

sociological journals (including the first volume of the *American Journal of Sociology*), self-defined as a sociologist, and been accepted by others as a sociologist. With this argument, Deegan paved the way for a revision of the history of American sociology to include contributions by women and began a feminist revolution in the discipline’s historiography (see, e.g., Hoecker-Drysdale 1992, Lengermann and Niebrugge 1998, MacDonald 1994).

Deegan remains the most productive scholar in this continuing revolution. Following the Addams study, she edited and wrote many of the entries in *Women in Sociology: A Bio-Bibliographical Sourcebook* (1991). With Michael R. Hill, she recovered Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s writings from *The Forerunner*, Gilman’s self-published journal, including *With Her in Ourland*, Gilman’s sequel to *Herland* and a work of enormous interest to scholars of Gilman’s sociology. In some 13 volumes of both original research and edited collections and close to one hundred articles, she has continued as the leader of what is now a scholarly community working on expanding the sociological canon to include an ever-growing list of significant early women sociologists.
With the MacLean study Deegan faces a different challenge—here the issue is not whether MacLean is a sociologist but rather what her significance is for the history of the discipline.

In meeting this challenge, Deegan relies on three qualities honed in four decades of advocating for the women founders of sociology: a steely determination never to waver in her project; a talent for searching out all the data, including the most obscure details about these hitherto forgotten women in little-known as well as renowned archives and from widely dispersed, often out-of-print documents; and the ability to create, in her patterning of these data, a portrait of sociology as a social enterprise consisting of multiple actors in many, diverse groupings and relationships held together over the generations chiefly by a belief in sociology.

All these qualities are visible in the MacLean study to an almost overwhelming degree. We offer five guides to help readers pattern the flood of data Deegan gives readers about Annie Marion MacLean, a native of Prince Edward Island who earned her BA and first MA at Acadia University. The first guidepost is that when MacLean arrived in the United States in 1896 to pursue graduate study in sociology at the University of Chicago, she moved into a discipline very different from what it would become over the course of her subsequent career. In the last two decades of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth, the period when MacLean was doing her major work, American sociology was being invented; and what we now take for granted as the material conditions of being a sociologist—credentialing through academic degrees, employment as a professor, publication in disciplinary journals, and use of specialized vocabulary—were only one possibility among many—a possibility that MacLean helped realize.

In 1896, American sociology was practiced in three major locations that overlapped in the problems they addressed: (1) voluntary citizens’ organizations, (2) colleges and universities, where the first graduate program had just been started at Chicago in 1893, and (3) the social settlements, a social invention taken from England’s Toynbee Hall that attempted to bridge class differences by having privileged-class young people live among the working poor (see Lengermann and Niebrugge 2007). MacLean would establish links to all three sites. While earning her MA in sociology in 1897 (as the first woman to do so) and after her PhD in 1900 (the second of Chicago’s woman PhDs), she held academic appointments at McGill University (1899 to 1900), Stetson University (1900 to ca. 1902), Adelphi College (1906 to 1916), and the University of Chicago Extension Education Division (1903 to 1934). She established ties with settlement sociologists both in Chicago and New York City, taking from them a passion for pursuing social reform through social research on behalf of society’s disempowered groups. In this work, she was frequently supported by voluntary associations like the Illinois Consumers’ League, the Association of Collegiate Alumnae (precursor to today’s AAUW), the YWCA, and groups within the era’s powerful women’s club movement. But MacLean’s linkages to these sites was not necessarily pioneering—she represents a picture of what sociology was in turn-of-the-century America.

A second guidepost is to remember that despite MacLean’s movement through this diverse sociological landscape, she always identified with and committed herself to the academy as the primary site for sociology and to the central power in that site, the Chicago Department of Sociology. (Except for one summer in New York, by our reading of Deegan’s account, MacLean was never a settlement resident.) With both an MA and a PhD earned there, she was among the most formally educated in sociology of the early women sociologists. She published more than any other woman in the American Journal of Sociology, some nine articles beginning with a version of her MA thesis, “Factory Legislation for Women in the United States” (1897). (This record should be seen in the light that the AJS, begun in 1895, was still a fledgling publication whose editor, Albion Small, often used work by promising graduate students to fill an issue.) MacLean maintained close ties to the Chicago department through three men—Charles Henderson, Charles Zueblin, and Small—with all of whom she shared a common faith as American Baptists and with Small a chain of interlocking marriages.
(Small’s daughter and MacLean’s brother had married siblings from the same prominent Chicago family).

Deegan argues that MacLean’s loyalty to the men of the Chicago department brought her little in return, blaming intense gender bias for what she sees as MacLean’s marginalization in the academy. The situation may, however, be more nuanced than that. MacLean may not have been the object of misogynistic hostility so much as the recipient of Chicago’s paternalistic, Edwardian-era protections: recommendations for jobs at lesser institutions or lesser branches of the University (i.e., the Extension Division); opportunities to publish in *AJS*, have her work reviewed there, and be an occasional reviewer; invitations to contribute to volumes in series edited by these senior men (e.g., Henderson’s *Modern Methods of Charity* [1904]) and to serve as a discussant at the annual meeting of sociologists; and advice from them in her research work, notably her large-scale survey of women’s employment that culminated in the important *Wage-Earning Women* (1910). She was, as it were, the “daughter of the Department,” rewarded with some attention in exchange for her uncritical loyalty but never viewed as an equal to male sociologists trained by the Department. It was gender bias, but subtle rather than blatant, and coming at a moment when men for really the first time were being asked in any way to look upon women as professional colleagues—and Deegan argues that MacLean in some ways shared their understanding of “separate spheres.”

A third guidepost is to understand MacLean’s achievements as those of a researcher, a creative innovator of data-gathering strategies: participant observation, ethnography, ethno-autobiography, statistical compilation, mapping, document analysis, large-scale social surveys—some 1300 respondents in 20 occupations in the fieldwork for *Wage-Earning Women*. She was really fearless in this regard. Unhindered by an established rulebook of approved data-gathering strategies, she launched herself into investigating any topic she wished to understand, seemingly inventing her methods as she went along and leaving them for later researchers to name and codify. (Deegan includes excerpts from 26 of MacLean’s publications in this study, as well as an impressively lengthy bibliography of her work.) Three threads tie much of this research together: a central concern with the lives and work of women in society; an embrace of the reformist goals of Progressivism of her time; and as a means to that reform, a belief that the sociologist’s research should be used to inform the public, both through clarity in presenting one’s findings and in commentary in popular publications like *Vogue* and *The Chicago Evening Post* (Deegan, Appendix D). In none of these qualities, however, was MacLean, though innovative, unique—issues of data collection were widely considered “women’s work” in this period; nor was her research anchored in a distinctive social theory, and a focus on women by women sociologists dated back to Harriet Martineau.

A fourth guidepost is to use Deegan’s account of MacLean’s life as a way to grasp the range and depth of the Progressive networks in her day, networks often of women’s groups or women-led groupings, and of their practice of sociology. Deegan’s tracing of MacLean’s activities between 1897 and 1916 gives the reader a window on, by our count, some 23 such organizations in these networks for whom MacLean sometimes worked, before whom she often spoke, and for whose self-sponsored publications she frequently wrote. Indeed, one pleasure in reading this book is the glimpses it offers of this dynamic and interconnected world of groups of mobilized Progressive women and men who collectively by action and writing laid the groundwork for the safety net of welfare legislation ushered in by Franklin Roosevelt’s New Deal and completed by Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society.

A fifth guidepost is to divide MacLean’s career into two broad periods: the twenty years following her arrival in Chicago when she maintained a frenetic pace of study, research, writing, teaching and professional networking, often holding three teaching positions at once; and the period beginning in 1911, when she was painfully debilitated by rheumatoid arthritis, with 1916 as a watershed year in which she seems to have come to terms with a situation of increasing invalidism. Yet supported by her family, MacLean between 1916 and 1930 managed a pace of
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work that many healthy people would find daunting, including teaching by correspondence through the University of Chicago’s Extension Division, articles in the *AJS* (four between 1915 and 1930), and two lively studies in the sociology of illness and medicine: *Mary Ann’s Malady: Fragmentary Papers Dealing with a Woman and Rheumatism* (1914) and *Cheero* (1918), in which MacLean analyzes her own experience of illness and the medical profession with what Deegan calls an experiential method, give us some of her best sociological writing and tell much of the defiant spirit with which she faced her failing powers. In 1934 the *AJS* marked her death with a short obituary. Annie Marion MacLean, like so many of the women sociologists of her era, disappeared from the collective memory of the profession, until in this new study Deegan reintroduces her for our evaluation.

Deegan gives the reader such a rich supply of hard-won information that it seems rank ingratitude to call attention to the problems in the study, many of which seem to stem from the mass of data itself, partly a product of Deegan’s encyclopedic knowledge of the subject. This heft makes the choice of organization both critical and difficult. The account might be more accessible if Deegan had maintained the chronological organization that she abandons at the end of Chapter Two, about 1906 in MacLean’s life. Instead, she shifts to presenting MacLean using a complex schema of several parts: one, MacLean’s research subjects (women’s work, race relations, disability); two, Deegan’s particular patterning of the history of the period, which divides into two themes: one, gender division and discrimination at the University of Chicago and two, the development of a sociology by women at Hull House and the University, which Deegan here, as elsewhere, names “feminist pragmatism.” This organizational complexity produces considerable repetition with the same subjects treated in much the same way at some length under three different rubrics.

More detrimental to the book’s project is the presence of overstatements or incomplete presentations of evidence. These tend to err in one direction, exaggerating the case for MacLean’s connections with major people and events. Deegan describes MacLean as “a pivotal figure in American sociology” (p. 57), “one of the most brilliant sociologists in the world” (p. 67), “recognized as one of the most outstanding intellectuals of her generation” (p. 230), and as “integral” to the network around Hull House and the University of Chicago Women “who led hundreds of thousands of Americans . . . in the formation of the ‘feminist pragmatist welfare state’” (p. 88). But despite the evidence she gives, Deegan does not substantiate these claims. What the evidence does make clear is that MacLean was a worthy and energetic contributor to the development of both sociology and the general Progressive movement. But by suggesting that MacLean was so much more, Deegan does a disservice to her subject’s real achievements, making them seem insignificant in comparison to what is claimed.

Finally, Deegan was not well served by her press, whose editors left uncorrected many errors in both citation and syntax. These problems are troubling in part because one comes to Deegan’s work with such high respect for the achievement she and her frequent co-author and life partner, Michael R. Hill, have made to the history of women in sociology (Deegan’s preface is worth reading in this regard for the elegantly understated tribute she pays to him).

Despite these problems, *Annie Marion MacLean and the Chicago Schools of Sociology* is a substantial contribution to the project Deegan began with *Jane Addams and the Men of the Chicago School*. That volume marks its thirtieth anniversary in 2018, an event that should be commemorated in the historiography of American sociology.
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*Everyday Troubles* is the long-awaited synthesis of several decades of research by Robert Emerson and colleagues. The focus on troubles is a classic one in Garfinkel’s ethnomethodology. Emerson’s design is more in the Goffman and Jack Katz style of microethnography, and Emerson builds his own theoretical frame, driven to a considerable extent by the effort to organize his extensive empirical materials. These include reports and diaries by students on roommate troubles and on neighbor troubles, disputes between intimate couples (married or cohabiting), plus Emerson’s own field work on families with Alzheimer’s patients and on psychiatric emergency teams. These are bolstered by cases from the sociological literature, especially on living with alcoholics.

What sort of troubles are these? The biggest set comes from people sharing a common living space: issues of messiness versus tidiness in the kitchen and bathroom, amount of noise versus quiet (talking, TV and music versus studying and sleeping), hogging the bathroom or the storage space. Neighbors chiefly dispute about noise from music, parties, dogs, and sometimes construction work. Intimate partners have the same issues (plus a few more like how hot or cold their bedroom should be, and how much they hog the blankets), but also their disputes are constrained by their commitment to each other and not just by appeals to politeness or “normal” standards. In a class by themselves are troubles distinctive to roommates, such as using the other roommate’s bed for sex, or exiling the roommate from a shared bedroom while a sexual partner stays over (in today’s parlance, being “sexiled”). Also roommates get into intimate property disputes over wearing the other person’s clothes and jewels, using their cosmetics, eating up their food, and appropriating/stealing their property.

Emerson’s data are heavily weighted toward females and ostensibly middle-class whites. He is not interested in correlations, but he does point out that although the