

EARLY WOMEN SOCIOLOGISTS AND THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL SOCIETY: THE PATTERNS OF EXCLUSION AND PARTICIPATION*

MARY JO DEEGAN

University of Nebraska-Lincoln

The American Sociologist 1981, Vol. 16 (February):14-24

American sociology owes a significant debt to early women professionals. Although discriminated against as full colleagues, they nonetheless contributed to sociological thought and participated in professional activities. Evidence of both the barriers and opportunities affecting these early female leaders is found in the records of the American Sociological Society during its founding years; i.e., from 1906-1931. Analysis of this information, as well as personal documents of sociologists working during this period, reveals that women did participate within a restricted range of "expertise," often associated with traditional sex roles. Jane Addams was a significant figure in these early years and was a leader within the separate, more institutionally limited female sociologists' network.

INTRODUCTION

Since its inception, the American Sociological Society¹ has discriminated against women.² Organized by a small group of men at the American Economics Association, during its first 25 years, from 1906 to 1931, the Association never elected a woman to the four highest offices, and rarely included them as major speakers, section organizers, or committee members.³ However, to know that this

institutional sexism existed is not enough. To understand male sociologists' exclusion of their female colleagues, a careful analysis is needed, for there are many questions that are unanswered. For example, how and why did these men keep women out of the organization? Which women participated despite these barriers? Were there efforts to open the organization for female participation? If so, what happened when such attempts were made?

Answers to these questions reveal not only the form and type of discrimination practiced with regard to female sociologists, but also the contributions that women made to the establishment of the profession during its crucial, formative years. Therefore, each of the questions raised above is addressed in this paper. This is done by first examining the attitudes and behavior of early Presidents of the ASA who directly affected women's participation in the structure. Next, the group of women who did hold elected offices are considered, as well as two sections of the ASA that provide information concerning both the barriers against and opportunities for participation in professional activities.

* The author wishes to thank Alan Booth, Mary Kay Schleiter, and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions on an earlier draft of this paper. In addition, the following archival societies and libraries have been extremely cooperative and generous with their time and access to their collections: the Schlesinger Library, the Swarthmore College Peace Collection, the Wisconsin Historical Society, and the Newberry Library. [Address correspondence to: Mary Jo Deegan, Department of Sociology, University of Nebraska, Lincoln NE 68588.]

¹ The American Sociological Society (ASS) was renamed the American Sociological Association (ASA) in order to avoid the use of the group's initials. Therefore, the ASA will be used to refer to the organization here.

² Extensive documentation of discrimination against women in sociology during the last quarter-century is quite extensive (see, for example, Acker, 1973; Hughes, 1973; Wilkinson, 1979; Chubin, 1974; Davis, 1969; Fava, 1960) as well as against academic women in general (Deegan, 1978; Bernard, 1964; Rossi and Claderwood, 1973).

³ Data on officers and participants were gathered through the use of *The Publications of the American Sociological Society* published from 1906 to 1931.

The back of the front cover lists all of the officers for the association and presents names of committee members and section officers. A list of participants at the annual meetings is provided in each annual volume.

THE PATRIARCHAL LEADERSHIP
STRUCTURE OF ASA

Albion Small was a central figure in the organization of the ASA and therefore his views on women are particularly relevant. As an advocate of the "Doctrine of the Separate Spheres" (see Kraditor, 1970), Small believed that men and women were distinctly different. His philosophy, like many of his contemporaries, was one of separate but equal. Small, however, stated that this equality was obvious and had been stressed. We needed to understand the distinct natures of male and females, for:

... we are aware that the mental output of the two persons (sexes), with reference to a given subject, is not the same. There is a subtle difference of quality, perhaps like that between the same musical note produced, for example, by a cornet and a violin. Each has the same relation to other notes higher and lower in the scale, but neither could supply the place of the other in its own series (Small, 1902:261-262).

Ironically, as an advocate of society based on competition and the survival of the fittest, Small did not believe that women should be taught to compete. Acknowledging that some "modern" women were trained like men, he felt this was a transitory and possibly destructive phase of social change. Despite his blatant bigotry (Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 1974:290), Small was nonetheless complex in his thought. For example, his contradictory ideas are evident in the following passage:

Equal pay for equal work is simple justice. But at best social ideals that train women to be competitors with men are like poisons administered as medicine (Small, 1902:262).

Small thought women's place was literally in the home. But he also asserted that people did not understand the significance of the home for social functioning and that it deserved serious academic study and status. Whatever increased opportunities for understanding women's status were created, however, Small's reality always resulted in women's loss of social power and control. Agreeing in the abstract that males and females had an equal ability to vote, he opposed the

extension of suffrage to women on grounds of social expediency. Women shouldn't vote because it would alter the complimentary divisions of labor wherein we should reserve "to men the representative functions in our political system" (Small, 1902:236).

Women also should not be "bread winners," according to his scheme. They could not devote their time to their homes and families, for work in the modern world not only was competitive, but, like a new religion, it fulfilled our obligation to the community and service to God (Small, 1902:236).⁴

It seems quite evident that Small believed that the ASA was a society for men. It was to be controlled, led, and defined by men for their professional advancement. Although Small was in the unique position of hiring the most women faculty in the Department of Sociology at the University of Chicago, he did this by having women work in "their specialized areas:" household administration, sanitary science, social settlements, and statistics (Deegan, 1978). Thus, when he established this professional society, he selected from his "old boy network" and helped establish a tradition of patriarchal power that was to continue for decades.

Small's type of sexism is important to understand for a variety of reasons. First, as the original Chair of the first Graduate Department of Sociology, the founding editor of *The American Journal of Sociology* (*AJS*), and one of the organizers of the ASA and one of its earliest Presidents (1912-1913), he was influential in forming policy concerning women professionals. Second, his attitudes were shared by other male sociologists of his day, and these help explain the presence of most of the women who participated in the early years of the ASA. Their participation, moreover, was over a wider range of topics which began to be narrowed later. Finally, this form of sexism depended upon women having a separate, strong network to draw upon for participants and active relations between the two networks. In-

⁴ Small repeated his arguments of distinct thought patterns and behavior of the sexes in 1903 (Small, 1903).

stead, the women's network separated more visibly from sociology during the late 1920s and the 1930s, and women sociologists became less segregated during this time and subsequently identified with the male professional network more than the female one.⁵

The ASA, then, had the character of a men's club. This tradition, however, allowed women to participate if they were part of the "women's network" which was seen as specializing in a range of topics that have frequently been associated with "applied sociology" (Deegan, 1978). This sub-speciality, however, often covered a wide range of topics and ideas that had important political implications, as well as those issues associated with traditional feminine interests.⁶ In order to have women active on even this level, though, it was necessary to have male presidents who invited women as speakers and discussants at the annual meetings.

During this first quarter-century of the organization there were four men who worked closely with the women's network and invited their participation. Each will be examined briefly to show the existence of this sub-group and the occasional resistance of some members of the ASA to including women at all in the proceedings.

The first President, Lester F. Ward, frequently wrote about the role of women in society and appears to have shared many of Small's biases (Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 1974:290). Although an in-depth analysis of his views on women has not been written and is outside of the scope of this paper, he was a major intellectual resource for Charlotte Perkins Gilman, the noted feminist social economist/sociologist.⁷ His support of

women's participation in the ASA is evident through the inclusion of a woman, Mrs. J. Oldenward-Unger, in the first meetings (she spoke on a "traditional" woman's topic, "The Fine Arts as a Dynamic Factor in Society"), and the inclusion of a number of women as discussants in the second annual meeting. Gilman was a discussant on three occasions, Addams on another, and Anna Garlin Spencer for yet another (see *Publications of the ASA*, 1908:v-vi). Even though all of the major papers were presented by men, the inclusion of controversial and articulate women as discussants set a good precedent that probably aided in recognition of this women's "point of view."

Small continued this tradition during his tenure from 1912 to 1913. In fact, he invited Addams, via E. A. Ross, to present a paper as a major speaker at the meetings (Ross to Addams, 18 January 1911, Ross Papers).⁸ Similarly, in 1913 he invited Lucy M. Salmon, of Vassar College, and Emily Green Balch, of Wellesley College, to be discussants (*Publications of the ASA*, 1914:v-vi).

Small and Ward apparently institutionalized the pattern of including women as discussants, although there were many years when even this small inclusion of women did not occur. The inclusion of women in more significant roles rarely occurred, and the two exceptions to this pattern reveal insights about the limits of women's acceptance and the possibility of structurally changing the organization. These exceptions occurred with E. A. Ross and W. I. Thomas.

Ross, President from 1914 to 1915, was a close associate of the female network's members, especially Jane Addams. As noted above, he sent the invitation for Addams's address in 1912 and when he became President, he asked her to present a

(Ward, 1888). However, he thought men and women had different innate capacities and supported the "Doctrine of the Separate Spheres." Gilman was so impressed by Ward that she dedicated her book *The Man-Made World* (1911) to him. The Schwendingers have examined some of his sexist views on women, but they have neglected to account for his positive contributions on this topic (1974:310-333).

⁸ Her address was "Recreation as a Public Function in Urban Communities," see Addams (1912).

⁵ The existence and extent of the women's network has little contemporary documentation. For a brief introduction of the concept and the women who participated in it and some of their organizational ties, see Deegan (1978; 1979; forthcoming) and Deegan and Burger (1978; 1981).

⁶ The work of both male and female sociologists in these "sub-specialities" generally has been forgotten or even erased. For an analysis of two male sociologists, G. H. Mead and W. I. Thomas, who wrote in these same areas, see Deegan and Burger (1978; 1981).

⁷ Ward believed that women had been the dominant sex first and modern man was a variation of her

paper on "War and Militarism in Their Sociological Aspects." Although Addams accepted (Ross to Addams, 13 September 1915; Addams to Ross, 29 September 1915, Ross Papers), it was not she but her colleague Emily Green Balch who accepted and actually presented a paper on the topic. This led to a controversial meeting in 1915 and in order to know why, it is necessary to know some of the background concerning Addams's and Balch's views on war, as well as Balch's sociological background.

Balch is one of the most significant female sociologists who wrote during the early decades of this century. Although it is not possible to trace all of her intellectual contributions here (see Deegan, 1979, forthcoming, and below), her book *Our Slavic Fellow Citizen* (1910) was a landmark study in immigration and social change which pre-dated and anticipated many of the issues discussed in Thomas and Znaniecki's *Polish Peasant* (1918). In addition to this work, one of her most important areas of study was pacifism. She and Addams co-authored a book describing women's organizing against war at the Hague in 1913 (Addams, Balch, and Hamilton, 1915). For this reason, she and Addams became increasingly controversial, anti-war figures during this year (1915) and subsequent ones. (Both were ultimately to win Nobel Peace Prizes for their work, Addams in 1931 and Balch in 1946.) Clearly Balch was a logical choice to present the sociological view against war. Ross, however, had an extremely difficult time getting men to be discussants of her paper. He asked over 15 men who replied with a series of excuses of why they could not be there or be prepared to critique her speech.⁹

Because of the difficulty in obtaining male discussants, Ross finally asked two women, Lillian Wald, the Head Resident of the Henry Street Settlement in New York City and close associate of Addams,

and Anna Garlin Spencer, an early woman sociologist who taught at Meadville Theological Seminary in Meadville, Ohio. Spencer was a close associate of both Ross and Addams, and thus was part of both his and the women's network. Ross's close friend and colleague from his early Stanford and University of Nebraska days, George Elliott Howard (President, 1917), also was tapped for the discussant position. The two other men, J. P. Lichtenberger and Francis D. Tyson, are unknown to this author and clearly not active, recognizable members of the early sociological networks. Thus, Ross tried to create an opportunity for women to participate in the annual meetings but met with strong internal resistance.

Thomas, President in 1927, also was effective in bringing women within the organizational structure. Ethel Sturgess Dummer, the Chicago philanthropist who commissioned Thomas to write *The Unadjusted Girl* (1923), was a central figure in his career (Deegan and Burger, forthcoming). Thomas was unemployed after he was ousted from the University of Chicago in 1917 when he was at the peak of his career and *The Polish Peasant* was in press. Charged but never convicted of violating the Mann Act, he was dismissed without a fair hearing at the University of Chicago. Subsequently blackballed from the profession, his triumphant reinstatement as President of the ASA a decade later was reflected in support shown to Mrs. Dummer when she was elected to the executive committee from 1927 to 1930 (see also below).

Thus, Dummer's association with the ASA and with Thomas, as well as her power as both philanthropist and leader in sociological thought, were all factors leading to her participation in the organization's hierarchy.

Nevertheless, the basic structure of the ASA remained patriarchal. The 21 men who led the organization during its first quarter-century kept the hierarchy male and those women allowed into the structure through Presidential advocacy were part of a separate female network. Even with this narrow range, however, women's participation was the exception rather than the rule.

⁹ Some of the men who were asked and declined were Franklin H. Giddings, the third ASA President and Balch's mentor; Charles Ellwood who was ASA President in 1924; and E. T. Devine and Hamilton Holt, both noted social reformers. The correspondence concerning the requests and refusals can be found in Box #8, Ross Papers.

THE WOMEN LEADERS

During the founding years of American sociology, especially from 1892–1920, Jane Addams was the foremost female sociologist. She led the women who basically formed a separate network. Generally banned from faculty positions in male or co-educational institutions of “higher learning” (Deegan, 1978), women were able to find employment in either women’s colleges or social welfare work. Although they considered themselves sociologists, they were barred from the institutional affiliations that would legitimize their claims. In addition to this structural discrimination, the women also adhered to a different vision of sociology than that practiced today. During the years of interest here, however, they were practicing “mainstream” sociology which was only subsequently reinterpreted as “social work.” During the 1920s, as well, their actual work content, ideological stance, and professional practice changed so that two separate professions did emerge.

No women held the highest offices of the ASA from 1906 to 1931. Nevertheless, eight women did hold elected positions on the executive committee, and they all engaged in work influenced by Jane Addams. Who were these women and what kind of sociology were they interested in writing and analyzing? It is this question that is crucial in understanding women’s role in the founding days of the profession.

Jane Addams and Hull House

Jane Addams is one of the most important American pragmatists.¹⁰ She directly influenced all of the men in the Department of Sociology at the University of

¹⁰ The literature on Addams is so extensive that only an introductory set of readings can be suggested. For an excellent account of Chicago life and Hull House activities see Addams (1910; 1930). The most accessible bibliographical references, including a listing of the 514 published works by Addams, can be found in Farrell (1967). An excellent introduction to her writings is found in Lasch’s *The Social Thought of Jane Addams* (1965), and an important interpretation of her impact on her age can be found in either Davis (1973) or Levine (1971).

Chicago,¹¹ as well as John Dewey (Mills, 1964), George Herbert Mead (Deegan and Burger, 1978), and other major American pragmatists. As the Head Resident of the social settlement, Hull House, she became the symbolic leader of a movement that swept the country. Addams assumed leadership through her ability to capture the American conscience and imagination. Writing on poverty, immigration, women’s suffrage, juvenile delinquency, old age, and changing American values, she was able to articulate the concerns of many Americans.

Hull House, founded in 1889, became an intellectual center in Chicago three years before the Department of Sociology at Chicago was founded. Active in the notorious Pullman Strike and other political issues in the volatile, fast-growing city, Addams achieved national recognition almost immediately. Intellectuals from around the world came to the settlement to meet this intellectual woman and the people who gathered around her.

One of Addams’s greatest skills was her ability to organize other workers, to generate enthusiasm in others for her interests, and to foment scholarly discussion and debate. To many Americans she symbolized the best in womanhood: concern for others, self-sacrifice, common speech, and concrete actions for social change. Simultaneously, she symbolized a voice of reason and justice in a time of disorienting change. She was seen as a speaker of truth and as a radical. This role as an antagonistic leader to the general public was one that often has been forgotten and her

¹¹ Addams’s influence on the male Chicago sociologists from 1892 to 1920 was extensive. To indicate only briefly this major sociological connection, some of the correspondence and joint activities can be found documented in correspondence and articles noted below. Jane Addams, “Charles R. Henderson, 1848–1915,” Taylor Papers:22. Mead and Thomas’s correspondence and work with Addams are noted respectively in Deegan and Burger (1978; forthcoming). Burgess wrote a long poem titled “To Jane Addams” in Burgess Correspondence, Graham Taylor Papers, Newberry Library; Zeublin was a resident at Hull House; and Small requested her papers to be included in *AJS* as important contributions to sociology (Small to Addams, 14 October 1899, Box 24, Addams Papers, Swarthmore College Peace Collection).

intellectual stature ignored. But during her day, these controversial stands and powerful intellect were well recognized.

It was this combination of symbolic womanhood, sharp intelligence, leadership of social settlements, and of the newly emergent professional woman that made her the leader of the female sociologists who were ostracized from the male institutions controlled by the male professionals. Addams considered herself a sociologist, and sociologists, both male and female, accepted this professional leadership.¹² This claim is buttressed further by the female sociologists who were visible in the ASA. Because all of these women did work similar to Addams or were directly influenced by her, her leadership of the female network is documented further. (See Table 1 for a list of their names and offices.)

Emily Green Balch, the earliest female officer, was a close associate of Addams for years. Active in the social settlement movement almost as early as Addams (Balch was a founder of Denison House in Boston), both of the women subsequently were to receive international recognition for their work by winning Nobel Peace Prizes, the only American women so honored (Addams in 1931; Balch in 1946). Balch studied with Giddings, Small, and Simmel and wrote two early classic sociological texts: *Public Assistance of the Poor in France* (1893) and *Our Slavic Fellow Citizen* (1910). She was hired to read papers at Wellesley College in 1899 and ultimately became a Professor in the Department of Sociology and Economics as well as its Chair. She was fired from her position in 1919 due to her pacifist work during World War I and was unable to find other academic employment after that. She worked for decades for the United Nations and helped to form international policy, especially in reference to Haiti (Balch, 1927; Randall, 1964; Deegan, forthcoming).

Julia Lathrop also was a close friend

TABLE 1. Names of the women who held elected office on the Executive Committee during the first 25 years of the American Sociological Society and their years of service.*

Name	Years of Service
Emily Green Balch	1913-1914
Julia Lathrop	1917-1918
Grace Abbott	1920-1923
Susan M. Kingsbury	1922-1925
Lucille Eaves	1924-1926
Ethel Sturgess Dummer	1927-1930

* The officer lists were obtained from *The Publications of the American Sociological Society*.

and associate of Addams for decades. In fact, Jane Addams wrote her biography, describing their years of collaboration and Lathrop's work for child welfare (Addams, 1935). Lathrop was admired both for her intellectual and administrative leadership in a series of social welfare issues. For example, she was the first head of the Immigration Protective League (IPL), a forerunner of the Immigration Bureau, and was the first head of the Children's Bureau.

Grace Abbott, a close associate of Addams and a sister to Edith Abbott (another female sociologist who worked at the University of Chicago), took over leadership of the IPL and the Children's Bureau after Lathrop retired. Considered for a cabinet post, Grace Abbott was one of the primary figures in the establishment of Social Security in this country.¹³ Lathrop and Abbott resided at Hull House for years, and Balch was a visitor there on several occasions (Addams, 1935; Deegan, 1978, forthcoming).

Both Susan M. Kingsbury and Lucille Eaves were research directors, at different times, of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union (WEIU). This organization collected statistical information on the lives and opportunities of working women, similar to the work done at the social settlements. In addition, Kingsbury directed the Department of Political Economy at Bryn Mawr, where she trained several noted sociologists, for example, Mabel Elliot and Belle Boone Beard.

¹² Additional documentation of Addams's role is found throughout most of the writings by Deegan. Additional, more comprehensive analysis is available in an unpublished paper on her by the same author.

¹³ Helen Springer is now documenting Grace Abbott's role in establishing Social Security in her biographical research.

Eaves taught sociology at Stanford and the University of Nebraska, where she was a colleague of Ross and Howard, before accepting the position at the WEIU. The only woman to teach in a coeducational institution, she nonetheless left because of the failure of the Department of Sociology to promote her or pay her a living wage (Eaves to Ross, 12 November 1914, Ross Papers).¹⁴

Dummer, as noted above, was a Chicago philanthropist who aided Thomas in his career (see Deegan and Burger, forthcoming). She also was the founder of the ASA section on the family. Her major contribution to sociology and to other academic disciplines was in her role as administrator, friend, and financial resource. Her intellectual leadership was not found in her writings, which are few. Dummer was a strong admirer of Addams and worked with her on several committees and organizations. Prime among these ties was their joint work for the Juvenile Protective Association and the establishment of the Juvenile Court and Juvenile Psychopathic Institute in Chicago.

Thus we see that Balch, Lathrop, Abbott, and Dummer all were close professional associates and personal friends. In addition, they worked for similar organizations, sometimes co-authored writings, and wrote on similar topics. These women were bound by a series of common concerns revolving around their professional commitments which were activated in a series of organizations (Deegan, 1978). Addams's leadership and patronage were evident, and these women represent a sociological worldview that has been neglected, and their contribution to the profession and their recognition denied. Fortunately, through an examination of records such as those analyzed here, their professional work can yet be noted and studied.

THE SECTION ON SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL WORK: THE EXCLUSION OF FEMALE SOCIAL WORKERS

The composition of the ASA section on sociology and social work also demon-

strates that women were excluded from the organization. Since social workers were predominantly female, especially those trained in sociology, their presence in this section should have been evident from the start, i.e., in 1921. This was not the case, however, when the first attempts to create this section were noted in the *Publications*. Round tables and a session devoted to a discussion of the topic were set up, but the latter was composed only of male sociologists. The elitism of the men is clear. Thomas D. Eliot, one of the speakers, noted that the sociologist had a superior knowledge to offer the social worker:

. . . in adding to his fund of organized knowledge of the nature of social relationships in normal society and to his point of view toward social work, rather than to the technique of community organization or even of 'getting Mrs. Jones to the clinic' (1922:241).

John Gillin noted that social workers needed an educational background in the sciences studying social problems, but he thought there was "a deplorable lack of appreciation by social workers and agencies" (Gillin, 1923:205) for this need. Burgess most blatantly brought to the fore his ideas of colonization of social workers in his paper on "The Independence of Sociology and Social Work" in 1923, where he notes that sociologists can donate their concepts of society to social workers, while they, in turn, can "contribute the materials accumulating in the various social agencies for teaching purposes"¹⁵ (Karpf, 1926:219).

In 1926 Maurice Karpf, the section head, summarized the relations between the two fields and the papers written on it in the following way:

From what has been said it would seem only fair to conclude that thus far the sociologists have been more ready to utilize social work and to contribute to it than social workers have been to seek, or even to accept, these contributions (1926:220-221).

The bias of these men who cited only male sociologists as authors who had related sociological theory to social work

¹⁴ Information on Eaves's work at Nebraska can be found in Hertzler (1979:54-56).

¹⁵ This is a direct quotation of Karpf's interpretation of Burgess's article published in 1923.

(Karpf, 1926:200), who had predominantly male sociologists as committee members and speakers, and who wished to donate their superior knowledge in exchange for the material resources and data of social workers is eloquent evidence of the extreme chauvinism of the profession. Further, Karpf noted that:

An examination of twenty-five of the foremost colleges and universities throughout the country which have schools of social work or which offer courses in social work shows that, with the exception of two or three instances, the schools are the direct offspring of the departments of sociology (Karpf, 1926:221).

It was evident that there were many close ties between the two groups. However, many of these courses were taught by women who, although trained in sociology, were put into the "female" specialization, social work, and these women were not considered equal participants to their male colleagues for leadership in the ASA. These women wrote extensively, spoke eloquently and powerfully, and were leaders in both sociology and social work.

Finally, if one would argue that the male sociologists, nonetheless, had to choose themselves because of a scarcity of social workers who were members of the ASA, then Karpf's evidence contradicts this possibility, for an occupational analysis of the membership of 1926 reveals the interesting fact that social workers constituted the largest single group in the Society, outside of the sociologists themselves (Karpf, 1926:218).

THE FAMILY SECTION: WOMEN MAKE A STRUCTURAL ENTRY

Ethel Sturgess Dummer was the founder of this ASA section and helped to establish an organizational precedent for including women within the ASA. Although the family is an area that fits Small's and other sexists' ideas of the "separate spheres" between men and women, female sociologists often were shut off from other such "specialities," as seen in our study of the section on sociology and social work. To trace this structural oppor-

tunity for women, Dummer herself needs to be introduced.

As mentioned above, she was a major philanthropist who aided Thomas's career and initiated the work of the Chicago Juvenile Court and Psychopathic Clinic. In this particular sub-field, she was considered a leader, and in 1921 Ernest W. Burgess, the Chicago sociologist and secretary of the ASA, corresponded with Dummer about her organizing a panel on the "Delinquent Girl." She included all women, all members of the women's network, in the session. She outlined her program as follows:

Psychology: The Adolescent Girl, Jessie Taft, Ph.D.; Psychiatry: The Logic of Delinquency, Dr. Marion Kenworthy; Sociology: Illegitimacy, Emma O. Lundberg; Jurisprudence: "The Court as Clinic" [sic] and Methods of Cure, Miriam Van Waters, Ph.D. (30 July 1921, Dummer to Burgess, Box 472, Dummer Papers).

Although all of these women were as well qualified as sociologists as many of the men participating in the ASA program, especially Taft, who had been a doctoral student of Mead's, Burgess wrote the following sexist reply:

Thank you for the tentative outline of the program for the session on the Delinquent Girl. Dr. Park and I, who both approve of it, are forwarding it to Professor Gillin for his sanction. The one suggestion that I would make is that the report on illegitimacy be assigned to Social Service rather than to Sociology, as apparently the treatment of the subject is from the former rather than from the latter standpoint (7 August 1921, Burgess to Dummer, Box 479, Dummer Papers).¹⁶

In the following fall, Burgess wrote Mrs. Dummer requesting the names and addresses of people who were studying the family, since the ASA had decided to have one session on this topic for the 1922 meetings (27 September 1922, Burgess to Dummer, Box 479, Dummer Papers).

¹⁶ In an important aside, Dummer telegraphed to Burgess that if he had not received Van Waters's paper by 12 January 1922 he could telephone Jessie Binford, who headed the Juvenile Protective Association, at Hull House for a copy of it (January 1921, Dummer telegram to Burgess, Box 479, Dummer Papers). Thus, the Addams/Hull House connection with the male sociologists is documented.

Again, in February of 1924 Burgess wrote Dummer about their continuing interest in the family and her help in organizing a conference or session on this topic (Burgess to Dummer, 14 February 1924, Box 479, Dummer Papers). In 1925, she organized a session including Burgess and Virginia Robinson, a close associate of Jessie Taft, as participants (5 November 1925, Dummer to Burgess, Box 480, Dummer Papers).

In 1927 as section chair, Dummer had four men and three women as participants. On 10 October 1926 she noted that she wished to include men but:

I hope to get some women to join them in this leadership—to keep the discussion going and also to keep it from running away (3 October 1926, Dummer to Gillin, Box 407, Dummer Papers).

Although Dummer left this section after 1927, she had established a policy of including women in the program, and we see that in 1928 and 1929 this continued. Thus, in 1928 there again were seven participants with three women participating, and in 1929 with Ernest Groves as Chair there were six participants of whom three were women (*Publications of the ASA*, Vol. 24, 1929:vii).

This patterned, structural inclusion of women within the program illustrates that when women were thought to be worthy of being participants, they were systematically part of the ASA activities over a period of years. When men with power had defined this field as one where women could hold expertise, the “experts” were found. (See Kanter, 1977, for a discussion of organizational patterns of sexual discrimination.) Although this section and the women who participated in it were “tokens,” nevertheless, they had an opportunity for participation that previously had been denied them.

CONCLUSION

In the Introduction, a series of questions were raised concerning the forms and patterns of discrimination against women in the ASA during its early years. All of these have been answered, at least partially. Briefly, the information provided can be summarized.

How and why did men keep women out of the ASA?

The women generally were limited in academic employment to women's colleges. In academia, they were second-class citizens. The early founders, especially Small, believed that this was fair because women belonged in a “separate sphere.” Women such as Jane Addams, who worked in social settlements, were doing “applied sociology” and were colleagues doing necessary, but different, work. The women rarely were asked to participate in the organizational structure of ASA, but those who did were affiliated with this separate “women's network.”

The exclusion of female sociologists from the section on sociology and social work illustrates extreme sexism. In this specialized area, women were by far the more numerous representatives, the more prestigious leaders, and the more logical choice for committee members and section leadership. The attitudes of the male sociologists toward this female-dominated profession also reveal the condescension they felt concerning this subject matter.

Who were the women who did participate despite these barriers?

The women who were active in the ASA generally were those who studied the topics of poverty, immigration, juvenile delinquency, and the family. Some of these women also were elected to positions on the executive committee.

On at least one occasion (Balch's address in 1915 on War and Militarism) a woman was a controversial speaker, and the difficulty in obtaining male discussants revealed the depths of antagonism both to her topic and her gender. Dummer's participation as a section organizer for the family provides evidence not only of a woman who worked on an acceptable female subject, touching her “special sphere” of expertise, but also that inclusion of women within the institutional structure helped establish a less sexist pattern for future participants.

As stated in the Introduction, to know that the ASA was intrinsically sexist is not enough. Instead, there was a complicated

pattern that occasionally allowed women entry within their "special spheres" of competence. In addition, there were some attempts to bring women into the hierarchy due either to respect for their work, as was the case with Balch and Addams, or due to their special administrative and financial powers, such as Dummer's. Deliberate ostracism of women and chauvinism probably could be documented with further searches of archives, written accounts, and interviews. This needs to be done, but even without this additional work it is evident that women did struggle and sometimes succeeded in participating in the early years of the profession, and that institutionalized patterns of sexism are the most invidious and difficult to destroy.

REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan
1973 "Women and social stratification: A case of intellectual sexism." *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (January):936-954.
- The Addams Papers
Hull House, Chicago: University of Illinois-Chicago Circle.
- The Addams Papers
Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore, PA: Swarthmore College.
- Addams, Jane
1910 *Twenty Years at Hull House*. New York: Macmillan.
1912 "Recreation as a public function in urban communities." *American Journal of Sociology* 17 (March):615-619.
1930 *The Second Twenty Years at Hull House: September 1909 to September 1929*. New York: Macmillan.
1935 *My Friend Julia Lathrop*. New York: Macmillan.
- Addams, Jane, Emily G. Balch, and Alice Hamilton
1915 *Women at the Hague, The International Congress of Women and Its Results*. New York: Macmillan.
- The Balch Papers
Swarthmore College Peace Collection, Swarthmore, PA: Swarthmore College.
- Balch, Emily G.
1893 *Public Assistance of the Poor in France*. Baltimore: Guggenheimer, Weil, & Co.
1910 *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens*. New York: Charities Publication Committee.
1927 *Occupied Haiti*. New York: The Writers Publishing Co.
- Bernard, Jessie
1964 *Academic Women*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Burgess, Ernest W.
1923 "The interdependence of sociology and social work." *Journal of Social Forces* 1 (May):336-370.
- Chubin, Daryl
1974 "Sociological manpower and woman power: Sex differences patterns of two cohorts of American doctorate sociologists." *The American Sociologist* 9 (May):83-92.
- Davis, Allen F.
1973 *American Heroine: The Life and Legend of Jane Addams*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Davis, Ann E.
1969 "Women as a minority group in higher academics." *The American Sociologist* 4 (May):95-99.
- Deegan, Mary Jo
1978 "Women in sociology: 1890-1920." *Journal of the History of Sociology* 1 (Fall):11-34.
1979 Entries on "Edith Abbott," pp. 3-5; "Emily Green Balch," pp. 96-98; and "Sophonisba Breckinridge," pp. 219-223 in *American Women Writers, Vol. 1*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Company.
- Forth-
"Sociology at Wellesley College, 1900-coming 1919." *Journal of the History of Sociology*.
- Deegan, Mary Jo and John S. Burger
1978 "George Herbert Mead and social reform: His work and writings." *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences* 14 (October):362-372.
- Forth-
"W. I. Thomas and social reform: His work coming and writings." *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 16 (January).
- The Dummer Papers
Schlesinger Library, Boston, MA: Radcliffe College.
- Eliot, Thomas D.
1922 Discussant in "Summary of Discussion" of the round table on sociology and social work, Frank D. Watson (ed.), *Publications of the American Sociological Society* 16:241-242.
- Farrell, John C.
1967 *Beloved Lady: A History of Jane Addams' Ideas on Reform and Peace*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.
- Fava, Sylvia F.
1960 "The status of women in professional sociology." *American Sociological Review* 25 (April):271-272.
- Gillin, John L.
1923 "The Tufts report on education and training for social work." *Publications of the American Sociological Society* 17:200-207.
- Gilman, Charlotte P.
1911 *The Man-Made World, or, Our Androcentric Culture*. New York: Chartton Co.
- Hertzler, Joyce O.
1979 "A history of sociology at the University of Nebraska," Mary Jo Deegan (ed.). *Journal of the History of Sociology* 2:41-62.
- Hughes, Helen
1972 "Maid of all work or departmental sister-in-law? The faculty wife employed on campus." *American Journal of Sociology* 78 (January):767-772.

- 1973 *The Status of Women in Sociology, 1968–1972* (ed.). Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- 1975 "Women in academic sociology, 1925–75." *Sociological Focus* 8 (August):215–222.
- Kanter, Rosabeth M.
1977 *Men and Women on the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Karpf, Maurice J.
1926 "The development of the relation between sociology and social work." *Publications of the American Sociological Society* 17:200–207.
- Kraditor, Aileen S. (ed.)
1970 *Up from the Pedestal: Selected Writings in the History of American Feminism*. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.
- Lasch, Christopher (ed.)
1965 *The Social Thought of Jane Addams*. The American Heritage Series, Leonard W. Levy and Alfred Young (eds.). New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Levine, Daniel
1971 *Jane Addams and the Liberal Tradition*. Madison: Wisconsin State Historical Society.
- Mills, C. Wright
1964 *Sociology and Pragmatism, The Higher Learning in America*. Ed. and Intro. by Irving Louis Horowitz. New York: Paine-Whitman Publishers.
- Publications of the American Sociological Society
1906- Annual Volumes. Chicago: University of
1931 Chicago Press.
- Randall, Mercedes M.
1964 *Improper Bostonian: Emily Greene Balch, Nobel Peace Laureates in 1946*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- The Ross Papers
Madison: Wisconsin State Historical Society.
- Rossi, Alice S. and Ann Calderwood (eds.)
1973 *Academic Women on the Move*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Schwendinger, Herman and Julia R. Schwendinger
1974 *The Sociologists of the Chair: A Radical Analysis of the Formative Years of North American Sociology (1883–1922)*. New York: Basic Books.
- Small, Albion W.
1902 "The social mission of college women." *The Independent* 54 (30 January):261–266.
1903 "Coeducation at the University of Chicago." *Proceedings of the National Education Association*:265–296.
- The Graham Taylor Papers
Chicago: Newberry Library.
- Thomas, W. I.
1923 *The Unadjusted Girl: With Cases and Standpoint for Behavior Analysis*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Thomas, W. I. and Florian Znaniecki
1918- *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*,
1920 5 Volumes. Boston: Richard G. Badger.
- Ward, Lester F.
1888 "Our better halves." *Forum* 6 (November):266–275.
- Wilkinson, Doris
1979 "A report: Status of women in sociology, 1934–1977." *ASA Footnotes* 7 (March):4–6.

MANUSCRIPTS FOR THE ASA ROSE SOCIOLOGY SERIES

Manuscripts (100 to 300 typed pages) are solicited for publication in the *ASA Arnold and Caroline Rose Monograph Series*. The Series welcomes a variety of types of sociological work—qualitative or quantitative empirical studies, and theoretical or methodological treatises. An author should submit three copies of a manuscript for consideration to the Series Editor, Professor Suzanne Keller, Department of Sociology, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08540.