75th Anniversary

Sociologists Form ‘Separate, Independent’ Society

By Lawrence J. Rhodes

At 5:30 p.m., Wednesday, December 27, 1905, some forty to fifty “specialists in sociology” from twenty-one educational institutions and a dozen organizations engaged in practical sociological work gathered in McCoy Hall at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore. They had responded to an invitation that begun that summer by C. W. A. Vedtz, George Washington University, to determine “the desirability and feasibility of forming some sort of an organization of sociologists.” Vedtz began the discussion of that possibility by writing to “a number of the well-known sociologists of the United States” including Albion W. Small, University of Chicago; E. A. Ross, University of Nebraska; Lester F. Ward, Washington, D.C.; Simon N. Paten and Samuel M. Lindsey, University of Pennsylvania, and Thomas N. Carter, Harvard University.

Responses were favorable to the establishment of an organization, but divided on whether the organization should be “separate and independent” or part of an existing organization such as the American Economics Association (AEA) or the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Initial Responses

Small wrote, “The formation of a sociological association has been suggested by a number of sociologically inclined people in this region, and I should certainly be glad to cooperate most heartily in any plan which may seem feasible. The main thing is getting together for free threshing out of ideas of common interest.”

He continued, “Whether we should throw logic to the winds and organize a section of the Economic Association, simply for the practical reason that most of us are members of that body, and in general would prefer concentration of interests rather than division; or whether we should organize a parallel society like the Historical or the Political Science Association, or whether we should disregard the elder societies altogether—these questions of detail about which I

Editor’s Note

This is the first of a series of articles on the history of the American Sociological Association that will appear in FOOTNOTES during this 75th Anniversary year. The article in this issue is based on the “official report” of the organization of the American Sociological Society which was published in the American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 17.

NSF Sociology Program Awards 72 Grants in FY ’79

Seventy-two grants totaling $3,575,762 were made by the Sociology Program of the National Science Foundation during fiscal year 1979.

Included in the total number of grants were 61 for basic research; 5 for doctoral dissertations; 3 for conferences; 1 for the General Social Survey, and 1 for scientific equipment. The duration of the grants runs from 8 to 27 months.

Basic Research

Sociologists receiving research grants, their institutional affiliations, project titles and award amounts follow:


Philip Benacich and Oscar Gruzky, UCLA, “The Role of Children in Family Coalition Formation,” $7,703.

James R. Khuegi and Eliot Smith, University of California-Riverside, “Americans’ Beliefs about Inequality,” $11,544.

Barbara Laslett, University of Southern California, “Demographic and Economic Determinants of Family Form and Function,” $56,511.


ASA Projects Invited Participation in Teaching Month Observance

An invitation has been extended by the ASA Projects on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology to members of the profession, their departments and their institutions to participate in April: Sociology Teaching Month.”

Hans O. Mauksh, Projects Director, said, “The observance of April as Sociology Teaching Month gives sociology the opportunity to demonstrate to its own members, to colleagues in other disciplines, and to educational administrators that our discipline has made a commitment to teaching, has developed curricula and programs to improve teaching, and is willing to demonstrate and to share its achievements.”

To facilitate widespread participation in the observance, the ASA Projects have developed a range of proposed activities for the special event. A list (presented below) is not considered exhaustive, so additional suggestions are invited.

Some of the activities will be carried out by the ASA Projects, some will be conducted by the ASA Section on Undergraduate Education, and some will become part of the programs of regional and state sociological associations.

Mauksh said, “Many programs, however, will need to be initiated by the membership, particularly by departments and institutions.”

Individuals or departments who wish to participate in the proposed activities or make additional suggestions should write to: Hans O. Mauksh, Department of Family & Community Medicine, TDD-West, Medical Center, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65212.

Proposed Activities

National Program of Training Workshops: Sponsored by the ASA Teacher Development Project, this program of 10 regional teacher development workshops was initially described in the December issue of FOOTNOTES. A revised listing of these workshops appears elsewhere in this issue.

Thematic Mini-Workshops: Sponsored and organized by the ASA Section on Undergraduate Education, these programs will take place at various institutions throughout the country. The mini-workshops will last from three to five hours, focus on a single topic, and be conducted by sociologists who have expertise on the topic. Additional information on the mini-workshops will be announced in the February issue of FOOTNOTES.

Departmental Programs: Individual departments are encouraged to take the initiative and plan a teaching program for their own staff and—whenever applicable—for their own graduate students. Such programs could be a retreat devoted to either teaching, curriculum, or departmental and institutional conditions affecting teaching. The program could also be a departmental workshop built around a visiting speaker. Resources and assistance in planning for such events are available from the Projects.

Inter-institutional Programs: This activity includes cooperatively planned programs between several area departments or divisions. Joint activities could focus on such widely shared issues as the first sociology course, the utilization of teaching resources, and the lower division curriculum. This activity could bring together sociology faculty from widely different institutions and develop bases for exchange and cooperation.

Important Documents

ASA members are urged to carefully read and comment on the following two important documents that are published in this issue:

1. The proposed ASA Code of Professional Ethics (see pp. 6-7).
2. The statement on Sexist Bias in Sociological Research, Problems and Issues (see pp. 8-9).
Strategy Proposed for Preserving Research Excellence thru Year 2000

by Lawrence J. Rhoads

A strategy for preserving the continuity and vitality of American social science is needed in order to ensure that research and education will continue through the year 2000 under conditions of limited growth and "roller-coaster" demographics that has been recommended by the National Science Foundation by a committee of the National Research Council.

The strategy addresses four areas of concern related to the maintenance of research excellence:

1. The flow of new young scholars into academic research;
2. The vitality and productivity of established faculty;
3. The contributions of universities and colleges other than major research producers; and
4. The need for improved data and monitoring of the PhD labor force.

The strategy is an outgrowth of a study conducted by the Committee on Continuity in Academic Research Performance to determine the impact "recent and anticipated trends and declines" in university openings for new faculty may have on "the vigor and effectiveness of the academic research enterprise."

New faculty are persons who are no more than seven years beyond their PhDs. The study was funded by NSF.

The key feature of the strategy is the establishment of a program for Research Excellence Awards by NSF alone or in concert with other federal agencies in 1981 "to ensure an adequate flow of new faculty in research universities and to foster the research efforts of outstanding present faculty."

The IRA program would offer five-year, non-renewable awards for tenured or non-tenured faculty members nominated by their department. Awards would provide partial salary support including summer support for research time to award recipients.

The employing university would be required to commit itself to devote funds freed by these awards to the hiring of additional faculty in the recipient's department.

The program would start immediately in physics and mathematics within fields added as "serious hiring shortfalls" became evident. The program is not likely to impact the social sciences until late 1981 due to the social sciences are better off in the near term on the following criteria: (1) ratio of current to total doctoral faculty; (2) ratio of full-time faculty aged greater than 50 to total full-time faculty; (3) annual rate of change in ratio of recent to total doctoral faculty; and (4) annual rate of change in total doctoral faculty.

The IRA program cost is estimated to be $38.3 million dollars in 1979 assuming a 20-year period of operation.

Although the "new faculty" problem is the central component of the strategy, the Committee expanded the problem to include the three other areas because "a continuing flow of new young scholars into academic research is one essential component, but not the only one, in a strategy to keep academic science and engineering vital" and because "it is a misfortune to program that vitality can be equated in any simple way with youth."

Two sociologists served on the Committee: Donald J. Hernandez, SSRIC Center for Coordination of Research on Social Indicators, Washington; and Barbara F. Reaskin, Indiana University.

The rationale for this strategy is outlined in "Research Excellence Through the Year 2000: The Importance of Maintaining a Flow of New Faculty into Academic Research which is available from the Office of Publications, National Academy of Science, 2100 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20418 for $9.00 prepaid."

New Faculty

The Committee concluded that the nation's research effort is likely to be damaged by "the expected constriction in the flow of new faculty" unless it is counted for three reasons:

1. The rate of research innovation, the inflow of new ideas, and the vitality of the research environment will be impaired;
2. Continuity in the education and socialization of succeeding generations of researchers will be threatened; and
3. The perceived lack of opportunities for an academic career may discourage able and creative young people from pursuing careers in basic scientific research.

The Committee based these conclusions on "the experience and judgment of its members;" responses from professional societies, and published analyses on the role of young people in research because it was unable to find "extensive quantitative evidence to support" its analysis.

Established Faculty

Another component of the strategy is programs directed toward established scientists because "productivity should be maximized at all ages."

The Committee said, "It seems only sensible to provide additional avenues for learning and stimulation for established scientists, especially at a time when the flow of new people into academia is diminishing."

The Committee urged NSF to continue to support research studies, special workshops and research conferences to "encourage the academic community to take full advantage of the special skills, knowledge, and perspectives that result from experience that only comes from age."

The Committee further stated that "it is vital that senior faculty be encouraged to contribute to the dissemination of innovation and cross-fertilization that have often come from established faculty."

Toward this end the Committee recommended that NSF launch "a small scale experimental program of Career Transition Awards...to provide partial support for one year for senior faculty members who wish to make a major change in the direction of their research or in the nature of their professional activities."

Non-major Producers

The Committee expressed concern about universities and colleges other than major research producers because "many institutions which do not make major direct contributions to the research effort perform tasks which are important to American science and engineering."

Among the tasks performed by these institutions are (1) encouraging young people to enter scientific careers; (2) playing a significant role in the dissemination of scientific results; (3) identifying faculty who develop great research ability "late" in their careers; and (4) the training of minority and women PhDs.

See Better Page 5

Karl F. Schuessler, Editor
SOCIOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY 1980
Sociological Methodology's ongoing effort to keep pace with contemporary sociological trends continues in this 1980 yearbook, which reveals a number of current concerns among social researchers. This volume, the eleventh in a series sponsored by the American Sociological Association, makes apparent the increasing importance sociologists attach to research methodology, theoretical validity, and methodological precision. New safeguards against potential biases have in turn produced a wealth of improved methods of social analysis. Some of the more popular include:

- sociological applications of Bayesian inference methods (until recently these methods, incorporating conditional probabilities, have been used principally in psychology and mathematics);
- increased concern with objectivity in testing (several chapters point out times when investigators' judgments can affect their data);
- incorporation of demographic approaches (the authors evaluate new methods of estimating future social probabilities);
- heightened interest in measuring the effects of social interventions (the volume presents new statistical methods for assessing effects of social actions);
- improved safeguards against distortions in survey responses (the authors propose ways to reduce errors in questions on such topics as sex, mental illness, or drugs).

This volume is the longest (600 pages) to date in the Sociological Methodology series and contains 130 tables, graphs, and charts. The eighteen chapters, written expressly for the 1980 yearbook, effectively reflect the range and sophistication of sociological methodology today.

January 1980, $27.50*

*Available to individual ASA members at the special prepaid price of $22.00 for orders postmarked no later than January 31, 1980 (payment must accompany order to receive discount).

John A. Centra
DETERMINING FACULTY EFFECTIVENESS
Assessing Teaching, Research, and Service for Personnel Decisions and Improvement

Faculty evaluation is essential in assuring fairness in personnel decisions and improving faculty performance. However, until now little has been known about the validity and reliability of even the most widely used evaluation techniques. To remedy this deficiency, John Centra draws on fifteen years of research to provide the first authoritative, fact-based guide to evaluating faculty teaching, research, student advising, and public service.

On the basis of a synthesis of evidence from the major studies in each area, Centra (1) analyzes the uses and limitations of different approaches to the assessment of teaching— including student ratings, instructor self-appraisals, evaluations by colleagues, and objective tests of student learning; (2) points out the strengths and drawbacks of various measures of quality in research, advising, and public service; (3) explains who ought to do what in the evaluation process; and (4) shows how evaluation information from different sources can best be combined to facilitate decision making.

Throughout the book, Centra supplies examples of the best in standards and procedures currently in use. Included are checklists and guidelines for analyzing classroom instruction, evaluating faculty publications, collecting students' assessments of their teachers and advisors, and determining an overall performance rating for any faculty member. Centra also reviews court decisions and legal principles that should be considered in setting evaluation criteria and making personnel decisions.

December 1979, $12.95

Free copies are not available.

433 California Street • JOSSEY-BASS INC., PUBLISHERS • San Francisco 94104
Sociologists Named to Peace Commission

President Jimmy Carter completed the formation of the nine-member Commission on Proposals for the National Academy of Peace and Conflict Resolutions in December by appointing its final three members, including two sociologists.

The Commission has responsibility for determining whether a NATO bombing of Libya, a bilateral self-defense operation. The Peace Commission will now hold public hearings throughout S. before preparing its report.

The Commission is composed of three persons appointed by the President as follows: Senator Warren Magnuson (D., Washington, President Pro Tem of the Senate, and three ap- pellate judges. The judges are: Robert H. G. Thomas P. O’Neill (D., Massachussetts), Speaker of the House; Edward J. Boland, D., Massachusetts; Elise Boulding, Dartmouth College; James H. Laue, Director of the Center for Metropolitan Education; John W. St. Louis; and Arthur H. Barnes, President of the New York Urban Coalition and Vice President of the Institute for Cultural and International Peace. The Commission will hold public hearings throughout S. before preparing its report.

Some $600,000 is available this fiscal year for basic research on or- ganizational processes in elementary and secondary schools and school districts through the Program on Educational Policy and Organization.

Health Service System Research Program Started

A new grant program in mental health services research that will emphasize quantitative oriented studies initially in five core areas was announced by the Division of Biometry and Epidemiology, NIH, for the fiscal year 1980.

Proposals are received at NIH throughout the year, and are held for review cycles which begin every third Thursday. Deadlines for review cycles remaining in this fiscal year are April 14 and August 18.

The program announcement and the application form may be obtained from: Gail MacColl, Pro- gram on Educational Policy and Organization, NIH, Mail Stop 16, Room 25, Bethesda 20205. Phone: (301) 254-7930.

Nominations

This biennial award was created to honor the intellectual achievements and contributions of W. E. Dubois, Charles S. Johnson, and E. Franklin Frazier. It will be made either to sociologists for outstanding contributions in the tradition of W. E. Dubois or to women of the academic institution for its work in the development of the discipline in the same tradition. It is not intended to be an award for a single book. Send nominations to the Executive Office, 416 Massapage Avenue, Shad- ma, MA, 02070. Material supporting the nomination must be at the Executive Office.
NEH Announces Summer Seminars for College Teachers

One hundred and twenty seminars, including two by sociologists, will be sponsored by the National Endowment for the Humanities this summer for undergraduates and two-year college teachers.

The Summer Seminars for College Teachers program is sponsored by NEH to provide opportunities for faculty at two-year colleges to work with distinguished scholars at institutions with library collections suitable for advanced research.

Twelve teachers will be selected to attend each seminar, and participants will receive a stipend of $2,500 to cover travel expenses to and from the seminar location, books and other responses, and living expenses.

Teachers interested in applying to a seminar should write to the director of the seminar for detailed information and for application materials. Deadline is April 1. To be eligible applicants must have completed at least one year of professorial training by the deadline date.

Chair Workshop Initiates Effort to Start Newsletter

An effort to establish a newsletter for chairs of sociology departments is underway as a result of the second workshop for chairs held by NEH Alternatives on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology last November in Dallas.

Hans O. Mauskopf, Project Director, said that the workshop indicated that further activities with and by chairs is in order.

The workshop included discussion in the development of the newsletter or in Project plans for additional activities related to chairs should contact: Royde Branch, Director, Department of Family & Community Medicine, TD3-West, Medical Center, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65212

Since it is the norm of the academic community to consider being a chair as something that ought to be done, Hans O. Mauskopf said, we are not only concerned with assisting the chair in doing his or her uto in teaching but also in finding more gratification and significance in the role of the chair.

Second Workshop

Thirty-four chairs from community colleges, four-year colleges, and universities in the United States and Canada attended the workshop. The chairs represented departments ranging in size from two to thirty-five faculty members.

Topics ranged from institutional resources and constraints to such issues as faculty motivation, curriculum evaluation and planning, and the chair’s role in relating to faculty, to students, to other administrators, and to the profession.

One chair observed, Many shies were discussed and were not necessarily new but by bringing them out in the open and by considering them in context we are able to go back and deal with the same issues more deliberately and systematically.

The workshop staff included Peter Bishop, University of Houston-Clear Lake City; Lee Bowker, Beloit College, Wisconsin; Phyllis Brown, Boston College; Fred Campbell, University of Wisconsin; Kathleen Crittenden, University of Illinois-Chicago Circle; Hans Mauskopf, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; and the two workshop coordinators, Betty Maynard, Southern Methodist University and Nancy Saunders, San Antonio College. Lawrence J. Rhoades, ASA Executive Associate, also participated in the program.

Teaching Session Activities Suggested

A revised listing of the ten teacher development workshops which will be held as part of the 1979 Teaching Sociology Month has been announced by the ASA Projects on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology.

April 18-19

Location: Gainesville, Florida

Coordinator: John Schnabel, Department of Sociology, University of Florida.

April 25-26

Location: New York, New York

Coordinator: Audrey Meyer, Department of Sociology, Institute of Technology, 227 West 27th Street, New York, NY 10010.

Location: Cleveland, Ohio

Coordinator: John Schnabel, Department of Sociology, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio 44106.

Location: Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Coordinator: William Mayr, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI 53201.

Location: Kansas City, Missouri

Coordinator: Tim Diamond, Department of Sociology, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65212.

In a significant demonstration by sociologists and sociology departments, the Scholarship and competence in the teaching process is taken seriously and is deemed worthy of recognition.
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Commems Comment On Nomads

I am a member of ASA and received the November 1998 issue of ASAFOOTNOTES today. I wish to commend J. Allen Whitt and Charles Derber for their excellent essays on the Nomads, though I have not read them as thoroughly as I would like to. I was one of those professional nomads who write all my papers on my laptop while sitting in the sun, or from a car, or from a train, or from a plane, or from a beach, or from a bar, or from a cafeteria, or from a hotel lobby, or from a coffee shop, or from a friend's house. I was also a member of the ASA nomad community, and I am glad to see that it is growing.

I am a member of ASA and received the November 1998 issue of ASAFOOTNOTES today. I wish to commend J. Allen Whitt and Charles Derber for their excellent essays on the Nomads, though I have not read them as thoroughly as I would like to. I was one of those professional nomads who write all my papers on my laptop while sitting in the sun, or from a car, or from a train, or from a plane, or from a beach, or from a bar, or from a cafeteria, or from a hotel lobby, or from a coffee shop, or from a friend's house. I was also a member of the ASA nomad community, and I am glad to see that it is growing.

Soc. Methodology Policies Outlined

Sociological Methodology, the ASA's yearly volume on methods, has a broad mandate: to provide comprehensive reviews and expository essays ranging over topics as diverse as the philosophy and methodology of sociological inquiry to the details of data collection devices at the micro- and macro-levels. Its editor, Margaret Slocum, has no page limitation. Thus, we can contemplate publishing a long manuscript when the topic addresses extended treatment. Additionally, the kind of type setting used by Jossey-Bass, Sociological Methodology's publisher, permits use of specialized symbolic representation when such is required for clarity and precision in presentation.

These, of course, are some of the features that readers have come to expect from this periodic. I would like to take a moment, however, to describe the policies that I intend to follow as editor of Sociological Methodology. Some of these represent continued development of policies introduced by earlier editors. Others are entirely new, and, therefore, need to be explained to the Association's membership.

I plan to alter Sociological Methodology in several ways. First, my own re- search experience with nomadic sociologists has convinced me that there are methods being developed and applied in other disciplines that we need to learn about. Second, I believe that sociologists, who are not commonly known in the discipline. Consequently, I am revising the selection process for manuscripts which can provide sociologists with introductions to these methods and present them with illustrative applications. Third, examples of methods developed outside of sociology which will be discussed in a future issue of Sociological Methodology are robust statistical methods, data smoothing and quantal regression theory. As seen from these examples, my idea of what qualifies as "sociological" methodology is broad, and I am quite willing to consider manuscripts which a more traditional view might rule out.

Second, I intend to make clear that this broad view of acceptable topics is not limited to quantitative approaches. To this end, I have asked the editor of the Journal of Quantitative Sociology to help ensure that manuscripts focusing on qualitative methods have only rarely appeared in Sociological Methodology. This has led some to believe that an editorial bias in favor of quantitative approaches exists. This is not true and in hopes of rectifying this situation I openly solicit submissions focusing on qualitative methods. Further, I suggest, should it be necessary, that a letter or two will receive and moderate comments on manuscripts I have been inherently eager to involve as many as is reasonable. I want to enlarge on the pedagogic and didactic role that Sociological Methodology plays. When sociologists have been at a loss and afoot in 1969 many authors of manuscripts on sociological and related issues had difficulty finding a home for their material in the major journals. Journal editors argued that the audience for these papers was small and space was at a premium. The situation is now markedly different. There has been a considerable development in the methodology of sociologists and as a consequence a sizable body of sociological research has been published. In addition, numerous journals have appeared with free-up space and a larger audience for opportunities for authors of technical manuscripts.

This means that Sociological Methodology is now no longer a periodic in which manuscripts on new sociological methods, models and applications appeared. Sociological Methodology can afford to provide space for material of a different nature, general methodological papers and more informal articles. Material that was too technical for a descriptive reviews of selected approaches. Here, again, I openly solicit comments as well as the opportunity to review manuscripts that address broad methodological issues. Sociological Methodology is also open to consist of reviews of available methods for handling particular data structures. Fourth, I believe that we should focus in future volumes. This does not mean that an entire volume will address only one theme. Rather, I hope to focus each volume around one or so distinct topics with an additional section of material of high quality which is not thematic. Themes for the 1981 volume, for example, include survey research, data analysis, computer models, networks, and robustness. Manuscripts on these topics are solicited although, as always, any manuscripts that have interest in seeing manuscripts on other topics as well, especially descriptions of innovative, novel methodological theories. Themes for the 1982 and 1983 volumes will be described in a future letter.

Finally, let me address the issue of timing of submissions. Sociological Methodology is published every other year. Because of the nature of the periodic, the size and production features of each volume transpires between acceptance of a manuscript and its appearance in print. In addition, I intend to work for this delay, however, is the high esteem and long life style that Sociological Methodology has. In view of the fact that we are the future, I am quite willing to consider manuscripts which are available longer, are used more extensively and by a more diverse audience than are the more frequent issues of other periodic, I am not aware of when I will aim to publish.

Graduate Student Comments on Faculty

I am encouraged to write this letter about my socialization experiences as a graduate student in the ASA. As a sensitive observation among problems in the discipline. My decision to leave sociology was based on a belief that it possessed an intellectual rigor that was buttressed by a commitment to social research. This approach was vastly in contrast to some other social sciences at the time I entered graduate school. While the numerous demands of methodological coursework, the professional advantages of sociological research, and the skills these has provided me with a foundation from which to pursue is interests, I am not without complaints about this training, rather the fact that such programs are understood to be nightingale students cannot be expected to do quality work. I have had difficulty understanding the process of socialization itself, since it has engendered such a deep distrust between myself and the students. I believe such training implies a sense of values that I fear is irreducible at this point. This distrust, and the subsequent democratization, stem from two factors.

First, my experience has convinced me that faculty do not necessarily engage in consistent patterns of behavior. When they are engaged in mental activity, they are engaged in teaching, but when they are engaged in social activity, they are engaged in socializing. If I have found my colleagues and I have given up. I have been forced to change the relationship to a student for another's personal and professional activities. Contact and communication between faculty and student are, under these circumstances, often ineffective and without such interaction, the creative impulses of those new to the field are stifled. This can lead to the use of computerized systems for exploring the worst of the worst, ideas are ephemeral, and it then becomes necessary to look back at the contributions of one person have been stifled but utilized, and appropriated to the benefit of some. However, extreme ambiguity and amorphousness of the intellectual process and the lack of an adequate codification of sociological faculty and student have terrible personal consequences.

There is an additional problem I have encountered in the socialization process. With the rapid accumulation of information and the development of methodological procedures in the past decade, the role of the faculty member, especially those trained twenty-five or thirty years ago, do not possess the knowledge base to provide the necessary guidance. However, since faculty are in positions of power, they do get to determine who shall pass and who shall fail. Some who do not actually are more knowledgeable than the faculty member. It is not simply a matter of concern to sociology, but is a problem in many disciplines. Yet it must be addressed.

We are a discipline in the full sense of the word, working relations between different departments and courses could be integral part of the socialization process. A recognition of the joint responsibility of all faculty in the overall development of both faculty and student would be openly acknowledged by many. Students and faculty would admit they were together carrying forward the intellectual inquiries of both in a common pursuit of knowledge. Collusion, rather than competition, would be recognized as a source of creativity in a mutually satisfying exchange and development of ideas. Such an endeavor would engender trust and mutual respect rather than hostility and exploitation. My days as a graduate student, however, are an end. They have not been happy days, nor productive ones. Hopefully, she will be time that comes to me and I will not be part of the cycle of my chosen profession, I can partake in the remedy of those factors that have a lasting effect on my colleagues. Perhaps others will attend to this issue, which in large part is one of profession.

Nancy Walshek

Better Data Needed

On PhD Labor Force

Better Data Needed

On PhD Labor Force (continued from page 2)

The Committee recommended that NASA, the U.S. Office of Education develop a "policy to maintain the delivery of these significant contributions of the next 20 years."

Labor Force Data

The Committee concluded that "better data and closer monitoring of the academic hiring situation are needed in order to maximize the effectiveness of the PhDs." It was recommending to "further advance our understanding of developments in the market for young faculty at research universities."

Consequently, it recommended that NSF's human resources survey of academic departments be "expanded to include questions on numbers of persons entering and leaving PhD programs." It also recommended that the Commission on Human Resources (NRC) expand its Survey of Doctorate Recipients to include "additional data on the employment of PhD's, both between fields and departments within academia, and in and out of academia and that the Commission on Human Resources seek funding for a longitudinal study of persons from several recent cohorts of PhD's to determine their employment history and opportunities"; that efforts be made to improve the reliability and sophistication of forecasting models for the PhD labor market, especially the development of more effective disaggregated modeling and that "data monitoring procedures be established in order to provide information for evaluation of the REA program."
ASA Code of Professional Ethics

PREAMBLE

Sociological research, teaching, and practice, like other social processes, have positive and negative consequences for individuals and institutions; consequently, the work of sociologists must be enhanced and restrained by ethical considerations. Sociological knowledge can be a form of economic and political power, and sociologists therefore need to protect themselves, the discipline, the people they study and teach, their colleagues, and "society as a whole" from abuses of power that may stem from their work.

Agreement on what constitutes abuses of power is not easily reached. In addition, researchers and teachers face inherent ethical dilemmas. On the one hand, they must be responsive to and responsible to the truths they uncover in research and promote in teaching; they must not distort or manipulate truth to serve untruthful, personal or institutional ends, and they must make sociological knowledge freely available to everyone. On the other hand, however, a first principle of ethics holds that people are always to be considered ends and not means, so that whether they are being studied or taught, their integrity, dignity, and autonomy must be maintained. The possible conflicts between the responsibilities of sociologists to truth and knowledge and to the rights of their subjects, students, and associates is therefore one justification for a code of ethics. Another is that, as professionals, sociologists are expected to regulate themselves through individual, peer, and associational action.

This Code has several purposes. It establishes feasible requirements for ethical behavior, that is, standards that are neither unachievably utopian nor easily "realizable." These requirements cover many—but not all—of the potential sources of ethical conflict that may arise in research, teaching, and practice. Some provisions are "should" statements that represent ideals to strive for; others are "must" statements that represent necessary rules. The Code states an associational consensus about ethical behavior upon which the Committee on Professional Ethics will base its judgments when it must decide whether individual members of the Association have acted unethically in specific instances. More than this, however, the Code is meant to sensitize all sociologists to the ethical issues that may arise in their work, and to encourage sociologists to educate themselves and their colleagues to behave ethically.

To fulfill these purposes, we, the members of the American Sociological Association, affirm and support the following Code of Ethics:

I. RESEARCH

A. Objectivity and Integrity

Sociologists should strive to maintain objectivity and integrity in the conduct of their research.

1. Sociologists must not misrepresent their own abilities, or the competence of their staff, to conduct a particular research project.

2. Sociologists must present their findings honestly and without distortion. There must be no omission of data from a research report which might significantly modify the interpretation of findings. And sociologists should indicate where and how their own theoretical and methodological perspective may bear upon or influence the interpretation of research findings.

3. Sociologists must report fully all sources of financial support in their research publications and must note any special relations to the sponsor that might affect the interpretation of findings.

4. Sociologists must honor any commitments made to persons or groups in order to gain research access.

5. Sociologists must not accept such grants, contracts or research assignments as appear likely to require violation of the principles above, and should dissociate themselves from the research if they discover a violation and are unable to achieve its correction.

6. The A.S.A. may ask an investigator for clarification of any distortion by a sponsor or consumer of the findings of a research project in which he or she has participated.

7. When financial support for a research project has been accepted, sociologists must make every reasonable effort to carry out the research proposed and to fulfill the reporting requirements of the funding source.

B. Sociologists should be guided by their experience in the conduct of their professional work, and the principles of research and scholarship, in the conduct of their professional work, and the principles of research and scholarship, in order to maintain the integrity of their work.

C. Sociologists should take reasonable care to safeguard the confidentiality of the data collected, and to ensure that the data are used only for the purposes for which they were collected.

D. Sociologists should not use their role as a researcher to obtain information for which they have not been authorized, or to which they have not been given access.

E. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

F. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

G. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

H. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

I. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

J. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

K. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

L. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

M. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

N. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

O. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

P. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

Q. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

R. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

S. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

T. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

U. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

V. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

W. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

X. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

Y. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

Z. Sociologists should not use information or data collected in the course of research for purposes other than those for which they were collected.

II. PUBLICATION AND REVIEW PROCESSES

A. Questions of Authorship and Acknowledgment

1. Sociologists must acknowledge the contribution of all persons who collaborated in the research and publication processes (including colleagues, student assistants, typists, editors, etc.).

2. Sociologists must also accurately reflect the contributions of all major participants in the research and writing process, including students. (Where the order of names in a joint-authored piece is ambiguous, a note may be used to explain the ordering.)

3. Material taken from another person's published or unpublished work must be enclosed in quotation marks and explicitly referenced to its author. Borrowed ideas or data, even if not quoted, must be explicitly acknowledged.

B. Submission for Publication

1. Submission of a manuscript to a professional journal clearly implies commitment to publish in that journal. Once a paper has been submitted for review to one journal, it must not be submitted to another journal until after an official decision has been received from the previous journal.

2. It may occasionally happen that a sociologist is solicited to review the same book by the editors of two or more journals. Ideally, books should be reviewed by various sociologists in order to encourage evaluations from a diversity of perspectives. In no case should the same text of a book review be submitted to more than one journal. Furthermore, no sociologist should review the same book more than once without notifying the editors of the journal that solicits the additional review(s). If the prospective reviewer feels that an additional review by him or her is appropriate, the justification can be presented to the journal editors for their informed consideration.

C. Participation in Review Processes

Sociologists are asked to provide evaluations of manuscripts or research proposals prepared by colleagues. Few professional obligations are as important, or subject to abuse, as this, and sociologists should hold themselves to high standards of performance, in several specific ways.

1. Unless requests of evaluations of colleagues' work can be met on time, they should be declined soon after they are received.

2. Sociologists should decline requests for reviews of the work of others when strong conflicts of interest are involved, such as may occur when a person is asked to review work by teachers, personal friends, or colleagues for whom he or she feels an overriding sense of obligation, competition, or enmity.

3. Materials sent for review should be read in their entirety and considered carefully. Evaluations should be explicit and justified with explicit reasons, and the reviewer should clearly identify those aspects of his or her own theoretical and methodological perspective that influence the frame of reference from which an evaluation is made (especially when the work being evaluated is based on different theoretical and methodological preferences).

III. TEACHING AND THE RIGHTS OF STUDENTS

A. Sociologists are obliged to protect the rights of students to fair treatment and competent teaching.

1. Sociologists must provide students with explicit policies and criteria about recruitment and admission, financial support, and conditions of possible dismissal. Sociologists should also help to locate employment for students who complete programs.

2. Sociologists must provide clear expectations for students' performances and make objective evaluations of their work.

3. Sociologists must respect students' private information concerning students where such information is not directly relevant to issues of competence or professional ethics.

Continued on Page 7
should be ready to acquire in the view of the majority.

Ross responded, "For three or four years I have thought the time was ripe for American sociologists to come together andродить their differences. I should there- after heartily welcome the project for some sort of national association and believe that such an association could do a great deal to clarify our minds, acquaint us with one another's opinions, and end the ostracism of sociology in the public eye.

"Sociology has grown up through one-idea thinkers, each of whom has pursued the particular slice of humanity that is worth clear across the field. Now, however, there is a get-together spirit abroad, and a continuity of thought that the past cannot but prove a damage to the development of our science."

At Small's suggestion, Veditz contacted the program committee of the Economic Association to see if time could be allotted for a conference on sociology at the upcoming meeting. The request was granted.

Consequently, on December 2 a letter was sent to about three hundred persons throughout the country supposed to be interested in sociology inviting them to attend the conference.

In part the letter said, "Sociologists have been so largely accustomed to working along divergent lines, and are so frequently held radically different views, that there seems to be peculiar justification for some kind of conference which shall bring together at regular intervals those interested in the same group of problems, and permit of the exchange of ideas and comparisons of projects which in other fields of knowledge has so frequently contributed to the advancement of science."

The letter continued, "Several European nations already possess sociological associations for this purpose, although nowhere, perhaps, is there a greater, more widespread, or more truly scientific interest in sociology than in the United States."

Those persons unable to attend the meeting were requested to "send an expression of opinion" on the following questions:

1. Is there need for an organization of sociologists?
2. Should it be formed now?
3. If needed and formed now, what should be its scope?
4. Should a constituent, independent organization, or should it, at least for the present, form a part or division of some existing association?

Some sixty sociologists replied to the letter, which in addition to the sociologists already men- tioned, bore the names of Franklin H. Giddings, Columbia University; William G. Sumner, Yale University; and Veditz.

The stage was then set for the first meeting of the new organization. At a subsequent meeting of the Johns Hopkins University.

First Meeting

William Davenport, Hamilton College, chaired the meeting. Veditz reported that written re- quests to the letters of invitation had unanimously favored the immediate creation of an organization while a considerable majority favored a separate and independent society. The discussion was sufficiently wide to include among its members not only those interested in sociology from a purely sociological point of view, but also those who are engaged in practical sociologi- cal enterprise.

Small wrote, "I should urge that the sociologists keep the machinery of their society as simple and inexpensive as possible, so that members will not be a serious addi- tional burden to anybody; and that we attempt to recognize in our fellowship no division among the different divisions of sociological interest. That is, the few gen- eral sociologists should not say to the practical sociologists, 'We have no need of thee,' or vice versa."

A practical sociologist, Anna Garlin Spencer, New York School of Philanthropy, expressed "keen interest in any effort to consolidate and make more attractive the labor of those who are trying to solve social problems and initiate social movements by the light of science."

Miss Sumner of Yale said there shall be a 'cleaning-house' in the field of sociology, especially that which has focused into practical effort."

C. R. Henderson, University of Chicago, advised it was a "very modest beginning be made."

Charles A. Ellwood, University of Chicago, advised that making membership in this association open to all who have any interest in sociology should be practiced by the members of those who are trying to solve social problems and initiate social movements by the light of science.

Miss Sumner of Yale said there shall be a 'cleaning-house' in the field of sociology, especially that which has focused into practical effort.

Carver thought the multiplication of organizations was undesirable. He suggested that the number of people interested in sociology might be too few persons interested in sociology to warrant the creation of an independent society for some time. Wilcox believed the new organization might unite with the "American Social Science Association," an organization that had an honorable history, but was in a state of decline. Some hope was expressed by others that a "central" school of societies engaged in the study of the social sciences would ultimately be formed.

A. Want, however, to immediately form a separate and independent organization was passed with only two votes against. A motion by Woodruff authorized the appointment of a five-person Committee on Organization. Davenport appointed the following persons to that committee: Charles H. Cooley, University of Chicago; Veditz; Wilcox; Wells; and Lindsay.

Second Meeting

At 3:30 p.m., Thursday, December 18, 1905, Veditz presented the conference with the Constitution and By-Laws of the Committee on Organization. The society was to be known as the American Sociological Society. Its purpose would be "the encouragement of sociological research and discussion, and the promotion of interest between persons engaged in the scientific study of society."

Membership was open to any person upon payment of $3 per year. Officers and directors would be elected by the members. The first meeting of the Executive Committee consisting of the officers ex officio, together with six elected members serving three-year terms, was held. The members of the Executive Committee were elected by a majority vote at the annual meeting. Resolu- tions were not submitted to the Executive Committee for its approval before submission to the members for ratification. The society was to be proposed by the Executive Committee and adopted by a majority of the members present at any regular or special meeting of the society.

Each Article of the Constitution was put to a vote by a two-thirds majority vote. The society was prohibited from excluding any persons interested in sociological work. Lucile Eaves of New York and Henry M. Leipziger, New York Bureau of Education, asked that it be made clear that practical sociologists could be included in the membership. Giddings and Wells believed the original wording was ample enough to include everybody interested in "sociological discussion and research."

Discussion on the "resolution" article sought a specific provision that would prevent the society from passing "any resolution approving or disapproving specific sociological doctrines or specific schemes for social betterment."

It was decided that the article was "sufficient to prevent the submission and consideration of undesirable motions." Each article and the Constitution as a whole was passed unanimously.

Davenport, then, appointed a Nominating Committee composed of Wells, Kelley, and J. El- liott Butler of the University of Chicago. The committee was considering a slate, a motion was made and carried to appoint a Committee on Membership as soon as possible for the purpose of making known the existence of the society and enrolling members."

In reply to the question whether the new organization would issue publications, the Committee on Organization decided to leave the creation of a publication Committee to the Executive Committee upon recommendation and approval of the Executive Committee. The officers were elected, and the funding which depended on membership.

The following slate of candidates for the Nominating Committee was approved unanimously by the conference: Ward, President; Sumner, First Vice President; Giddings, Second Vice President; Veditz, Secretary-Treasurer; and the following members of the Executive Committee— for three years: Ross and Wilcox; for two years: Small and Lindsay; for one year: Wells and Davenport.

When the first Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society was held December 27-29, 1906 in Providence, R.I., membership stood at 115. Fourteen of these charter members were eventually to serve as President of the American Sociological Society.

1980 Annual Meeting

New York Hilton
August 27—31
Tuesday—Sunday (foot Monday—Friday)

Minority Fellow Wins Award

Obie Clayton, an ASA Minority Fellow at University of Chicago, received the Best Graduate Student Paper Award for his paper, "A Theory of Attitudinal Differences Concerning Violence Controlling for Class," that examines the influence of race and class on perceptions of violence.

Clayton has completed his work at Emory and is beginning his dissertation research on the factors involved in economic crimes and crimes of violence. He is a graduate of Milligan College.

(continued from page 1)
Sexist Biases in Sociological Research: Problems and Issues

Prepared by the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology

Sexist bias in sociological research is a topic of current concern. This document identifies five aspects of the research process where bias frequently occurs: research problem selection and formulation, review of previous research, selection of population and sample, validity issues, and interpretation of research results. The various problems are closely linked and reinforcing; and studies frequently have major shortcomings in several areas at the same time. Many of the issues discussed here could also be generalized to race and class bias.

The A.S.A. Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology prepared this document to encourage all members of the profession, whether teacher, researcher, grant officer, research consumer, or publication editor, to recognize and solve the problems described. Several of the most serious types of problems in each area are identified, and, where appropriate, examples of the general problems are provided. The issues are clearly not exhaustive, and readers are invited to identify and share additional problems and to recommend solutions. Any comments and suggestions should be sent to the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology or the Executive Office.

I. Research Problem Selection and Formulation

General problem

1. Gender-blind social theory
   Gender may be a significant variable in a social setting, institution, or society, but the gender variable is not explored or incorporated into a theory, interpretation, or analysis of the system.

2. Significant topics ignored
   Topics of particular significance for women are ignored.

3. Selective treatment of topics
   Aspects of a topic of special salience for men are defined as covering the entire topic while aspects of special salience for women are under-researched.

4. Inadequate specification of research problem
   a. A research problem is formulated for men or women only, but this limitation is not explicitly noted.
   b. A research model is improperly assumed to apply to men or to women only.
   c. Inadequate exploration of topics which transcend sex-stereotyped divisions.
   d. Pejorative labeling or conceptualization
      Situations in which men or women act outside of prescribed sex roles are defined as areas for the study of deviant behavior or "problems"; situations in which they conform to prescribed roles are assumed to be non-problematic.

Example

Analysis of social inequality in a society without reference to gender inequality.

II. Review of Previous Research

General problem

1. Failure to mention that samples are single-sex or have highly imbalanced sex ratios
   The results of a study are cited but no reference is made to the gender composition of the sample upon which the results are based.

2. Failure to note that samples are single-sex or have highly imbalanced sex ratios when reviewing a body of literature.

3. Methodological weaknesses of previous research ignored
   Previous studies are cited which purport to reach conclusions casting women in inferior light; the studies suffer from serious methodological weaknesses, but the reviewer fails to warn the reader about these problems and how they may invalidate the results.

Example

Citation of a study demonstrating a positive association between position in the job hierarchy and work satisfaction; failure to mention that the study sampled men only.

Uncritical citation of studies purporting to find sex differences in fear of success, field dependence, and industrial productivity.

III. Selection of Population and Sample

General problem

1. Women or men are arbitrarily excluded from sample
   A research problem applies to a population with both men and women but only a single-sex is sampled for study.

2. Inadequate justification for exclusion of men or women from sample
   Men or women are arbitrarily excluded from a study because of financial constraints, convenience, lack of familiarity, or personal preference of the investigator; it is presumed that the topic is only relevant for men or women.

Example

Studies of language acquisition which focus on the interaction of mother and child, neglecting the role of the father.

Studies of occupational mobility or work roles which include men only on the unstated assumption that the male experience is the most important aspect.

IV. Validity Issues

General problem

1. Biased question wording in surveys
   Numerous problems associated with question wording yield conclusions which are invalid.

2. Scales validated on a single sex
   A scale is validated on a sample of men or women only but is then applied to samples of both men and women.

3. Cross-sex interviewing
   On highly sensitive gender-related questions, efforts are not made to ensure that interviewers are of the sex that will yield the least bias in eliciting responses.

Example

A respondent is asked to designate a single person as "head of household".

An instrument for the measurement of the need for achievement is developed on male samples but is then used for measurement with both men and women.

Continued on Page 9
V. Interpretation of Research Results

Example

Results of a study of the correlates of job satisfaction among generalized to both men and women.

b. Observed differences between men and women are attributed to individual-level biological and psychological differences; no effort is made to investigate whether social factors correlated with gender in the U.S. may account for the observed sex differences.

Example

Reference Notes

This device was developed by Michael Useem with the assistance of: Joan Huber, Council Liaison (78); Etsie Rutledge; Pepper Schwartz; Joan Stelling, Chair (77–78); Barrie Thorne, Chair (78–83); and Gaye Tuchman. Input was also received from Lewis Coser; Helen Hughes, Council Liaison (79); Joyce Latane; and Donie Wilkinson, Staff Liaison Committee. The document was approved by the ASA Council at its June 1979 meeting.

The U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, defines the civilian labor force as the sum of the unemployed and the civilian employed. The total labor force includes those in the armed forces.

Jerome Davis 1932–1979

On October 24, the New York Times announced the death of Jerome Davis at the age of 87. He was one of the oldest continuing members of the American Sociological Association. His name appears in the 1979 Directory of Members; I don’t think he had missed a year. He was a professor at Dartmouth for a few years and then for sometime at the Yale University Division of Social Science, for 30 years or more he had a non-academic career of enough interest to get him four inches of write-up in WHO (1969). He became a freelance writer and an unorthodox agent of peace organizations. He organized travel between this country, the Soviet Union and China. He wrote many books on labor and social problems. He was probably too controversial to have had a long quiet academic career. He is an excellent example of an interesting non-academic sociological career.

Everett C. Hughes

Boston College

Gino Germani 1911–1979

Gino Germani died in Rome, on October 2, 1979. Until his death, he held the Monroe Calvin Professor of Latin American Affairs at Harvard University. From 1975 on, he shared his time between Harvard and the University of Naples: after more than three decades, Gino had finally returned with some permanence to Italy, which he had been forced to leave for political reasons in 1934. As a student of economics, he had been active in the anti-fascist movement; arrested and incarcerated on the island of Pantelleria, he later managed to leave for Argentina through the intervention of his relatives. In Buenos Aires and, more propitiously, in Latin America that his intellectual career as an interpreter of the political and economic forces of modernization and as a major organizer of Latin American social science was to unfold. Although Gino was the only child of parents respected in this country by all those interested in the Latin American area and the only student to develop and change his international influence and fascination for excessively broad and difficult, he was, according to him, the United States. The difficult personal circumstances of a political refugee never halted Gino’s social and political activity, nor his intellectual production. Involved in the movement of opposition to Joan Peron in the 1950’s, he was even more involved in the effort of analyzing and reproducing the social reality that had produced Peronismo. The Social Structure of Argentina, written by Gino Germani and his students, without assistance, financial or otherwise, and published in 1935, was the first major social scientific work to be produced in the country. The author of the first interpretative essays on the initial phase of historical sociology in Latin America (Epoca de Transicion, Buenos Aires, 1942), Gino was also ready (as was too few other major intellectuals) to revise and, in fact, reject his original explanation in his later, deeper and more ambitious works (Sociologia de la Modernizacion, Buenos Aires, 1946; Autoritarismismo, Fascismo y Nacionalisme Populista (Political and Social Research Books, 1970) and Social Mobilization and Mass Movements (Transaction Books, forthcoming). From the mid 1500’s to the mid 1960’s, Argentine social science re- volved around Germani and the Institu- te de Sociología of the University of Buenos Aires, which he and his students worked to bring to life, out of formal institutional semi-independence. The Instituto became the basis for the institutionalization of Argentine social scientific teaching and research in Argentina, and a generating center of the compara- tive study of Latin American social science which, in those years, began to de- velop over Latin America as a whole. Gino’s work thus became the signifi- cant beginning and the constant refer- ence point for all subsequent efforts to develop theory relevant to Latin American political and social move- ments.

Gino Germani was not merely an academic sociologist but, much more broadly, an intellectual involved with the crises of his time. The tension be- tween professionalism and a deeper existential desire to know” was always part of his work, according to his contemporaries. Gino continued working on developing countries and on the social matrices of mass movements; he was also working intensely on the histori- cal development of individual identity and on the sociological measurement of aesthetic and religious experience. Gino was a pessimist, and a cynic with a kind heart. People knew in his dark sense of humor to understand, not comprehending that it was only the other side of his pervasive sense of tragedy. Those who knew him found great joy in his curiosità, in his healthy and amusing curiosity, and in his critical, real, and subtle intelligence. He could not stand blandness, sentimentalism, mental laziness or the abstraction of the self in front of habits; as a good Lincoln, he could not countenance bureaucratic irresponsibility; he al- ways elaborated complicated schemes to beat them with great glee.

Yet, wherever he went, his political sense made him seek to create appro- priate institutional frameworks for his ideas and methods. His last collaboration, as well as former associates have joined together to continue that effort; an international center for the investigation and modernization is being planned in his honor, to be located in Rome. Those interested in collaborating to recall Gino’s last collaboration, should write Luisa Germani, Via delle Terme Deciane, Rome, Italy.

Gino’s last collaboration was a huge burden undoubtedly had led him to jest about the sanctimonious nature of idealism; for us, it was important to record that social science has lost an acute and profound interpreter of our times. Fortunately, despite occasional passages, our intellectual lives will be fatter and diller.

Magali Sartel-Lorrain; Eyvonne Kisnopoulos,

Temple University

Ivan V. Jacko; University

Institute of the Study of Human In- duces, Philadelphia


On October 17, 1979, John A. O’Donnell, an international acclaimed expert on drug abuse and a Professor of Political Science at the University of Kansas was killed in his sleep. He had spent his day working in his office and was resting in order to enjoy the final game of the world series. Born on October 29, 1919 in Jersey City, New Jersey, he received his B.A. from St. Peter’s College in New Jersey in 1938, his M.A. from Fordham in 1940, and his Ph.D. from the University of Kansas in 1960. After earning his Master’s degree, Jack was a caseworker for the Catholic Home Bureau in New York City for two years.

With the outbreak of World War II, Jack joined the Army as a Private and rose to the rank of captain. He served overseas for 18 months in India, Burma and China in Signal Intelligence. It was Jack’s war stories that ended with the end of the war when he was the highest ranking U.S. officer in Indo-China (Vietnam). Throwing their weapons into the sea, the Japanese troops in the area surrendered to him. This ritual was repeated for several days until the bayonets showed rust.

In the years four after his discharge from the Army, Jack was a caseworker and chief social worker at the VA hos- pital in Kansas City, Missouri. In 1951, he began to search social workers at the NIH Center in Phoenix. As Chief of the Social Work Service at the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital in Lexington, Kentucky, he was an ex- cellent administrator and developed af- fective relationships with many pa- tients. He was the first Chief of the Social Science Section at the Addiction Research Center. Serving in that role from 1961 to 1968, he recruited an excellent staff and his work was widely recognized. From 1968 to 1969, Dr. O’Donnell was Chief of Research Sections at the Addiction Research Center in Lexington, and from 1970 until his death, he was Professor of Sociology at the University of Ken- tucky.

In high school and college, Jack re- ceived a number of academic hon- ors; for example, he won a Greek poetry award and translating contest. In 1962, he was awarded the Public Health Commendation medal. In 1979, he received the Distinguished Alumnus Award, which is offered annually by the Sociology faculty of the University of Kentucky for meritorious achievement. During his 36 years of academic career, Jack received several major re- research grants from the National Insti- tute on Mental Health, the Special Ac- tion Program for Drug Abuse Preven- tion, and the National Institute on Drug Abuse. Throughout his many years of govern- ment and university service, Jack was a highly trusted advisor and consultant to the National Institute on Mental Health, the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse, and Mental Health Administration; the White House Office on Drug Abuse Policy; and many other research organizations. He was in- vited to present papers at World Health Organization conferences held in London and Geneva, and at the Dahlem Konferenzen in Berlin. In ad- dition, he was a member of the Board of Directors of the Committee on Prob- lems of Drug Dependence and was on the editorial boards of Drug and Al- coholism Review and Euthanasia and the Health Professions.

John O’Donnell co-edited two major books: Narcotic Addiction, with John Ball in 1966 and the Handbook on Drug Abuse, with Itzhak Panther, both published by Goldstein in 1969. He was the author of a monograph entitled Narcotic Ad- diction in Korea in 1971, and the senior author of Young Men and Drugs A Nationwide Survey, which appeared in 1976. These monographs are considered classics in the field of drug abuse.

Jack was devoted to his family. He and his wife, Estelle, shared many happy years together. Seldom did Jack ever mention an accomplishment, but he was willing to relate, with justifiable fatherly pride, the ac- complishments of his son and daugh- ter, John and Kitty. Jack had a brilliant mind, but the characteristic that perhaps most distinguished him was his integrity; he never wavered in his
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Health Care

A project to develop teaching mate-
reriai for educating physicians to rec-
ognize and respond to barriers to health care in underserved areas at the University of Texas Medical School at Houston, funded by the National Insti-
tute of Medical Education. The ob-
jective is to develop instructional ma-
terials (discrete text, case presenta-
tions, and videos) that will provide practitioners with guidelines to assist them in diagnosing and treat-
ing health problems. These docu-
ments may be newstk or current.

Environment/Natural Resources

Kenneth R. Tremblay, Jr., is collect-
ing course outlines on environmental science/technology/geology resources. He intends to publish these outlines through the Educational Media Center at the University of South Dakota. People interested in ob-
taining a copy of the booklet after its completion would be encouraged to cover the cost of printing. If you have taught or are teaching a course in this area, and would like your outline to appear in the booklet, please send a copy to Mr. Tremblay at the Department of Social Behavior, University of South Dakota, Vermillion, SD 57069.
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Guide to the Use of the Graduates Re-

Search Record Examinations, 1979-80 edition,

is available from the Graduate Record Office, Box 957, New Yor-

k, N.Y. (50 cents). Also available is the GPE Technical Manual which supple-

ments the Guide by providing all the det-

ails needed for careful evaluation of the tests. Manual price: $0.00. The

manual was published in September, 1978.

The Nonparisian Review is a new

magazine published by the National

Endowment for the Humanities that cov-

ers the humanities and highlights the Federal

grant-making agency's programs and

projects in the arts, humanities, and natu-

ral sciences. The Nonparisian Review, M.

S. 204, NH4, Washington, DC 20500.

The diary of Theodore Abel, Professor

Emeritus of Columbia University, is open for research at the Hoover

Institution on War, Revolution and Re-

construction, Stanford University, to
date the years 1931-76 and re-

late generally to sociological theory, research and teaching and world

politics.

The Research Committee on Ethnic,

Race and Minority Relations of the In-

ternational Sociological Association

is conducting a survey designed to

develop personal contacts between sociologists in the field of minorities.

The survey will investigate aspects of the international dissemination and exchange of information on significant developments. Persons interested in taking part should contact Dr. F. A. B., Office of the Director, Survey Research Center, In-

stitute for Social Research, P. O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106.

Within the American Educational Re-

search Association special interest

groups (SIGs) on social indicators has been organized to promote research into the development and use of indi-

icators for monitoring social conditions and for assessing the effects on these trends of specific societal interven-

ions. It issues a bi-monthly newsletter. Contact: Robert J. Rossi, Social In-

dicators Research Program, American Sociological Association, P. O. Box 1133, Palo Alto, CA 94303. Phone: (415) 493-3590.

The Institute for American Research

may be on special interest to indi-

viduals lacking other institutional support and affiliations limited secre-

tary and other office resources to aid in the preparation of research or edu-

cational grant proposals. The pro-

gram provides assistance in the propo-

sition of American history, archaeology, or contemporary social life. Interested persons are requested to send brief proposals, outline, budget and time table, a list of possible fund-

ing sources and a current resume. Send to: Dr. Gary B. Combs, Execu-

tive Director, Institute for American Research, P. O. Box 2125, Goleta, CA 93117.

Robert J. Havighurst, professor emeritus, University of Chicago, has received the first Brookfield Award for social and behavioral research related to aging. The award, made by the Gerontological Society, carries a cash prize of $5,000.

Edward A. Tiryakian has become Di-

rector of Quebec Studies at Duke Uni-

versity. A major objective of the studies project is to explore cross-

national and collaborative re-

search between Duke University and leading universities in Canada and

Europe.

Pauline B. Bart, University of Illinois-Chicago Circle, will serve as an associate professor of Women's Studies at San Diego State

College during Spring 1980.

Stanley Lieberson, University of Arca,

is spending the present academic year as the Claude Bissel Distinguished Visiting Professor, University of Toronto. He is the first sociologist to hold the chair.

Margaret T. Gordon has been named to the newly created post of Deputy Director of the Center for Urban and Area

Affairs, Northwestern University.

James F. Martin, Fordham University-Lincoln Center, has become an associate professor of geog-

raphy, public affairs, and urban plan-

ning, Princeton University.

John E. Hansan, former Director of Government and Social Policy Department for the American Public Welfare As-

sociation, became the Executive Direc-

tor of the National Conference on So-

cial Welfare, July 1.

Amatul Azimi, Columbia University, will join the Georgia Tech University faculty in July as the first per-

son to hold the recently authorized chair of Urban Geography.

She spent 1978-79 as a guest scholar at the Brookings Institution and will move to GCU from her position as director of the Executive Office of the President which she assumed last fall.

Christopher Jencs, Harvard University, has been appointed Asso-

ciate Professor of Sociological Research at North-

western University where he is also 

working with the Center for Urban Af-

fairs.

Shirley A. Nuss, Wayne State Uni-

versity, is on leave working at the United Nations as a consultant for the Sec-

retariat of the World Conference of the United Nations Decade for Women.

She is the associate director of the Survey Research Center and is a member of the Review and Appraisal documents and the Statistical Annals which will provide the statistical information that the representatives of the member nations of the U.N.

John D. Gregory, formerly of Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Illinois and Northern Illinois University, has been appointed Associate Director of the American Dental Association's Bureau of Economic and Behavioral Research. In that position, he is involved in management and policy development including development of new tools and services.

John W. Foley, University of South Carolina, has been appointed Director of the Center for the Study of Middle-

Size Cities and Urban Policy at Appalachian State University.

Joan Huber has become Head of the Department of Sociology at the Uni-

versity of Illinois at Urbana-

Champaign.

Elah Shanas, University of Illinois-

Chicago Circle, was elected to the In-

stitute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences, last fall.

Nabih Shouman, Bidwell, University of Chicago, and Burton R. Clark, Yale University, have been elected to the National Academy of Education.

President-Elect

Regional Sociological Associations

Karen Peterson, American University, D.C. Sociological Society.

Kai T. Erikson, Yale University, East-

ern Sociological Society.

Samuel E. Wallace, University of Ten-

nessee, Mid-South Sociological As-

sociation.

Elah Shanas, University of Illinois-

Chicago Circle, Midwest Sociological Society.

Irving Wechsler, University of Alabama, Southern Sociological Soci-

ety.

Janet S. Chafetz, University of Hawaii,

Hawaiian Sociological Soci-

association.

President

Regional Sociological Associations

Laure M. Sharp, Bureau of Social Science Research, D.C. Sociological

Society.

Susan Haller, Arizona State College, Western Sociological Society.

Irving Wechsler, University of Alabama, Southern Sociological Society.

Joan Huber, University of Illinois-

Chicago Circle, Midwest Sociological Society.

Ruth Hill Ussery, Michigan State Uni-

versity, North Central Sociological

Society.

Lenard Gording, Oregon State Uni-

versity, Pacific Sociological Asso-

ciation.

M. Elaine Burgess, UNG-Greensboro,

Southern Sociological Society.

Massachusetts Institute of Technol-

ogy, Department of Architecture is ac-

cepting students for its new Master of Science program in Building En-

vironment. This two-year program is de-

signed to allow students with and without an architectural background to

work with one another and with an interdisciplinary faculty on research projects intended to deal with the changing societal and cultural concerns that accompany the new building environment, the forces shaping the new building environment, the built environment’s impact on people and with im-

proved techniques of environmental design and environmental assess-

ment. M.I.T. is particularly anxious to attract students interested in the sociology and technology of the built

environment. Contact: Prof. Julian Beinart, Department of Architecture, Rm. 10-455, M.I.T., Cambridge, MA 02139, Phone: (617) 253-3155.
Wrong Number

In the December 1979 issue of FOOTNOTES, the phone number for Roland Liebert and James J. Zinich, managers of the NSF Sociology Program, was incorrectly stated. The correct number is (202) 328-4204.

Grant Privacy Research Proposals Wanted

Research proposals designed to investigate invasion of privacy problems associated with social networking websites are solicited for the ASA for the Privacy Research Award competition. The competition was made possible by a gift from Clark Abt Associates, Inc., Boston. The award(s) provides funds to carry out the proposed research.

Proposals are invited in four broad areas:
1. Privacy of subjects of social research
2. Privacy: protecting techniques for research
3. Social conditions affecting privacy
4. Problems of doing social research under privacy restrictions

Proposals should not exceed 2,000 words. Grants should not exceed $10,000. No funds for the support of the investigator are awarded.

The competition is open to all members of the ASA including student members. Entry deadline is April 1. Results of the competition will be announced by June 15. Entries should be sent to the ASA Executive Office, 1722 N Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

I spent my vacation working with the President's Commission on the Accident at Three Mile Island, heading the Task Force on Emergency Preparedness and Response. It was neither a usual vacation activity nor a restful one. I can look back on it with some perspective on the ways sociologists conduct research.

Conferences

Sociologists receiving conference grants, their institutions, conference titles, dates and locations plus amounts awarded follow:


Terry N. Clark, University of Chicago, “Conference on Public Urban Research”, May 1979, Chicago, $13,221.


Others


Suggestions for Annual Review

The Editorial Committee of the Annual Review of Sociology solicits suggestions from those who would like to see reviewed in Volume 8 future volumes.

Please send your suggestions by February 10, 1980, to Alex Inkeles, Editor, Annual Review of Sociology, El Camino Way, Palo Alto, CA 94306.