenn and Villemce (1970), and others have published studies of sociology departments in terms of quality. Overman (1970) has extended the analyses by attempting to explain subjective ratings of departments in terms of objective characteristics. Indicators or explanations that have been used to determine departmental quality are subjective quality ratings by research productivity, Ph.D. output, publications of graduate students, faculty members, faculty size, average age of faculty, and academic origins of faculty. The first goal of this paper is to attempt to ascertain the effects of departmental research productivity, doctoral output, and size of faculty on the quality ratings of sociology departments in the United States. However, in sociological inquiry particular events are better interpreted when considered as parts of a more encompassing whole. The use of only departmental characteristics to account for quality ratings treats departments in a contextual vacuum. The past-mentioned objective characteristics of sociology departments do not include contextual characteristics, which might be the dimension of the university, community, region, or society in which a department is located that has a bearing on a departmental rating. This paper will therefore also consider the effects of university characteristics on the quality ratings of sociology departments.

Departmental Characteristics and Prestige

Objective characteristics and reputational characteristics are usually stratification research. Research based on objective characteristics—such as studies utilizing data on education and income as dimensions of socioeconomic status—tends to employ performance data, either separately or combined into an index, as the measures of stratification. Most of the conceptions of prestige that are valid is that a socially meaningful object has for an actor (Davis, 1949-53) prestige is thus reputational or subjective in definition. Using this conception, objective data are significant primarily in accounting for subjective ratings, a source of explanation that is lost when objective characteristics are defined as prestige.

The Glenn and Villemce (1970) ratings of sociology departments constitute the measure of departmental prestige used in this analysis for using the Glenn and Villemce ratings are that they are reputational and the data on which they are based were systematically collected under the auspices of a widely respected educational research foundation. Glenn and Villemce used a research design that essentially replicated the Carter (1946) design. For both the Glenn and Villemce, the cross-section of universities and departments in the United States was assessed by judges from each discipline. The Carter and Glenn and Villemce raters report, respectively, thirty-six and thirty-one.

The graduate faculty of a department in a university was rated by Carter as distinguished, strong, good, satisfactory, or unranked. Glenn and Villemce (1970) collapsed the first two categories distinguished and strong and kept the remaining categories essentially the same. The collapsing of the distinguished and strong categories meant less precision in differentiating departments, but there was sufficient information in the Glenn and Villemce report to maintain Carter's original distinction between distinguished and strong departments. Both Carter and Glenn and Villemce ranked the departments. Carter designated five departments of sociology as distinguished. I have consequently considered the top five departments in the Glenn and Villemce study as also distinguished. Although the membership could vary, the distinguished and strong categories were maintained. The ratings were weighted from five to one—distinguished departments being rated five—for purposes of statistical analysis.

The most complete and published study of the research productivity of sociology departments in the United States is that of Glenn and Villemce (1970). Glenn and Villemce rated faculty members in departments which they judged thirty-six for my study. For my purposes these thirty-six also had to be in the Glenn and Villemce survey. Because one of the indices to be considered was departmental teaching productivity as represented by output of Ph.D.s, I excluded four departments listed by Glenn and Villemce because they had no doctoral programs or the programs had just been established. Another department was excluded because it had not been included in the Glenn and Villemce survey. A department in a religious university was excluded because my study was restricted to secular institutions. The three departments were excluded because of other data limitations. No claim is made that this is a probability sample. The Glenn and Villemce (1970) has also been treated as a general class; they are the leading sociology departments that have established Ph.D. programs in secular universities in the United States. Some question pertains to the rating of a department is whether it is the faculty that is evaluated or the effect of the research program, reporting publications for 1955-68, is the research productivity index. Data on doctorates conferred and full-time faculty members are based on information in the Guide to Graduate Departments of Sociology, 1959 (American Sociological Association). The Glenn and Villemce quality ratings of graduate faculty in sociology departments are the measure of departmental quality.

The most fundamental issue in the development of departmental ratings is whether or not subjective ratings of quality are equivalent to ratings based on objective measures of research productivity and other types of performance. The results shown above indicate that they are not equivalent. Departmental research accounts for less than 50 percent of the explained variance in the Glenn and Villemce ratings. Factors in addition to research productivity are needed to account for differences in departmental quality. The number of doctors conferred is only slightly less effective than research productivity in accounting for departmental quality ratings: the number of doctorates conferred from 1964 to 1968 correlates .64 with the Glenn and Villemce ratings. Faculty size is weakly associated with the quality ratings, correlating .24 with the quality ratings. It is not the size of a department that contributes to ratings, it is what the members do that counts. The departmental characteristics considered above account for 57 percent of the explained variation in departmental ratings. A more complete departmental analysis might include such characteristics as age of the department, number of sociology graduate students, number of faculty, "stars," activities of the faculty in professional associations and in journalistic capacities, and academic origins and other personal characteristics of faculty members.

Departmental and University Factors

When asked to assess the standing of an academic department in a particular university, what is the referents that serves as the means to make a judgment? Does the referent of the university in which the department is a part? The correlation coefficients shown in Table 3 indicate for the thirty-six departments in the study the effects of research productivity, doctorates conferred, full-time faculty, and overall prestige of the university as a whole on the sociology department ratings. The first three variables are conceptually equivalent to
the departmental characteristics shown previously, but now the referent is the university rather than the department. Because these variables pertain to the university as a whole, they constitute the departmental characteristics. During this period, the number of doctoral degrees conferred in June 1967 and on the number of full-time faculty for the academic year 1966-67 were obtained from Seldinger (1968).

The index of university research productivity was based on three of the discipline included in the Carnegie classification. The number of twenty-nine disciplines were aggregated into five areas: humanities, social sciences, biological sciences, physical sciences, and others. The results from these five areas vary, a weighting procedure was applied to give each area equal weight. An aggregate index was obtained by summing the weighted output for the five areas for each university. This resulting index is incomplete for at least two reasons. First, there is the fact that it did not include all the departments of most universities. Its usefulness must rest on the assumption that the representation of the twenty-nine disciplines is representative of the performance of universities as a whole. One test of the representativeness of the twenty-nine disciplines is to ascertain the share of doctorates they conferred. For the years 1963-66, Seldinger (1968) reported that 60,860 doctorates were conferred by American universities. Of this total, 37,878 doctorates were conferred by the twenty-nine disciplines included in the Carnegie classification. If these disciplines such as law, education, business, and medicine would be difficult to ascertain not only because of the "knowledge explosion" but because such disciplines are considered to be outside of the academic faculty. The second reason is the research productivity is incomplete is that there did not include all forms of publications. This omission included only research reported in elite journals and excluded research reported in monographs and less prestigious journals.

To construct indices of a university's prestige, either of two methods may be used. In one, judges are asked to rate only the universities; in the other, they are asked to rate the particular department or departments about which they have special competence. Because few persons are competent judges of fields other than their own, the latter method was selected for my study. The index of university prestige was based also on data collected by Rose and Anderson (1970) on the prestige of departments (excluding sociology) that comprised the lists of disciplines studied by Carver (1966). Because the university prestige index will be used to account for sociology ratings, ratings of sociology departments are excluded in order to prevent contaminating effects. The ratings are weighted from five to one (distinction, strong, good, fair, and poor) at the 1966-67 academic year, for the thirty-eight disciplines is designated as the prestige score of a university; the scores range from 28 to 140.

A comparison of the correlations between departmental and university characteristics and departmental ratings indicates that faculty size does not account for substantial variation in departmental ratings. The r's between full-time and part-time faculty and departmental ratings is .24, while it is .31 for part-time university faculty—not a substantial difference. Dummies conferred on the department and university level are also of essentially equal importance in accounting for departmental ratings (the Pearson correlation coefficients are .64 and .38 respectively). Departmental research productivity more adequately accounts for departmental ratings than the university-level equivalent—not a surprising finding. However, all of the university and departmental correlations of departmental ratings university prestige is the highest with an r of .86. Seventy-four percent of the unexplained variance in departmental ratings may be accounted for on the basis of these two variables. University prestige thus accounts for departmental ratings more effectively for departmental research, doctorates, and faculty size combined.

At the university level, ratings of departments based on departmental performance (which is a valid basis for assessment) are ratings of departments based on the prestige of the university is which the department is located which is a non-professional basis for departmental assessment. The multiple-partial coefficients of determination shown below make possible a comparison of the effects university and departmental characteristics have on departmental ratings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient of Determination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental characteristics</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University characteristics</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental characteristics, adjusting for university characteristics</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University characteristics, adjusting for departmental characteristics</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The multiple-partial coefficient is analogous to the partial correlation coefficient and indicates the net effectiveness of a given variable in measuring variation in a dependent variable in relation to variation unexplained by the set of "control" variables. The higher the value of the multiple partial coefficient, the more important the variable is in comparison with another set. (See Blacklock [1969-70] for calculating procedures.) Taking departmental and university characteristics as the explanatory and control variables respectively, the multiple partial coefficients of determination are .33 and .67, indicating that departmental ratings are more effectively accounted for by university variables than by departmental variables. The rating of a sociology department is thus not a function of university size, but it is determined largely by the extent of professional affiliation and the larger university context. Whether this holds true for other departments might be learned from comparative research. For the ratings of sociology departments based on reputational data-collecting procedures should include the criteria used by respondents in making judgments about departmental standings.
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SOCIOLoGISTS ON THE MOVE
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It is often asserted that professionals are among the most mobile persons in a society.1 Their mobility is explained by the intrinsic characteristics of their occupations and by extrinsic characteristics of a society that needs a large professional class. The processes of socialization into the status of professionals do not differentiate in the society, but rather it provides a loyalty to his or her profession rather than to an institution or organization. Consequently, if an opportunity for advancement arises it is generally for professionals in a sociologically prepared to move. In a society with insufficient numbers of professionals to fill the demand, there are frequently incentives for those professions to move.

Mobility among sociologists, however, may not indicate advancement. Because most sociologists are in academia, a change in location sometimes reflects that a person has published too little or has given unsatisfactory performance in such duties as teaching, serving on committees, or serving the community. Mobility of sociologists than may have negative as well as positive implications.

This paper examines the mobility of sociologists just when they were in the process of moving from one place to another. It is a study of mobility may have their peers trusted. Specifically, it asks: (1) Whom are some of the factors causing horizontal mobility? (2) How many of these moves are independent? (3) What are the implications for mobility for sociologists?

Method

The sample was drawn randomly from the names of fellows and active members of the American Sociological Association listed in the ASA's 1967 directory. The number of fellows and active members listed in the directory was 4,423. From this, a sample of 500 (14.6 percent) was obtained. Persons who became active ASA members after 1967 were not included because of their likely absence of experienced sociologists. A total of 237 moves were indicated. A comparison between respondents and nonrespondents as to age, academic rank, and institutional affiliation showed no significant differences.

For vertical mobility, we noted the institutional affiliation of persons in 1967 and the institutions with which they were affiliated in 1970. These institutions were given one of three rankings: the highest (rank 1) was given to institutions with graduate departments rated "acceptable plus" or higher in the report by Carter (1966); the next lower (rank 2) was given to institutions with graduate departments not rated by Carter; the lowest (rank 3) was given to institutions without graduate programs in sociology. To determine the extent of overall vertical mobility among movers for a particular institutional level, differences were obtained between the number of within-level movers and without movers for the institutional level. These differences were then divided by the total number of movers from that level.

1Some authors have suggested that professionals have few mobility characteristics. It seems that sociologists see that profession is the career of a lifetime and they do not see that mobility may have their peers trusted. Specifically, it asks: (1) Whom are some of the factors causing horizontal mobility? (2) How many of these moves are independent? (3) What are the implications for mobility for sociologists?

2Chi-square was the statistical test used to assess significant at the .05 level.
Findings

A verified hypothesis in mobility studies is that people move in search of better opportunities. Movers tend to be persons whose opportunities are exhausted at the place they have been employed and who seek greater opportunities at a new place. However, an individual's propensity to move is not determined solely by pull or push forces. Individual characteristics, needs, or desires must also be taken into account. The well-documented consensus is that mobility is influenced by the stage an individual has reached in his life (Thomas, 1938:11; see also Goldscheider, 1971: 320). Another explanation of mobility is a person's seeking higher ranking. Though it is difficult to determine the effect these factors have on mobility, our findings nevertheless have implications for the isolated effects these two variables have on horizontal mobility.

Table 1 shows that 363 sociologists in our sample for whom mobility could be determined, 128 were movers and 255 were nonmovers. Thus, one out of three sociologists experienced horizontal mobility in a three-year period. However, horizontal mobility varied from one age cohort to another. The younger the sociologist, the greater his mobility—41 percent of the sociologists born between 1933 and 1942 were movers. Thus, mobility appears to be a monotonic function of age, a fact found also in studies of other professional groups.

Why are younger sociologists more horizontally mobile? Are they less attached to the institution? Are they aiming for higher ranking? Or are they released by their departments for lack of productivity? The answer may lie in any or all of these factors. We did not examine the "attached" or "productivity" variables for this report, but we did examine the influence of academic rank on mobility.

Ordinarily, associate and full professors are protected by a tenure system and their rank is relatively secure. For assistant professors, instructors, or persons in government or research institutions, a struggle for higher rank seems to be an inevitable process and results in considerable movement of persons. The proportions shown in Table 1 support this generalization.

Table 2 focuses on the relative importance of age and academic rank on horizontal mobility. When the variable of rank is controlled, we observe less of a tie between age and horizontal mobility than was observed in Table 1. Among full professors, horizontal mobility increases from the 1910 or earlier age cohort to the 1910-19age cohort but decreases thereafter. For associate professors, the younger they are, the more they move, and for assistant professors, age does not appear to be associated with horizontal mobility.

The tie between rank and horizontal mobility, on the other hand, is greater with a control for age. In almost every age group the lower academic ranks show more horizontal mobility than do the upper ranks, and we conclude that academic rank is a significant index in horizontal mobility among sociologists.

If the contention is true that sociologists tend to move for the sake of improved status, then academic rank, movers should experience more vertical mobility than nonmovers. Table 3 shows our findings on this contention. Of the persons who

---
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TABLE 2. VERIFIED INSTITUTIONS, BY YEAR OF BIRTH AND ACADEMIC RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Number Percent</th>
<th>Number Percent</th>
<th>Number Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910 or earlier</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930 later</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Less than 5, not considered.

Table 3 shows our findings on this contention. Of the persons who were associate professors in 1967, for example, 65.2 percent of those who moved were at least one age cohort older than those who did not move. Had 1970 become full professors—nonmovers had an edge over movers in improving their rank. This finding is not altogether unexpected because, as suggested previously, horizontal mobility may reflect a department's or institution's desire to keep an individual. If a person is perceived as an asset, he experiences vertical mobility; if not, he is encouraged to leave, he is not promoted, or he is released.

Vertical mobility entails focus for a sociologist on promotion from assistant to associate to full professor. It may occur entirely within one institution or it may occur between institutions, that is, intra- and inter-institutional mobility. For example, does a move from assistant professor at a "strong" department to associate professor at a "weak" department constitute upward or downward mobility? Though we do not resolve the value problem in this question, we offer a description of movers' institutional origins and destinations.

TABLE 3. ACADEMIC RANK AND MOVERS AND NONMOVERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Birth</th>
<th>Number Percent</th>
<th>Number Percent</th>
<th>Number Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910 or earlier</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-19</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930 later</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 Less than 5, not considered.

Ordinarily, associate and full professors are protected by a tenure system and their rank is relatively secure. For assistant professors, instructors, or persons in government or research institutions, a struggle for higher rank seems to be an inevitable process and results in considerable movement of persons. The proportions shown in Table 1 support this generalization.

Table 2 focuses on the relative importance of age and academic rank on horizontal mobility. When the variable of rank is controlled, we observe less of a tie between age and horizontal mobility than was observed in Table 1. Among full professors, horizontal mobility increases from the 1910 or earlier age cohort to the 1910-19 age cohort but decreases thereafter. For associate professors, the younger they are, the more they move, and for assistant professors, age does not appear to be associated with horizontal mobility.

The tie between rank and horizontal mobility, on the other hand, is greater with a control for age. In almost every age group the lower academic ranks show more horizontal mobility than do the upper ranks, and we conclude that academic rank is a significant index in horizontal mobility among sociologists.

If the contention is true that sociologists tend to move for the sake of improved status, then academic rank, movers should experience more vertical mobility than nonmovers. Table 3 shows our findings on this contention. Of the persons who
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Current Sources of Outcome Measures

The impetus for large-scale field experiments, comes from a variety of sources in the policy makers, social planners, and influential citizens deeply concerned with the lack of progress in the improvement of human well-being and the need to determine the impact of the social policies and programs designed to remedy the vast socialills that confront all contemporary communities. The other source is the social and behavioral scientists and colleagues in allied professions who regard large-scale intervention trials either as critical extensions of or vital substitutes for laboratory research. The third element is that field experiments are substitutes for laboratory research usually is based upon pragmatic considerations or on judgments that certain laboratory investigations in the same area are impractical or impossible.

It would be naive, of course, to disregard the possibility that selfish political considerations—the lure of funds to support practice and research programs; the interprofessional relations among policy makers, research investigators, and grant-managers—and sheer momentum—account for the direction of much of the work that is undertaken. Nevertheless, the pressures for funding efficacious interventions and for additional scientific knowledge have stimulated the growth of large-scale intervention programs and development of the conceptual foundations of research methodology.

Present studies reflect concern for social well-being, on the one hand, and interest in behavioral science knowledge, on the other. Most research has employed rigorous programs that are operationally defined measures of sociological phenomena, of individual psychological properties, or of a combination of the two. A cursory review of some criteria of existing experimental programs finds the use of such sociological measures as frequency of court appearance, educational attainment, and other measures of socialization as well as the use of tests of individual properties such as cognitive functioning, motor skills, and interpersonal attractiveness. Each of these variables has obvious limitations.

Sociologically Normative Measures. Basically, all outcome measures are normative. But in this paper my focus is on the criteria of social worth. Social change and social worth are variables defined by societal values, on which persons' hierarchical rankings are determined by normative priorities. The sociological measures used as outcome variables in evaluation studies are not derived from a systematic sociological and ideological analysis of a community. Rather, they reflect concerns made salient as part of a political process in which elected officials, entrepreneurial organizations, business and union leaders, and representatives of the religious sector—although perhaps not in that order—exercise influence. Understanding some societal values, and personal dispositions are the general categories of outcome measures employed in studies with a normative sociological orientation.

The charge is often made that these criteria reflect middle-class values of what is right and proper, and certainly many are. Indeed, in many cases the variables used as outcome measures reflect the researcher's interest in limiting societal change or in producing conformity. Arguments of how individuals feel affected feel about the appropriateness of current social norms, systems maintenance, not the success of individuals in dealing with their environment, often becomes the underlying frame of reference in developing measures for intervention studies. Probably more often than not in intervention studies, cultural diversity is explained by special operational definitions. For example, some years back a large number of cities supported field experiments that focused upon intervention programs to reduce criminal behavior among youths. No two of the cities used exactly the same set of outcome measures. After all, it was assumed that different values norms differ from Cleveland, Los Angeles, and Boston (and maybe they do). The diversity of operational definitions is greater, of course, when issues that differ markedly in ethnic, religious, or other social orientations are involved in parallel action programs. But to adapt measures to assess cultural differences, particularly when validity studies are not made, raises serious questions about the generalizability potential of findings and the comparability of studies.

Identification of individuals in normative sociological measures depends largely on the workings of the social control and treatment systems that operate where the individuals live. These systems differ in effectiveness and in services available not only in different communities and groups, but also within the same population, where there are often marked variations in persons of different social, ethnic, and religious backgrounds. That is, researchers cannot collate their findings, which, of course, limits the worth of the findings. It bears emphasis that it is foolish to argue against the utilization of normative sociological ratings as variables in experimental studies. Pragmatic considerations of providing humane services are immediate, obvious, and emotionally laden, demands for new and expanded programs in particular areas. Certainly it is better to respond to the demands for action than to respond with action that does not. But to begin a study with such diffuse concepts as educational success, delinquency, or the ability to develop measures for the study to reflect the views of middle-income, supposedly socially integrated community members is an approach that will not be overestimated in the selection of dependent variables.

Psychological properties. Another commonly used source of dependent variables is properties of individuals; such variables purportedly measure the outputs of internal processes. They, too, are open to criticism. All individual measures are rooted in a relatively normative, or at least unobservable, system. While properties such as manual dexterity are derived from well-established neurological measures, these as well are strongly influenced by sociological variations. This is the case for many interpersonal characteristics, such as empathy and sympathy, assertiveness, and other social skills. For most individual properties, then, have the same potential cultural bias that the normative sociological measures have. Even phenomena that are not "socially" in the small sense are contaminated because the operational means of measuring them is culturally determined. Keeping in mind the current concern about "white note's" of cognitive development, little need be said on this matter.

"Given the opportunity to rank individuals with their own environment, the issue becomes whether or not a particular intervention program modifies the rankings."

Measures selected as outcome variables usually are chosen because of their presumed links to social competencies of one sort or another—indices of intellectual developmental for example, for reasons for the association with educational and personal performance. In many cases such evidence is or a causal relationship is hypotetically rather than demonstrable. This is the case, for example, when ratings on tests of infer cognitive development are employed as predictors of future social achievement. As it is foolish to argue against the use of normative sociological ratings as variables in experimental studies, so it is foolish to argue against continued use of individual psychological properties as outcome measures. As there are both political and disciplinary concerns with respect to normative sociological phenomena, so there are humanistic and academic investments in the individual properties of persons. In any ethological scheme, these individual properties undoubtedly are important explanatory factors in the social performance and role behavior of individuals. But the goals of most action programs is not to improve people's effective engagement with their social environment, nor merely to enhance the psychological properties of individuals.

Both sets of measures are, however, subject to critical deficiencies that inhibit the accumulation of findings and make it difficult for investigators to offer strong policy judgments of or to develop social and behavioral science knowledge. Each action experiment is an inferoetric activity possibly better to be replicated or not to be built upon subsequent research—clearly an undesirable if not a chaotic state of affairs.

The solution to this state of affairs is expensive and time-consuming. It requires the development of parallel, culture-bound measures that provide rankings of individuals in social systems processes that cut across groups, communities, and nations. In the same way that Krueckohn (1955) argued for cultural anthropography, evaluation researchers should use the common points of reference supplied by the biological, psychological, and social situational "glimpses" of human life as the criteria of outcome. Impact, then, comes to be measured in terms of the order of individuals before and after an effort has been made to alter them.

Social Systems Properties as Outcome Measures

The social systems properties approach to outcome measures holds that there is limited likelihood of developing useful outcome ratings across different locales, groups, and cultural setups. It holds, rather, than there would consist of the ranking of individuals (as groups of individuals such as families) within defined geo-cultural units. The impact of intervention programs is measured in terms of whether or not there is a redistribution of the rankings of persons or units in the target group compared with the control group. The intervention program as measured in terms of whether or not there is a redistribution of the rankings of persons or units in the target group compared with the control group. The intervention program is judged to be successful if it is more successful in producing comparable relative changes in relative change in the target group than in the control group.

The selection of dependent variables remain an important issue in the development of evaluation frameworks. The limitations of the variables of social system properties and the limitations of the variables of individual properties are critical considerations in the development of evaluation frameworks. The limitations of the variables of social system properties and the limitations of the variables of individual properties are critical considerations in the development of evaluation frameworks.
The central question for the evaluation researcher—indeed, for all behavioral scientists—is whether or not the same or similar causal pathways or sequences are associated with individuals’ rankings along social systems properties regardless of the markers that order these properties from one locale, group, or culture to another. My position is that to a large extent the underlying ecological patterns are the same. Whether or not this hypothesis holds universally is unimportant provided it encourages curiosity about and effort among large-scale intervention studies to determine whether or not different settings become the entry points for additional conceptual development and specification of refined generalizations. For example, conceptions of mental development may run through all local cultural settings; identification of these persistent elements permits investigators to seek out the different social structural components characteristic to particular populations that are associated with variability between populations. Put another way, in all groups, in all locales, it is possible to rank individuals on dimensions of social viability; individuals who rank high on these dimensions in one setting will rank high and at parity in parallel situations valued by participants in other milieux, providing they had the same opportunities to “learn the ropes.” A person ranked high in dimensions of social viability in the middle-class America would rank high in a black city, in a small town in Poland, or in an isolated Central American village if he were given the functionally equivalent opportunities he had in his middle-class American environment. In some ways the discussion has come full circle. I am arguing that these structural properties—essentially reflectives of interpersonal and structural barriers to the social development of an individual—and individual characteristics of the person and the biologist character have to be taken into account in any analytical scheme that aims for the notion of a generic cluster of dysfunctional behaviors as a correlate of social viability. For example, an individual labeled a delinquent and institutionalized for a considerable period of time has a little potential to learn social viability properties and consequently little likelihood of high social viability. Obviously, too, an individual with severe health problems is unlikely to be an active participant in most settings.

### Framework for Intervention Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Culturally Specific</th>
<th>Culturally Equivalent</th>
<th>Universal Mode of Social Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Viability</td>
<td>Participation in Economic Exchange</td>
<td>Activity in Political Process, Level of Exploitation of Human Resources, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart above summarizes the framework for intervention studies. The chart and discussion oversimplify matters, however. Normative sociological measures interact with the individual as the collective. The location of these two sets of measures on the chart could have been reversed and, indeed, interwound between psychological and social indices, the two spheres of development. In the chart the two sets of variables commonly regarded as sufficient outcome measures are placed as intermediate variables, nodes in an explanatory process leading to a consideration of what I contend should be the neglected focuses of large-scale intervention programs.

### Concluding Remarks

My plea for new directions in social action experimentation is an important proposal that is related in a modest way without disrupting present activities. In many ways it is, or comes close to being, illegitimate. It demands new directions of social action in those areas of interest to the key dependent variables and places them in a subordinate status. It brings into notice the view that there are more viable areas of scientific work that require attention. It proposes a specific organization for social experimentation that is unlikely to be viewed favorably by all investigators, many of whom to examine their own narrow hands of variables. The development work necessary even to evaluate the scheme in terms of research results is enormous.
November 1972

It is important to redirect interest in outcome measures to a different set of dimensions, dimensions I refer to as reflective of social validity. I see normative sociological variables and individual properties as interstitial in an overall framework. This does not mean they are not valid or not of their own right; it merely means that the components of social validity should be examined. Indeed, unless this is done, a researcher has no way of knowing whether or not there is payoff in pursuing a particular individual property or a particular normative sociological measure.

The concept of social validity requires a thorough examination of considerable literature including ethnographic reports. Even the mapping of the markers—the specific measuring devices that are going to allow for the ranking of individuals—is yet to be realized. Only after these activities are undertaken and particular action intervention studies are tried as a means of providing case illustrations will the scheme make sense. But investigators should not remain content with the two axes of dimensions—normative sociological measures and psychological properties—that are presently employed.

Cates, F. G.

Freeman, H. E., and C. Herrwood

Klecka, W.

LeVine, R. A.

Wholey, J. S.
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VARIATIONS IN INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY COURSES

One-offshoot of the burgeoning interest in sociology as a major and as a career is concern with teaching undergradu-
ate sociology. Recently the American Sociological Asso-
ciation, in response to a concern that existing sociology offered inadequate instruction in social analysis and to suggest improvements, asked its Council at its 1971 meetings in Denver to approve a resolution of action called Undergraduate Education in Sociology. And a new, The Teaching of Sociology, communed publication early in 1972.

Particular interest has been focused upon the teaching of introductory sociology. The American Sociologist has publi-
ished a number of articles on the subject (Boker and Labree-
seven, 1971; Farley, 1970; Gaten, 1969). Our paper will be concerned with the problems of integrating new material into the introductory course in the United States and Canadian sociology departments. Our results indicate that, contrary to feelings expressed in prev-
ious articles (Reid and Beets, 1971:174-175), sociology departments are grappling with the problem of making the beginning course a more relevant and more intellectually exciting course for students with an ever-growing rate of interests and ex-
periences. Our survey asked us what we considered to be a more fundamental question than has been asked previously: How do the introductory courses in the United States and Canada differ? Our findings indicate that, contrary to previous reports (Reid and Beets, 1971:174-175), sociology departments are grappling with the problem of making the beginning course a more relevant and more intellectually exciting course for students with an ever-growing rate of interests and experiences.

Method

A two-page questionnaire was sent to 126 of the 167 United States and 17 Canadian sociology departments listed in the ASA Guide to Undergraduate Departments of Sociology, 1971-72. We felt that this particular group of colleges and universities, as such, any group, would be facing the de-
mands resulting from an increased interest in sociology. It should thus reflect what, or in what ways, sociology de-
partments are changing to meet the changing demands. The choice of the 126 departments was made with an eye toward having a wide representative group of schools as possible—schools public and private, located in different regions, and with sociology departments of all sizes.

Each of the 126 departments was sent to the chairman of the soci-
ology department accompanied by two letters. One letter, addressed to the chairman, explained the purpose of the survey and included a schedule to give the second letter, expres-
sively below, to the undergraduate advisor or some other person concerned with the introductory course.

Dear Staff Member:
We are interested in the type of course offerings through which students are introduced to sociology. We are particularly interested in knowing what courses are offered in the introductory course. If you have such a course, please fill out the attached questionnaire. If you do not have such a course, we shall appreciate it if you fill out the attached part of the questionnaire. We have been asked to complete the first part of this survey to determine the number of departments offering introductory courses and the number of students enrolled in such courses. We hope that your participation will help us to obtain these data.

The key question of the questionnaire was:

Which of the following basic course formats do you have at your school (check one):

1. three basic courses; one geared to majors and po-
tential majors; a second geared to sociology related courses (e.g., social work); a third geared to students who fall into neither of the first two categories (e.g., natural science majors);

2. other format (specify).

Among the other formats specified by respondents were the following:

1. Honors format. Some departments have an honors sec-
tion along with a conventional one-course format at the in-
trductory level. The honors sections are small; one depart-
ment, for example, limits its enrollment to not more than 3 percent of its undergraduate students. Some courses of se-
lection are involved—in one case it is "based on entrance or other exam scores." The honors sections are often tied to university-wide honors programs. As one respondent indi-
cated: "When the university administration wants an honors system, we respond by developing an honors introductory course."

2. Sequential format. The introductory sociology course at some universities consists of a sequential series of courses that may include theory and concepts, research methods, and substantive material from particular areas. One depart-
ment has "a three-quarter sequence open to all students: first course, basic concepts; second course, sociological re-
search methods; third course, social problems." A different sequence is "a first term of principles and for the second and third term the students select two out of six sections, each dealing with some different substantive material (throughout the sequence the introductory course offers a unique sequence: "The first course in sociology is the transformation of the 19th and 20th century, the second course deals with the individual and the social structure."

3. Specific area format. In some departments the empha-
sis at the introductory level is on specific areas. In one cases the "Introduction to" course is offered in a specific area format. Where this is true, it is an alternative to courses in substantive areas of sociology. In contrast, in the sequential format the "Introduction to Sociology" course is open to students in areas other than sociology.

Table 1. DEPARTMENTS COMMITTED TO FORMAT CHANGE FOR INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Format</th>
<th>Current Format</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Already Changed</th>
<th>To Be Changed Soon</th>
<th>Change Being Considered</th>
<th>Total Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-course</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-course</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-course</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-course</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequential</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Area</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

In our survey, 71.1 percent (69) of the United States sociology departments had the conventional one-course for-

1. The 10 social anxiety departments included 11 by counting one department with two formats twice. (The 11 additional departments become 13 by counting one department with two formats twice.) The 97 additional departments become 99 by counting two departments with two formats twice.

2. The 12 additional departments became 13 by counting one department with two formats twice.

3. The 97 additional departments become 99 by counting two departments with two formats twice.
Table 1 also indicates that of the departments that recently changed formats, 32.1 percent presently have a two-course format, 10.7 percent have a three-course format, 25.0 percent have an honors format, 14.3 percent have a sequential format, and 17.9 percent have a specific area format. The two-course format is the most popular change from the traditional beginning course. Twenty-one of the 97 departments (21.6 percent) have recently effected a change or are considering a change to the two-course format.

Two respondents indicated they were thinking about eliminating their basic course, and four respondents did not specify the nature of the change they were contemplating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period When Format Changed</th>
<th>New Format</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Two-Course</td>
<td>Three-Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1969, Spring 1972</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 1969, Spring 1969</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before Fall 1966</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the surge of undergraduate enrollments in sociology is a recent phenomenon, we were interested in finding out whether the changes in the introductory course format came about. As seen in Table 2, 28.7 percent of the United States sociology departments in our sample changed their formats after the fall of 1969 and 26.0 percent changed their formats between the fall of 1966 and the spring of 1969, meaning that more than half of the schools (37.2 percent) have changed their introductory sociology courses since the fall of 1966. It may be of some significance that all changes to the "specific area" format have taken place since the fall of 1966.

Table 3 shows the relation of format changes to size of enrollment in introductory sociology courses in the fall of 1971. Universities with the largest enrollments are seen to be most likely to change. Thirty-seven universities had undergraduate sociology student enrollments of less than 400, and of these, only 16 (43.2 percent) had implemented changes in their introductory format or were considering implementing them. Of the 58 universities with enrollments of 400 or more, 35 (56.9 percent) had made changes or were considering doing so. Universities with large enrollments probably experience the most pressure because of the more diverse backgrounds and needs of their students.

Table 4 suggests that the higher the percentage of faculty members teaching introductory sociology, the less likely there is for format changes. The difference between departments planning change and not planning change is most pronounced between departments with 20 percent or less and with 21 percent or more of their faculty teaching introductory sociology.

As indicated earlier, we did not solicit information about how sociology was taught, but some of our respondents dealt with this issue. In some universities, mass lectures, taught by faculty members, constitute the basic course, the large lectures are commonly supplemented by small discussion groups led by graduate students. In other universities the small section is the vehicle through which introductory sociology is taught; normally a small section is conducted by a faculty member, a graduate student, or both. One respondent remarked that his department had moved to smaller sections of basic sociology, "some taught by graduate students, some by senior majors."

In conclusion we note the distribution of formats is similar: six of the ten respondents had the conventional one-course formats, two had the two-course formats, one allowed an option of introductory or specific areas, and one planned a change to the three-course format in the near future.

Summary

Some critics feel that sociology departments have failed to adapt their course formats to changing student needs. Baker and Behrens (1971:317) feel this way and state that "it is imperative that we face the reality of students' abilities, interests, and expectations." Our survey indicates that this pessimism represents a notational pathos and that, in fact, United States and Canadian departments of sociology are facing the demand for change. Not surprisingly, we found that it is the schools that feel these pressures most acutely—those with the largest enrollments—that have shown the greatest predilection toward change. Perhaps the most telling evidence of departments' commitments to dealing with changing student needs is in the departmental responses. One respondent stated that the two-course and three-course formats are "probably useful in reducing student alienation." An observe remarked that the one-course format had been "too restrictive for both students and faculty." Another replied, "We want to make the resources of sociology available to any student, where his or her interests lie. Let's face it, most people don't want to be locked into sociology majors, and most "introduction to courses turn people off."" Besides, he said, "it's more fun this way."
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Students also had the option of expressing their ideas.

re told that verbosity would be rewarded, whatever the application or subject. Projects were always submitted, graded over the weekend, and examined. Discussion with mixed feelings. It was freedom, but being grade-oriented was the real issue. After the first effort and evaluation, most fears seemed to try to undo one aspect of the assignment, and absorption of the means. At least one visual discipline, choreographic presentations, sculpures, collages, and story-telling items, were most appreciated. One pre-dental student enjoyed the principle of humor. A nursing major tested who waited together were less than those who waited in the cold and wet, body heat. A aggressive behavior. Why not use this to apply to real experience. One student, a little submitted the diary by notation in the mountains and experience what he had learned. Selected as a current event by the class, the conflict, rules, political campaigns as illustrations of attitude change techniques, and resisting all topics of essays.

Grading problems, though present, were not insurmountable. The concept was made to evaluate arts and music contributions to their disciplines; rather, artistic endeavors were graded on the basis of their portrayal of the concept. If I could interpret a project, the entire class took part in explanation and evaluation. Students also had the opportunity to explain and defend their own work, and if I remained uncertain as to whether or not a student had mastered the concept, a short conference was usually sufficient to reveal the student's misunderstanding. Only a few projects were hastily done or reflected internet activity.

There was one unexpected result of the project: instead of lacking understanding of the concept, or lacking a feeling for their relevance, students became almost overzealous in their use. They developed a tendency to label behavior biologically and then to assume that the behavior was explained.

Such a tendency, of course, is not desirable even for introductory students. The problem can be corrected by several lectures on the abstractness of concepts, on the difference between propositions and concepts, on the multi-causal nature of social behavior, and on the tentative nature of research findings. Examples of research now seem to be in error and examples of concepts now discarded also help to keep students from oversimplifying labeling behavior.

Obviously the teaching of sociological concepts through the assignment of projects is not suitable for large classes because of insufficient time for students to present their projects and insufficient time for grading the projects. Nevertheless, for a willing instructor with less than forty students, such projects are a useful technique for teaching basic sociological concepts.

...and his acceptability is checked out with the appropriate organizations and spokespersons. That an ideological element loss with the status is already clear in the case of race: the agency or other institution wanting a black is likely to want one who is approved by militant or even extremist black groups — not just one who is a member of the race. [See the same issue of THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGIST, William College adver-

...and the pressures — behind the incorporation of sex are the same as those behind the incorporation of race and ethnicity, and in principle there is no reason why, in time, the acceptability of a female candidate should not have to be checked out with NOW, a woman's caucus, or whatever organization or clique claims to speak for the sex — in more and more settings, racial and ethnic candidates are cleared with, and even named by, vocal vocal or militant groups claim to speak for the race or ethnic minority. Once irrelevant criteria are admitted, where does one draw the line? Or why draw any line at all?

But the complex, the most basic, reason for refusing to respond to such announcements or solicitations, is that they are demeaning. In the name of equality, they create a mark of inferiority. Women complain, often with justice, that they are not seen — as men are — as scientists, doctors, lawyers; but as women scientists, doctors, women lawyers. The present policy, with its open adoption of a sexual category ("female Ph.D. sociologists"), although it favors rather than excludes women, perpetuates and reinforces the attitudes that women have for so long dreaded.

Sincerely yours,
Florence A. Ruderman
Assistant Professor, Brooklyn College

Editors Note:
The reference in the above letter to an advertisement in TAS from Williams College prompts the following note. The Publications Committee of the ASA, confronted with problems about such ads, adopted in New Orleans, the following two motions which now stand as ASA policy:

1. The list of vacancies in the Employment Bulletin should not include as qualification in applying for a position race, ethnic origin, religion, sex, or age characteristics.

2. When the Executive Officer receives vacancy listings that appear to be objectionable under the rules just established, the Executive Officer will inform the advertiser that the strongest of discouraged Applicants Encouraged."
News and Notes on Minorities and Women

FELLOWSHIPS FOR PUERTO RICAN GRADUATE STUDENTS

Fellowships (preferably in sociology) are available for 1973-74 to Puerto Rican graduate students for research on social problems. Fellows are required to write a paper on research dealing with Puerto Ricans in the United States. They may also attend 3-weekend seminars relating to research and career development during the year. Stipends $3,500 and $4,000 for each dependent. Financial need considered. For application and further information write: Dr. Maria Mercedes Diaz, Puerto Rican Research and Resources Center, Inc., 1109 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036.

POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS FOR 1973-1974 TO STUDY ETHNIC MINORITIES

National Endowment for the Humanities announces fellowships for historical, social or cultural studies of U.S. ethnic minorities to young scholars and teachers who have just completed graduate work or professional training or expect to complete it before September, 1973. Fellows will study under senior scholars of their own choice. Arrangements will be made for full access to libraries and auditing privileges in courses.

Applications must be U.S. Citizens or native residents of its territorial possessions.

Maximum stipend $18,000. Fellows may supplement the award with small grants from other sources or may have sabbaticals or grants from their employing institutions.

Applications may be submitted directly to: Division of Fellowships, National Endowment for the Humanities, 800 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506.

VITAE OF MINORITY SOCIOLOGISTS

The Council of the ASA has approved a recommendation of The Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession instructing the executive Specialist to collect vitae of sociologists from minority groups who wish to find work that requires special qualifications or who are interested in obtaining information about minority sociologists.

WOMEN SOCIOLOGISTS SERVE AS PRESIDENTS

Current records of various national and regional sociological organizations indicate that the following women sociologists have been elected to positions of top leadership: Mirra Komarovsky, President, American Sociological Association; Dorothy K. Newman, President, D.G. Sociological Society; and Gertrude A. Selznick, President, Pacific Sociological Association. In addition, the following women have been elected as President-Elect: Alice S. Rossi, Eastern Sociological Society, and Caroline Rose, Midwest Sociological Society.
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SOCIOLGISTS ADVANCE ON AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

The 1972 Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science will be held in the Sheraton-Park Hotel in Washington, D.C. from December 26-31.

Participation by sociologists in the program was initiated when President Mirra Komarovsky appointed Dr. Eleanor Sheldon, President of the Social Science Research Council, to accept responsibility for session in Section K of the meeting. Dr. Sheldon has announced the following two sessions: (1) "Historical Sociology of Science," organized by Herbert Zuckerman of Columbia University, and (2) "Methods of Social Indicator Analysis," organized by Kenneth Land of the Russell Sage Foundation. Arnold Themarck of the University of Pennsylvania will present a major paper in the history session and Seymour Spilerman of the University of Wisconsin will present the key paper on indirect analysis.

Several sociologists will also participate in a session on "The Future of Collective Violence: Societal and International Perspectives," organized by Joseph Ben-Dak for the Section on Social and Economic Sciences. Among the participants are Paul Peachy, Chairman of the Department of Sociology at Catholic University; Kurt Freidus, University of Maryland, and William Gomson, University of Michigan. This Annual Meeting will also mark the point where James Coleman of Johns Hopkins University will succeed Daniel Moynihan as the elected chairman of Section K and Vice-President of AAAS.

Other Organizations

• The Institute for Community Development and the Center on Human Policy Call for Papers: Third Annual Symposium on Current Issues in Community Psychology. April 11-14, 1973. Topic: Alternatives to Institutionalization. Papers should relate in alternative to total institutional structures for people of all ages having special needs. Travel expenses will be covered for those on or near public transportation. Deadline January 15. For further information write: Dr. Robert Cohen, Institute for Community Development, 118 Harvard Place, Syracuse, New York 13210.

• The Third Annual Alpha Kappa Delta Sociological Research Symposium will be held March 22-24, 1973 at the Delta Chapter, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia. Papers are solicited on any aspect of social science research. Send to Rhonda Zinnett, Chairman, Program Committee, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, Virginia 23284.

• The Southern Anthropological Society has announced the annual James Mooney Award of $1,000 for the book-length manuscript that best describes and interprets the people or culture of a distinctive New World population. The subject may be pre-historic, historic, or contemporary. Submissions can be about people belonging to major social, cultural, or ethnic groups, or about people belonging to obscure or heterogeneous groups.


• November 16-25 International Institute of Sociology; Twenty-third Congress, Science, Society and Communication, Venedikums, Institute International de Sociologie, Apartado Postal 5800, Casarca 105, Veneza.


CALENDAR OF FORTHCOMING MEETINGS


• November 16-25 International Institute of Sociology; Twenty-third Congress, Science, Society and Communication, Venedikums, Institute International de Sociologie, Apartado Postal 5800, Casarca 105, Veneza.


Papers solicited. Symposium, Saturday, 1 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10016.

• April 5-8 The American Society of Group Psychotherapy and Psychodrama, Annual Meeting, Hotel New York Plaza, New York, N. Y.

• April 6 Michigan Sociologists' Association, Spring Meeting, Ann Arbor Coca Bagby, Dept. of Sociology, Western Michigan University 49001.

EMPLOYMENT BULLETIN

VACANCIES

Teaching

University of Maryland. The Department of Sociology, cooperating with the A.S.A.'s policy on job openings, announces the following positions to fill for 1972-73, primarily at senior level. High-quality, full-time teaching with research emphasis expected. The applicant's location in the Washington, D.C. area, the department is interested in building its program in urban sociology, medical sociology, and social psychology. A.A.U.P. appointments are not limited to United States citizens. Edward Duyck, Director of the Staff Development Department, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

Fort Lewis College. Assistant professor rank. Introductory methods and statistics, social psychology, social theory, and selected courses in urban sociology. Preference for candidates with experience in teaching in a multicultural setting. Salary: $7,000.

Vanderbilt University. Two positions at assistant professor rank: social statistics in demography; and fundamental embryology. The department offers a program in the biological and physical sciences. Salary: $5,500.

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga. Two positions at assistant professor rank: social statistics in demography; and fundamental embryology. The department offers a program in the biological and physical sciences. Salary: $5,500.

Institutions Currently Under Appointment

ASSOCIATION NEWS

Sociology of Sexual Roles: In the October issue of TASS Pauline Bart was listed as persons to whom Sex Roles Section annual meeting papers should be sent. In addition, papers should also be sent to the following:

Sexism and Racism—Dorita Wilkinson, MacMaster College, St. Paul, Minnesota 55104

Sex Roles in Everyday Life—Ralph Brink, Bloomsfield College, Bloomfield, N.J.

Sex and Security—Dana Brown, Oakland, California 94613.

These papers should be limited to ten pages since the session will include informal discussion.

CRIME, CORRECTION, AND SOCIETY

Third Edition

With Johnson's long-held view that theoretical questions should be relevant to the issues of the day, this edition continues to strike the proper balance between these two objectives. The author has thoroughly revised and reorganized this material to include more recent research findings and criminological literature, emphasizing intensive questioning of the system of criminal justice, the dynamics of deviant behavior, and critical theories of criminal behavior, and investigation of the correctional institution as a "people-changing" organization.

Both editions will be ready in early 1973.

DowPEX PRESS, HOMEWOOD, ILLINOIS 60403 for your examination copy.

State of Social Problems of Urban Man

Oriented to bridge the gap between theory and practice, Johnson has grouped theories around two major approaches to social problems—social deviance and social disorganization—and has adopted urbanization and technological change as central to the sources of these problems and their solutions.

Comment threads are provided as the text moves from the summary of theoretical approaches to per se to deal with each of these two problem sources specifically. Can be used on a one- or two-semester basis.

DowPEX PRESS, HOMEWOOD, ILLINOIS 60403 for your examination copy.
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