Future Organizational Trends of the ASA

The following is the report of the ASA Council's Ad Hoc Committee on ASA Future Organizational Trends, commissioned by past President Herbert J. Gans, and submitted to Council in January 1989. Members of the Committee were: Randall Collins (chair), John McCarthy, Marshall Parker, Pamela Otter and Jonathan Turner. Council moved to publish the report in Footnotes for the attention of all ASA members.

I. The Issue

What is the likely future of the ASA as an organization? A major issue raised within Council in the deliberation of sections, Do this indicate a shift in the center of gravity within the Association? Is the ASA destined to become a loose holding company of quasi-autonomous specialty groups, similar to the International Sociological Association? Is it likely that the ASA may splinter apart, as has recently happened with the American Psychological Association? Short of these drastic changes, does the growth of sections represent an intellectual and social fragmentation of sociology, perhaps even an institutionalization of it within our association? On the other hand, there are less pessimistic interpretations: the growth of sections may be a move towards democracy, decentralization, increased participation and feelings of intellectual community. Professions have many of the characteristics of social movements, and what is happening in sociology is part of a broader trend which appears to be strengthening the position of the professionals generally. From this point of view, organizational differentiation may be a source of strength for sociology.

We examine these questions in the following pages, drawing upon the sociology of organizations and of social movements. We believe that sociologists, of all professions, ought to be able to bring our disciplinary skills to bear upon our selves. Informatio

Table 1: Section Memberships (1976-1987)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Gave award in 1988
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More than doubled between 1978 and 1988, from $10,000,000 to $22,777,128, beating the rate of inflation during that period. All these changes should be seen against a background of asymmetrical bell-shaped growth and decline in the organizational size. Most of these aspects are discussed in the text. See ASA, page 2.
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of internal differentiation, and the addi-
tion of new activities within the associa-
tion, began during the boom period of membership growth from 1946 to 1972. But all of these structural patterns have continued, during the phase of contrac-
tion (1973-1984), and appear to be further expanding during the current period of stability or minimal upswing in membership. This is especially apparent in the case of sections. In the period between 1976 and 1984, the number of sections jumped from 14 to 23 (plus one new section in formation which failed). Detailed informa-
tion is not available for the period 1961-
1975, but it is apparent that the growth of sections has slowed approximately con-
tinuously since the upswing, downward,
and stable phases of ASA membership.

IV. Organizational Causes of Section Growth

Let us attempt to put the phenomenon of growth within the organizational com-
ponents of the ASA into a more general perspective. From the point of view of organization theory, it is likely that an organization operating in a diverse and changing environment would mirror that environment by developing internal complexity. Sociology certainly deals with an extremely complex environment. Insofar as sociologists are engaged in intellectual activities, their topics are as broad as one can imagine, since there is a possible sociology of every aspect of the social world. This diversity of intellectual focus has been increasing in recent years as sociologists have broadened into the
range of culture and of history, as well as their more traditional focus on interaction and contemporary social change. Sociology also has several other components of diversity in its environment that go beyond most other organizations of aca-
demic intellectuals; there are major links to applied activities, and to political and ideological movements. The environment of professional sociologists is thus a very complex one, and our organization has been mirroring it in its internal structure.

The Mobilization Density of Professions

The question remains why this envi-
ronmental diversity is having such effects increasingly in recent years. It is useful to recognize that the underlying organizational structure is not the ASA, but the profession of sociology. McCarthy points out that professions have many of the characteristics of social movements, which organize to create and control markets for their services, as well as engaging in educational and political lobbying and legitimation efforts. As social movements, the success of professions depends upon their mobilization density, the extent of organizational links and resources connecting members. The ASA is a typical “peak association,” similar to the AIA or ABA, which attempts to represent the profession as a whole, while local and specialized organizations (including sub-organizations within the peak association, such as ASA sections) are also typical structures within a larger profession.

Although we lack comparable data on the components of mobilization density

for sociologists, the following comparis-
on may serve to illustrate the range of organizational mobilization in several academically based fields (data from McCarthy, 1985):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Membeks/Occupation Member</th>
<th>Physicians</th>
<th>2.47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychologists</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economists</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Workers</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means, all professional occupations</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff/1000 Occupation Members:

| Physicians | 5.81 |
| Psychologists | 1.83 |
| Economists | 0.05 |
| Social Workers | 0.21 |
| Means, all professional occupations | 1.64 |

Committees/1000 Occupation Members:

| Physicians | 1.13 |
| Psychologists | 0.46 |
| Economists | 0.04 |
| Social Workers | 0.01 |
| Means, all professional occupations | 0.50 |

Publications/1000 Occupation Members:

| Physicians | 1.83 |
| Psychologists | 0.46 |
| Economists | 0.04 |
| Social Workers | 0.02 |
| Means, all professional occupations | 0.41 |

Physicians, the most highly mobilized profession, have a ratio of 2.47 professional memberships for each member of the occupation. These organizations are Psychologists, with 5.81 staff persons for 1000 members of the occupation; they have a comparatively high density of committee participation (1.13 committees per 1000 members), and a very high level of communications (1.83 publications per 1000 members). Social workers, by contrast, have a very low level of mobiliza-
tion density, with only 0.05 professional memberships per professional, and very meager resources in the organizations they have. Psychologists and economists are intermediate but are the most active for all professional occupations in organiza-
tional mobilization (although economists have surprisingly resource-poor organizations).

These data do not give us the dynamics of organizational mobilization, but the process has been going on, and perhaps accelerating, for the past several decades. Of the organizations in McCarthy’s study, 32 percent were founded after 1960, and 64 percent after 1940. Of a national adult sample of Americans, 7 percent belonged to a professional/ache-
demic association in 1967, a figure which almost doubled to 13 percent in 1980. Clearly we are in a time of expansion of such organizations generally. Unfortu-
nately, we lack comparable data on sociologists, but it seems clear that the mobil-
ization density of our profession has also been increasing. But this has been happening at other levels than the central-
ized components of the peak association, the ASA. This trend is apparent in the case with all such peak associations.

Ancreing in Applied Specialties

The oldest ASA sections tend to be those which have some identity which cuts across the boundary of academic sociology into an applied arena especially Medical Sociology, Criminology, Soci-
ology of Education, to some extent also Family Sociology, Organizations & Occupations, and Social Psychology. These may be regarded as having an external anchoring that makes them especially likely to identify as a subdivision. This is especially apparent in the case of Medical Sociology, which is by far the largest of the sections (cur-
rently over 1100 members), and among the most stable in membership. Some of the newer sections have probably also developed for similar reasons, with the recent expansion of particular applied areas outside academic sociology this would especially include sections on Sociological Practice, and on Aging, whose bases have radically expanded in the past decade. But it is difficult to understand in this fashion why Population organized as a section relatively late (1977), since it is one of the longest-standing areas of applied sociology.

External Political Movements

Another impetus for the growth of sec-
tions has been political activism. This was espe-
cially a characteristic of the 1970s. More
loosely, we tend to refer to this as a “1960s” mood, a critical mass of young, militant sociologists who had fin-
ished their PhDs and became full members of the ASA did not arrive on the scene in most instances, until after the turn of the 1970s. These sections included Sex and Gender; Women and the Family; Ethnic groups (a peace-movement-oriented section); Environmental Sociology; Marxist Soci-
ology, and Political Economy of the World System (anarchist Marxist). It is per-
haps surprising that the section on Social and Ethnic Minorities did not become organized until 1980, the section on Asian and Asian American until 1984. In the case of the latter, it is likely that a crit-
ical mass of Asian sociologists did not exist until that date.

These relatively politicized sections have held their own within the ASA; Continued on next page

---

TABLE 3. ASA MEMBERSHIP: 1976 TO PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Associates</th>
<th>International Members</th>
<th>International Associations</th>
<th>Student Members</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>7770</td>
<td>1398</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1377</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>1095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>8302</td>
<td>1499</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>8006</td>
<td>1485</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1648</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>1299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>9281</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>1518</td>
<td>1359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>9542</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>1415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>8719</td>
<td>1248</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>8456</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>1368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>8704</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>1385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>8715</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>1385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>8972</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>1394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>8975</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>1394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>8335</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>1536</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>1385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This category includes Emeritus and Life Members.

---

Figure 1: Association Memberships for All Available Years

- Membership Size vs. Year
- AEA
- ASS/ASA
- APIA
must have been fairly stable in membership since their inception (see Table 1). Marxist sociology experienced some decline in the 1960s (Table 2), and political mobilization that had maintained itself throughout the 1960s lasted barely above the level of 200,000 members required to stay operation as a functioning section. The Sex and Gender section, a stronghold of feminist sociology, dipped from its strength of 560 in 1976, and a low of 390 in 1982 (still one of the fairly substantial sections at that time, however), has in recent years has slipped to become the second largest section (at 866 in 1988). This recent growth is supported by the increase in the number of female members of the ASA (although the dip in section strength in the early 1980s goes counter to that trend).

The most important conclusion seems to be that the major trends of political movements have maintained considerable strength, even though the scope of our major movements in the larger world is already having the desired influence. By radical, student movements, the student liberation movements, and the women's movement, the main exception here is the feminist movement, which although apparently weakening as a mass movement since the 1970s, remains strong in some respects in political and social action. The point is underlined in the sections below of sociological points: As mass participation social movements go into decline, it is typical for their most committed activists to concentrate their energies on maintaining a social movement organization, keeping alive core networks of solidarity and ideological discussions within a narrower circle. Organizational resources of this sort are available in academic organizations, especially in the form of specialized courses, programs, and recruitment patterns that are oriented to the need and demands of social movements.

Internal Politics of the Association

There are at least two processes, then, which overlap the borders of the ASA and which have affected the growth of sections: groups organized in applied areas, and those which share political loyalties to larger social movements. Once the process of adding new sections to those already in existence becomes well-established, however, it has become part of the normal organizational politics of our association. This process is analogous to what has happened to ASA Presidential elections. Prior to 1971, a substantial majority of Presidents went on to become President, and most Presidents have previously been Vice President. In the 1970s, this regular succession broke down, with a sharply declining proportion of Vice Presidents going on to become President. In 1975, the first President was elected who was added to the ballot by petition, rather than from the nominations committee. Since that election, there have been petition candidates, usually supported by vigorous campaigning in six of the 12 presidential elections. There has been a politicization of ASA elections, breaking through the 1970s, and which has become institutionalized since that time, even through a period of decline in ideological diversity. Perhaps we should label this "politicization" has taken place at the overt, public level; old-timers have indicated (in personal communications to the committee) that elections before 1970s also sometimes involved factional mobilization, but taking the form of insider politics on the organizational background.

Establishing new sections has become a routine move within the ASA, for any group that mobilizes, whether it be around ideological, organizational, or practical issues and activities. Active ASA members are highly aware of the existing sections, and knowledge of these ongoing process is widespread. It is likely that core members of institutional networks have had experience in forming at least one section, and have held membership in more than one. We know, for example, that there is a high correlation between section membership and voting in ASA elections (Steven A. Tuch and William V. D’Antoni, "Professional Associations and Patterns of Membership," in March 1982: "The skimpy data indicate that voting correlates with section membership in the way that characteristics like shared theory, shared practice, and shared identity predict correlative outcomes.")

Another area in which emulsion occurs is nearly described in Table 6: the number of sections which host receptions at the ASA annual meeting has increased smoothly through the 1980s. One section gave an official cocktail party in 1980, and the practice has spread to 16-17 sections in the years since 1980. There also appears to be an increasing number of other activities put on by sections (although information on this is spotty). Some sections have been sponsoring movies or special exhibitions; some have organized joint thematic sessions with other sections; some have put on sociological excursions in the annual meeting; they have experimented with nonstandard session formats. Some sections have organized thematic "mini-conferences" within the ASA Annual Meeting, and have arranged to publish these papers in thematic volumes with independent publishers. In some instances, these have organized their own mini-conferences outside the framework of the ASA annual meeting. The CUS Sections, for instance, hold at least one such, all-woman, all-attended, current meeting. During recent years, FEWS holds an annual conference; the Theory Section has taken part, somewhat informally, in several meetings jointly with other CUS counterparts. In this respect, the section activities begin to take on the more extreme decentralization which is characteristic of European associations such as the German Sociological Association.

It is important to recognize the extent to which this is a change from the traditional operation of ASA sections. In the 1970s and early 1980s, it was common for sections to gather at a sparsely-attended business meeting, at which the main activity consisted of requesting more money from the budget and electing a new set of officers.

Table 4: Sections Activities (Counts of Section Meetings, Awards, Other Activities)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Receptions</th>
<th>Awards</th>
<th>Other Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some sections may now offer two awards. Information was obtained from the individual section newsletters.

**The Annual Meeting program usually does not specify the nature of the activity. In the case of one instance, a special meeting met with SWP over a topic of mutual interest.

† Years 1986-88: 1988 reception count was obtained from Annual Meeting program. Years 1981-1985 reception count was obtained from the latest available review of Other Group Activities report prepared by ASA Section Officers. Where blank, no information was available.

Table 5: 1980 Section Awards

1. Undergraduate Education: Hans O. Mischke Award for Distinguished Contributions to Undergraduate Education
2. Methodology: Paul F. Lazarsfeld Award
3. Medical Sociology: Best Dissertation Award; Leo G. Rubner Award for Distinguished Scholarship in Medical Sociology
4. Criminology: Latin American Scholar Award; Distinguished Scholar Award
5. Sociology of Education: William Hallower Award
6. Family, William J. Goode Distinguished Book Award
7. Organizations and Groups: ECOS Award (European Group for Organization Studies)
8. Sociological Theory Prize
9. Sex and Gender: Dissertation Award
10. Community Robert and Willy Lynd Award; Robert E. Park Award
11. Social Psychology: Cosley-Mead Award
12. Environment and Technology: Section Award for Distinguished Contributions
13. Sociological Practice: ASA’s Distinguished Career Award for the Practice of Sociology
14. Aging: Distinguished Contribution to the Sociology of Aging Award; Student Dissertation Award
15. Colloquium: Behavioral, Social Movements: The Collective Behavior-Social Movements Award for the Outstanding Book or Paper Published Within the Previous Two Years
16. Comparative Historical Sociology: Comparative History Prize

Another area in which emulsion occurs is nearly described in Table 6: the number of sections which host receptions at the ASA annual meeting has increased smoothly through the 1980s. One section gave an official cocktail party in 1980, and the practice has spread to 16-17 sections in the years since 1980. There also appears to be an increasing number of other activities put on by sections (although information on this is spotty). Some sections have been sponsoring movies or special exhibitions; some have organized joint thematic sessions with other sections; some have put on sociological excursions in the annual meeting; they have experimented with nonstandard session formats. Some sections have organized thematic "mini-conferences" within the ASA Annual Meeting, and have arranged to publish these papers in thematic volumes with independent publishers. In some instances, these have organized their own mini-conferences outside the framework of the ASA annual meeting. The CUS Sections, for instance, hold at least one such, all-woman, all-attended, current meeting. During recent years, FEWS holds an annual conference; the Theory Section has taken part, somewhat informally, in several meetings jointly with other CUS counterparts. In this respect, the section activities begin to take on the more extreme decentralization which is characteristic of European associations such as the German Sociological Association.

It is important to recognize the extent to which this is a change from the traditional operation of ASA sections. In the 1970s and early 1980s, it was common for sections to gather at a sparsely-attended business meeting, at which the main activity consisted of requesting more money from the budget and electing a new set of officers.
who are specially relevant to the cutting-edge of work in that network. Although we lack data on this, it may well be the case that participation in these enhanced section activities has generated more positive feelings about attendance at ASA meetings.

At the same time, there is some indication of political antagonism between sections and the ASA governance structure as a whole. There are various points of contention: resources such as dues which are divided between the sections and the ASA administrative budget; control of journals or the creation of new journals in specialty areas; tenure of the autonomy of sessions to engage in their own activities. The very question of the possibility of sessions to plan sessions in non-standard formats, relying on informal connections, is countered by the tendency of the central organization to be highly rule-conscious and to enforce standardization on sections. These problems are expected in patterns of organizational politics.

The ASA, as an organization of sociologists, is not exempt from typical organizational conflicts and dilemmas. Let us note two points in this connection. One is that organizational conflict tends to be self-sustaining. From the side of the sections, the very fact that there is some political conflict with the ASA central government is something that mobilizes section members; it creates issues which bring people to section meetings, it generates emotions, and thereby enhances section identity and solidarity. On the other hand, some ASA members who sit on the appointed and elected bodies which make up the central structure only serve in these capacities intermittently, but their very participation in these roles seems to mobilize their sense of identification with the ASA and its centrally-appointed bodies of rules and policies. The experience of being on an ASA wide committee makes its members think about regulations and principles that they may never have given any thought to before they became advocates of interests of the "whole," which, in fact, are concretely embodied nowhere except on these committees. In these settings, the demands of sections for their own resources or autonomy to pursue their own activities, perhaps in a particularistic way, are seen as non-universalistic, perhaps as violations of due procedures or the rights of ide type ASA members in the abstract.

A "democratic mobilization" has taken place in the ASA at both levels in the last two decades. We have already seen that the growth of sections represents several aspects of such mobilization. At the same time, there have been movements which identify themselves as "anti-establishment" or "anti-establishment" which have campaigned for Presidential candidates, and for increased representation in nominations and other ASA committees. Some of these movements have been part of the Left politics of the 1960s and 1970s; some have been especially oriented towards increased representation by gender and ethnic minorities. These movements have been partly successful in penetrating the central structure of the association. The very fact that they are in the central structure, however, appears likely to give them a "counter-ideological" orientation. Thus the two prongs of democratic mobilization in the ASA, at the level of sections and the central government, have probably increased the level of tension in the ASA's internal organizational politics.

An important part of organizational theory is relevant here: the success of
decentralization and the democratization at the center increase the complexity and the proliferation of rules and regulatory bodies. Both processes feed on the other. The process seems likely to continue in the future.

To end this part of the report on a theoretical note it is not merely size that pushes differentiation. Political mobilization itself fosters the kind of differentiation we have seen in the growth of sections, specialty journals, regulatory committees, and probably the ASA Executive Committee itself. Once set in motion, incremental democratic mobilization and the structures which result feed on themselves in a circular process. This is the reason why complexity in the ASA has continued to increase even during periods when the organizations has not grown in size, or even declined.

III. Policy Implications for ASA as a peak association

We can ask now whether the growth of sections is going to change the structure of the ASA, whether it will lead to a loose federation, or to ASA-style splits, whether it is has good or bad effects on intellectual life and professional solidarity, and what if anything the ASA policy-making bodies can and should do about it.

It appears that the internal structure of the ASA has already changed into a quasi-decentralized organization in which sections are a major location of intellectual and social activities. Growth of sections seems likely to continue in the future, especially since it is not dependent upon growth in size of ASA membership, but derives from political processes which are now institutionalized. If membership grows again in the future, this would add further incentives and motivations for continuing the proliferation of sections. The up-and-down swings in ASA membership during the past two decades have been tied to growth and decline in the production of PhD's, and in that in turn to undergraduate enrollments in sociology; indeed this same pattern exists in all the social science disciplines. (See Figures 2 and 3). The upturn in enrollments in the mid-1980s, and further potential growth in future...
decades, may bring increases in ASA membership, although probably not the precipitous growth of the period 1948-72. But since the internal dynamics of ASA structural change do not seem to be primarily size-driven, these trends will have only a secondary influence on structure.

We have not made the systematic comparisons among professional associations in different fields and different countries that would show the conditions under which federated structures or organizational fission occur. We can however, indicate a few patterns.

One line of thought suggests that any of these more extreme forms of decentralization or fission are not very probable, at least in the immediate future. That is because few if any of the ASA sections have a strong enough independent identity or independent resource base to go it alone. Sections may increasingly hold some activities independently of the ASA, but few of them seem likely to organize themselves as disciplines in their own right. Some trends have gone in the opposite direction. For instance, sociologists of science have since 1970 belonged to the Society for Social Studies of Science (4S), an interdisciplinary group with its own annual meetings, journals, and honors; but in 1988 a Science, Knowledge, and Technology section was formed within the ASA, led by individuals who are also active in the 4S. The Society for the Study of Social Problems (SSSP) in the early 1950s, and the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction (SSSI), which formed in 1975, continue to have large overlapping memberships with ASA and typically arrange their meetings to connect with ASA annual meetings.

There appear to be advantages to sociologists in various specialties to continue to identify themselves organizationally with the ASA, even as they identify themselves as specialists. There are economies of scale in meetings, sponsoring journals, and otherwise remaining connected. The costs of the specialized activities among the conglomeration of specialties in the ASA, specialized sociologists feel isolated or alienated within the complex structure of the ASA, they likely would feel greater isolation without some institutional structure, as they would comprise even smaller fragments within the larger intellectual world in general. The institutionalization of sections for specialties thus may be an accommodation to the specialized nature of much work in sociology, and may also provide an incentive for specialists to remain in the ASA.

The ASA as a peak association for the profession of sociology has a unique position not shared by the other organizations through which the profession mobilizes. Such peak associations have typically remained viable in other fields. It may even be the case that sociology has not reached the highest levels of organizational mobilization and differentiation which are rare; the data presented above on mobilization density show physicians, for example, at a level of multiple organizational membership that is far above the more strictly academic professors. It can be argued, moreover, that the strength of the discipline as a whole (opposed to the narrower interests of any particular organization within it) is enhanced by a high degree of organizational mobilization and hence of organizational differentiation.

The case of fusion in the American Psychological Association bears some examination in its own right, which see have not carried out in any detail. In broad terms, this organizational split is the culmination of a conflict between academic and applied psychologists. It has occurred after psychology and sustained growth in membership to levels which are much higher than in sociology. The growth curves for both disciplines were similar up through 1970 (Figure 1) and after that point, psychology continued upward, while sociology declined; in undergraduate enrollments, psychology produced peak association membership alike. Most of the recent growth in psychology appeared to have been in the applied areas, reaching a peak in the 1980s in which practitioners have become the majority of the APA. It is conceivable that a comparable growth in applied, non-academic sociologists could occur in the future, but we are far from an APA-type situation. The ASA remains overwhelming academic, estimated at least as 7.5 percent of membership; by current trends in growth of applied sociologists, the danger of organizational split would not appear until for into the next century. The point is underscored by the fact that the APA at its height reached a membership of 8,000, an order of magnitude larger than the ASA or any other social science association (see Figure 1).

The effects of the "section evolution" on intellectual life and social solidarity within the ASA are not straightforward. At first glance, it would appear that sections further the fragmentation of intellectual interests within the profession, and reduce solidarity. However, there are indications that sections, especially the newer ones, are intellectually vital, and provide some of the excitement and sense of participation that sociologists want from their professional association. It is not clear that by forcefully splitting or drastically curtailing sections, we would be able to create intellectual integration, or raise our level of solidarity as sociologists generally. Complementarity and fragmentation are a fact of life in our discipline, due to the wide variety of topics upon which sociologists work, the variety of methods and theoretical approaches, and the many borders which sociology shares with adjacent fields. The structure of the ASA responds to these conditions more than it creates them. One line of policy, then, would be the growth of sections as a good thing, at a desirable accommodation to a state of affairs which we cannot control in any case.

There are probably some intrinsic limits to the amount of section growth that can occur. With the exception of Medical Sociology, Organizations and Occupations (two sections which have traditionally been very large), and the Sex and Gender section (which has grown upon the rising proportion of female sociologists), all sections are of modest size (between 200 and 500 members). The creation of new sections appears to cut into the membership of existing sections. This probably occurs because of increased demands on time, and because of the piling up of additional section dues (which themselves have increased in dollar amounts). It is likely that many sociologists work in more than one specialty, and that they change their interests from time to time (this is a pattern typically found in any scientific research discipline: see Derek Price's, Little Science, Big Science, and Beyond). A Columbia University Press, 1986; and Eugene Garfinkel, Citizenship and Social Order, New York: Free Press, 1969). Accordingly, the continued proliferation of sections is likely to put burdens upon the growth of any new section, and also to keep its membership in flux. This is another reason why we would not expect that this would be viable organizations outside the context of the ASA.

Policy Options

The ASA could adopt policies to move deliberately toward several different structural models. At one end, the ASA could reorganize as a holding company of highly autonomous specialty organizations, along the lines of the International Sociological Association, which is little more than a central registration and control of research committees. However, the ASA has about 1,000 dues-paying members between world congresses, guaranteeing survival of the organization as an UNESCO grants decline. Not surprisingly, the ISA is strong enough in internationalization and control of research committees, although many members don't like this.

An opposite policy would be to encourage special interest groups to organize, but without ASA recognition. The network researchers, with their annual Sunbelt Network Conferences and their journal/newsletter groups, may well be a successful example of this model. Organizational sociologists could be encouraged to take their activities to the Academy of Management, political sociologists to the American Political Science Association, and so forth. Related to this, the ASA could abolish specialty journals, and maintain only journals with an intellectual centralizing approach: an ASE, which is eclectic, and a CSP that looks like the Journal of Economic Literature, which the Pyschologi cal Bulletin, reviewing books as well as entire fields in synthetic articles. This centralizing policy would work down the length of meetings, so that the entire membership would be present at the same time. Such meeting programs would be pared down to plenary, thematic, and a few other special sessions. These moves, although perhaps draconian in the current atmosphere of ASA politics, would enforce an emphasis on a central identity of sociologists, focus their attention on a few (hopefully major) issues; it would also make for a more articulate voice for academic sociology and perhaps for greater ability to speak as an association on professional as well as public policy issues.

Between the two extremes of loose federation and tightened centralization, various levels of tinkering are possible. The ASA has the power to manipulate rules for sections. One could limit the number of sections to which a member could belong. One could increase or decrease the number of new members required for section survival. One could create several levels of section membership, such as a newsletter-only category which costs less than full membership. One could treat the expenses of sections dues explicitly as incentives or disincentives for section membership. This has become a political sore point in the relation between the sections and Council. At the Atlanta meetings, for example, there was serious hostility in the CBSS Section Business Meeting over section dues increases, which were perceived as insensitive (or worse) to the interests of section members; and there appear to be numerous such incidents.

The underlying problem is that the formal governance structure of ASA has only an incidental relationship to the structure.

See ASA, page 9.
Regular Session Topics and Organizers Announced

August 11-15, 1990
Washington Hilton & Towers

Theme: Sociology and the Public Agenda

The 1990 Program Committee, headed by President-Elect William Jalius Wilson, has organized thematic sessions exploring the problem of protecting the tradi-
tion of free intellectual inquiry and promoting the political and social responsibil-
ity of social science. The regular sessions reflect the broad array of topics that per-
cently interest sociologists.

President-Elect William Jalius Wilson and the 1990 Program Committee are call-
ing for submissions to Regular Sessions, Poster Sessions, and Roundtable Dis-
sкусions, according to the guidelines below. All submissions are due as early as possible and must be received by December 31, 1989 at the latest.

Regular Sessions

Regular Sessions continue to constitute the heart of the program. The 1990 Pro-
gram Committee has retained broad topics and expanded several areas to reflect cur-
rent trends of interest and the 1990 meet-
ing theme ("Sociology and the Public Agenda").

Where to send papers. Members of the ASA and other interested persons should submit abstracts directly to the Regular Ses-
sion organizers listed below. For topics having two co-organizers, please be sure to send two copies, one directly to each co-
organizer. Submissions should include complete information (Affiliations, mailing addresses) on all authors and co-authors.

Topics have been defined rather broadly by the 1990 Program Committee in order to discourage multiple submissions of the same paper to the different organizers (as with ASA journals). The 1990 Program
Committee has set the following submis-
sion policy: You are permitted to submit the same paper to two—and no more than two—organizers, including organizers of Sections-
sponsored sessions. In cases of dual submis-
sions, you are required to notify each organizer of this fact and to list the other organizer to whom the paper is being sent. Failure to meet this requirement allows organizers to drop the paper from all sessions involved.

Length and Style: Papers as submitted are limited to 20 pages, including footnotes, tables and bibliographies. For presentation at the meetings, papers should be turned in 10 minutes talk. Presentations should highlight and interpret major points only and the delivery should be well-paced. (Details of empirical data and procedures of collection and analysis should be reserved for handouts or written versions.) Lengthier versions are more suitable for subsequent publication than for oral presentation.

Original contribution: Papers must reflect original work, or major developments in previously reported work. Papers are not acceptable if they have been published or presented at the meeting or accepted for publication before being submitted to the organizers for consideration, or if they have been modi-
fied in only secondary respects after similar
readings or publication.

How to send: Organizers have been instructed by the Program Committee not to accept abstracts, letters, or telephone calls in lieu of full papers when consider-
ing inclusions for their sessions; therefore, your opportunities for acceptance will be reduced if you fail to submit a complete paper.

Submissions should include a cover letter which provides affiliations and current mailing addresses for all co-authors and identifies anyone you are not a sociologist or who is a foreign scholar. If a paper is also being sent to another organizer, identify that topic and organizer.

Authors should note that organizers have been informed that they need not return manuscripts unless the manus-
cripts have been accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Authors who want an acknowledgement of receipt of the paper by the organizer should also include a self-addressed, stamped postcard.

Deadlines: The deadline for submission of paper to organizers is December 31, 1989. Organiz-
ers are not obligated to consider papers received after that date. Abstracts are final copies of accepted papers will be due in the Executive Office by April 1, 1990.

Roundtables

Discussion Roundtables are continually popular features of ASA programs. They are particularly valuable for those who are developing new ideas or formulating issues in new ways and who would like to explore these ideas or issues with colleagues who have similar interests.

Roundtables also offer an opportunity for those who share conceptual, methodol-
ical, professional, or policy concerns to meet one another and to initiate and expand networks.

At Roundtables, no formal papers are presented, nor is audio-visual or tape recording equipment permitted. Since these roundtables are classified as infor-
mal sessions, the presentations are not eligible for inclusion in the ASA Abstract and Paper Service.

A Roundtable Session is usually com-
prised of up to 15 tables of discussion (each roundtable seats ten people) held at the same time in one of the larger public rooms in the hotel. Presenters introduce topics and facilitate discussion among all the participants at the table. All Roundta-
ble topics and presenters will be listed in the Program.

Members wishing to propose a topic or issue for discussions should send a one-page summary describing this topic to Vincent Pariv, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Paterson College of New Jer-
sey, 100 Pompton Road, Wayne, NJ 07470. Summaries will be reviewed by the Roundtable Organizing Committee for possible inclusion in the program. The submission deadline is December 31, 1989.

Poster Sessions

A Poster Session is a display presenta-
tion that consists of an exhibit of material that authors personally attend for an
assigned period (usually one or two hours). The display reports current research with results that can be readily summarized in graphic form, tables, graphs, pictures, etc. Handouts of the complete presentation must also be avail-
able at the session. Poster sessions provide a unique platform for personal discussion of work with interested colleagues.

Poster submissions are invited on all topics including the program theme. As in regular sessions, poster submissions are expected to reflect original research that has not been previously published. Submis-
sions should be limited to 20 pages, including examples or drafts of the graphic material to be presented.

Send all submissions to Stephen F. Sevri, Research Consultant, 901 Randell Road, Severna Park, MD 21146. Detailed instruc-
tions on preparing a poster, together with information about the exhibit space, will be sent to those who have been accepted for poster sessions. The submission deadline is December 31, 1989.

Program Policies

Membership: All sociologists and graduate students of sociology who are listed on the Program must hold current membership in ASA. Participation on the Program is limited to ASA members, including graduate students. Exemptions may be made for the following three categories: (1) foreign scholars, (2) persons from other disciplines, and (3) sociologists invited by the Program Committee to participate on Thematic or Plenary Sessions. (Note that a mem-
bership exemption does not include an exemption from the following pre-
registration fees requirement.)

Pre-registration. ASA Council policy requires all participants on the Annual Meeting program who present papers or serve as presiders, discussants, panelists, presenters, or workshop leaders, to pre-
register for the convention. Pre-
registration fees are not received by April 1; participants’ names will be deleted from the Program. Foreign scholars and persons from other disciplines are not exempted from the pre-registration requirement but may pre-register at the Member rate if they have received a membership exemption. Pre-registration fees are non-refundable.

Listings: No individual may be accorded more than two listings on the Program. This ruling includes all types of participa-
tion except being listed as the organizer of a session.

You may present only one sole-authored paper: however, you may do this in con-
junction with one other participation on the program. Program proposals which count as participations include presider/modera-
tor/facilitator, discussant/reviewer, sole author, co-author, roundtable presenter, roundtable presider/leader, panelist, and seminar or workshop leader/co-leader. In short, every appearance on the program except that of organizer counts as a participation.

Sessions: Papers presented on Regular Sessions, Section-sponsored formal paper ses-
sions, and Section Refereed Roundtables are eligible for the ASA Abstract and Paper Service.

Non-refereed roundtable presentations, including Informal Discussion Roundtable and Section Informal Roundtables, are not eligible for the Abstract and Paper Service since these sessions are intended to be informal discussions and not formal paper presentations.

(Continued on next page)
Washington University's Sociology Department: An Update

It is important for sociologists to know that the Washington University case in no way is symptomatic of a discipline on the verge of decline or collapse. In discussing this case among yourselves, with colleagues in other departments, and with administrators for those who work in academia, please keep in mind the following facts: a) the number of sociology majors is up by more than 10% in the past four years, from 11,223 to 12,500; the climb has been slow but steady, and consistent.

b) Job openings, as measured by ads in the ASA Employment Bulletin, have almost doubled in the past six years. In the 1982-83 years, the EBD recorded 444 different jobs in the year just completed (June 1 - May 31) there were a total of 842 jobs advertised.

c) Despite the cuts made by Reagan administration officials in 1981 and 1982, federal funding for basic research in sociology grew from $23.9 million in 1979 to $34.8 million in 1987. The figures for applied research for sociology were $34 million in 1979 to $44 million in 1987. These figures are small compared with the amounts received by the physical sciences, but they are comparable to what economics and political science received and greater than anthropology.

d) The Departments of Agriculture, of Education, of Commerce, and in the American Association for the Advancement of Science is the most positive and about here, and positive in all respects. COSSA is highly regarded, and the leaders of the physical sciences are invisibly recognizing that the key role we must play in the nation is to confront successfully the major problems if fact.

e) Despite occasional stories of gloom and doom that appear in the press about sociology, the fact is that sociologists are being quoted favorably on a regular basis in the nation's leading newspapers and magazines.

The discipline certainly has problems and it requires talented people to meet the growing demands of one is demand. But if you think about the number of three thatAutomian American to receive a PhD in sociology, Iulian Samoza, now Professor Emeritus of the University of Washington, in 1966. He embarked on a program of research in the area of social change, a field that is growing steadily, and is one that has been recognized by the National Academy of Sciences. It is not only the social sciences that are facing this challenge, but also the humanities, that is, the social sciences and the humanities.

On the face of it, it would not require that much effort to restore sociology to a point that would put it at the top of the social sciences at Washington University. It is no wonder, then, that the action taken by you and the higher administration of Washington University seems as arbitrary and capricious to us.

One hears that the problem stems from the fact that the Department had its share of controversies during the past two decades. So have other great and not-so-great departments. Perhaps more than any other science, sociology by its nature may be seen as controversial. Sociological research into areas like race relations, family life, and human sexuality touch deeply held beliefs and values. Large segments of the public have difficulty accepting sociological research on the reasons why people get divorced, or have abortions, and they value that absolutely oppose divorce or abortion. Kristin Lack's charter and the Regents of Mother is important science research precisely because it demands the hard questions, and does so in an ever-expanding scientific and humanistic way. But in a society like ours, it and much of the important research, whether done by the Washington University sociology faculty, or by faculty at Berkeley or Madison, is bound to be controversial. I would like to believe, therefore, that the controversy of so much research in sociology is not the result of the reasons why the society's leading minds have decided his actions.

Your action causes wondrous at yet absurd. Washington University claims to house within the larger university structure a liberal arts undergraduate institution of national stature. It is true, that I believe in a contradiction in terms to claim that we have a liberal arts program of national stature and not to include as a core part of that program a major in sociology. That sociology is one of the core disciplines would seem to be beyond question. It is in fact one of the eleven disciplines selected to participate in the "Study in Depth" program sponsored by the Association of American Colleges, with grants from the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education. Furthermore, I have recently been appointed to the Committee on Science, Mathematics and Engineering Education of Sigma Xi, The Scientific Research Society. So far as I know, I am the only social scientist on the Committee. The focus of the Committee's attention this year is to assist the student body in graduate education.

Whatever the reason or reason for the decision to close the Sociology Department, this seems a most opportune time to re-examine that decision. The American Sociological Association stands ready to offer its good offices in a variety of ways to help rebuild sociology at Washington University to a position of national stature.

The number of jobs for PhD sociologists available in the ASA Employment Bulletin has almost doubled in the past seven years. And the number of jobs for sociologists with graduate degree in business and government and nonprofit associations has been growing steadily since 1983 in numbers and in every part of the country.

The present situation nationally and internationally is very favorable for sociology. The Association stands ready to assist you in developing a good and continuing curriculum to offer your students, and to offer its good offices in a variety of ways to help rebuild sociology at Washington University to a position of national stature. Given its location in one of America's important urban centers, it should be possible to begin the rebuilding process within a year, and within five years, achieve a program of which the University and the Association can both be proud.

Sincerely yours, William V. D'Antonio Executive Officer

Update from a WU Faculty Member

by Diane Baker, Washington University

For the second time in five years, a private university has decided to close a sociology department, this time one that ranked among the very best only twenty years ago. Citing resource allocation as their rationale and modelling their decision explicitly on the closure of the sociology department at the University of Rochester in 1986, administrators at Washington University in St. Louis will close the sociology department, effective 1991. Ironically, Washington University has just completed an endowment campaign of $830 million which was described in January 1988 by University Chancellor William Danforth as "the largest amount yet raised by any university in a single campaign," and which placed the university seventh nationally in college endowments, just behind Princeton, Cornell, and Stanford. Nevertheless, according to Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences Martin E. Institute of Higher Education was established by Washington University, a barrier to the title of excellence, and a barrier to leadership in every field, and in a period of no-growth budget the university must reduplicate its resources selectively to nurture excellence where it can. “Rebuilding the sociology department to a level of excellence with substantial investment,” an investment which the Dean felt would be better made in other departments, rather than the announcement to the Washington University sociology faculty on April 10th, 1989.

Repeatedly citing listing of faculty, Dean Israel has written to the university's campus newspaper arguing that, “within the social sciences there is no depth, no discipline,” such that much of the subject matter of sociology can be found in psychology, political science, and anthropology. The Dean sought no offers of support for that decision, but was advised by an academic planning committee which he appointed and which included the social sciences chair, Professor of Political Science, Peter Watkinson of Anthropology, and Douglas North of Economics. In fact, the Dean and his academic planning committee, abandoned previous recommendations for strengthening the sociology department, late 1986 by outside consultants Richard Simpson (UNC) and Gary Becker (Chicago).

At its last regular faculty meeting on April 28th, the faculty of the College of Arts & Sciences heard various reservations both about the specific closure of the sociology department and about the general strategy of the closure for the future directions of Washington's College of Arts and Sciences. An unusually large number of faculty members attended this final faculty meeting of the academic year and by a decisive vote passed a resolution directing the college's Faculty Council to review the Dean's recommendation and the Dean's decision to close the sociology department. The motion read as follows: "To seek the support of the College of Arts & Sciences to understand better the implications of the policy of building on strengths, this policy, as well as the specific decision to phase out the Department of Sociology, should be explored in detail by the Faculty Council, using whatever methods seem reasonable and appropriate." The Faculty Council is scheduled to begin its review of the decision in the upcoming fall semester.

Since the situation at Washington University was first announced in May 1989, attempts have been made by the ASA's President Joan Huber and Executive Director William Danforth to reconcile the private university officials to develop plans for revitalizing rather than closing department (see A. Antonio letter to this page). To date, saying that he anticipates no change in the decisions to close the sociology department, Chancellor Danforth has declined to meet with ASA representatives. These Washington University officials, who have faced administrative difficulties with their sociology department before, once again appear to diminish the significance of a discipline and its critical role for the future. Writing from Cambridge to the St. Louis Post Dispatch, Danforth asked how can a "University hope to produce an informed and alert citizenry, capable of making national decisions, and of handling the many problems of our times, if it fails to cultivate sociological thought?" Marvin Cummings, chair of the department at Washington University, said, "Sociology and the many disciplines of the liberal arts are seriously jeopardized by the leadership of higher education has no greater vision than linking university figures with..."
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with the research opportunities of the moment.

Washington University administrators are abandoning a sociology department with a long and famous history. Max Weber lectured at Washington University when eminent European scholars were invited to St. Louis in conjunction with the 1904 World’s Fair. Sociology was first taught regularly at the University in 1906 when Roger Baldwin, who later founded the American Civil Liberties Union, began his career by offering sociology courses. Prior to World War II, Washington University’s sociology department was home to two ASA presidents, L.L. Bernard (1932) and Stuart Queen (1941), and it was also home of four distinguished journals, The American Sociologist, Transactions, Titus, and—still in residence—Theory and Society. Jessie Bernard received one of the first PhDs from Washington University’s sociology department in 1935 and still retains fond memories of the department. In 1956, Nicholas Denzin was recruited from the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences at the University of North Carolina to develop a nationally recognized research program, a task which he promptly accomplished by recruiting scholars such as Joseph Rauh, David Filtran, and Alpert Weiss. In 1959, Alvin Gouldner was attracted to the department, followed by Leo Rieffel, Robert Regoli, Irving Louis Horowitz, and Robert Habermas. Throughout the sixties the sociology department was internationally recognized as the site of considerable creativity and controversy, culminating in the creation of the New World view for Alvin Gouldner and the exodus of many of the talented sociologists by the end of the decade. Since 1975 no tenure has been granted for the department of sociology and the administration has allowed the department to languish.

Reported promptly by the New York Times (May 28, 1989), the closure of the sociology department at Washington University was characterized as a milestone in the purported decline of the discipline of sociology. It is now quite urgent that all concerned are aware that the ASA move to diffuse and redefine the myth about the current condition of sociology. Concerned collegians in all of the social sciences need to write to their local newspapers and to Washington University administrators. We should also consider the wider implications of the situation. The need for a more comprehensive and coordinated public image of the discipline strongly echoes the recent summons by past ASA president Herbert Gans’ for a fuller sense of our “sociological identity” and for active communication and cooperation both among ourselves and with the press (ASA, February 1989). As noted by Washington University sociologist Alvin, William Staudemann, Assistant Professor at Bates College, “Washington University has provided an effective model for how the modern, financially secure university can remove ‘unnecessary’ academic disciplines. The ASA challenge is to provide an equally strong model for how professional associations can respond to this threat.”

We urge sociologists to contact the department by writing to Professor Marvin Einhorn, Chair, Department of Sociology, Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri 63130, or by calling (314) 889-6650 (or BITNET at #008274stanmail.wustl.edu). At least we would urge all concerned ASA members to raise pens and voices, both in protest over the Washington University situation and, in your more public posture, to your own local newspapers and media representatives. Sociology deserves a better press but, as sociologists have themselves long noted, this involves active management and proactive response to media issues.

Sociologists Urge Reconsideration

Editor’s Note: The following letter was sent to the editors of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and was signed by 63 sociologists in the St. Louis metropolitan area. Use the address below to send additional letters.

May 2, 1989

St. Louis Post-Dispatch
900 North Tucker Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Editor:

Over the past 20 years Americans have had reason to become wary of narrow and short-sighted solutions to complex problems. We increasingly realize that our actions affect multiple aspects of the world around us. Yet, policy decision that are served by medicine, politics, or other individual disciplines tend to be informed by limited perspectives. At a result, it is critical that any college education include a sound grounding in the liberal arts. Students need to be exposed to philosophy, literature, history, sociology and other disciplines regardless of their field of specialization to create well rounded individuals.

It is in this context that the undersigned sociologists, from colleges and universities throughout the St. Louis region, are alarmed by the actions of Washington University to close its sociology department. Sociology involves the study of society. In our increasingly complex society, it is hard to imagine that a university could consider itself complete without having a sociology faculty. Sociology offers a unique and distinct way of looking at society that cannot be provided by any other discipline. As political science, anthropology, economics, and the other social sciences, sociology offers its students special insights into the world around us that are useful in any profession. Cloning a department of sociology is therefore not much different from burning a book, because both也好ishment of knowledge.

We urge the Chancellor of Washington University and its Board of Trustees to reconsider their decision to close their sociology department. Its closure will be a loss to Washington University’s students, and the St. Louis community as a whole.

Sincerely,

[Signatures and affiliations]
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of the sections. The major policy-making bodies (Council, Committees and Section Nominations) are based on plenum principles of direct election, where the sections are corporate groups with their own propensities toward self-government. If sections have become the major focus of identification for ASA members, then one might consider giving them direct representation in the policy-making bodies.

If in fact sections are a permanent, and growing, part of ASA, the most reasonable policy might be to encourage extensive overlapping membership among sections.

The more extreme policy of enforced centralization would likely increase conflict, the other extreme, radical decentralization, would in effect deprive the sociological profession of its peak association.

Footnotes

*During the years 1906-24, every Vice President became President two years later (passing through the steps of 2nd and 1st Vice President). This was a custom but not a constitutional requirement. See Kimball Young. *"History of the American Sociological Society, 1890-1919," American Journal of Sociology, 29 (1923): 404-418.

**In contrast, the system of 1st and 2nd Vice President’s has been ended: 23 of the 33 1st Vice Presidents serving went on to become President, with an average wait of 4.1 years. During 1958-69, 6 of 12 Vice Presidents serving subsequently became President (average wait 4.3 years, including one Vice President who succeeded to office immediately because of a President’s death). During 1965-82, 4 of 12 Vice Presidents have gone on to higher office (average wait 6.3 years). (None has yet advanced for the 1981-89 group. Looking at it in the other direction: every President between 1937 and 1952 had been a Vice President, except for Lester Ward (the first President) and Allen Sears (the fourth). From 1953 to 1959, 12 of 41 Presidents did not come up through the ranks: 1974 to 1980: the most typical path (1st 2nd President) was to be an "outsider".

**The forerunner of this pattern was the 1964 election when Gordon was elected after a "grassroots campaign" of supporters.

The historical relationship between ASA and the regional and district level associations is documented in the manuscript by Tannen and Turner cited at the beginning of this report.


---

Special Prices on Overstocked Publications!

The ASA has several publications currently overstocked in our storage facilities. We are offering, on a first-come, first-served basis, the following special prices on these publications. Special prices apply only to ASA members using the order form below. Supplies are limited. Please allow 4-6 weeks for delivery.

**Cumulative Index of Sociological Journals, 1971-1985**
Regularly $13.70; now $2.00

**Index to American Sociological Review, 1936-1970**
Regularly $10.00; now $5.00

**Directory of Members, 1988**
Regularly $15.00; now $2.00

**Sociological Methodology, 1986** (without指数)
Regularly $23.00; now $15.00

**Row Monograph Series (paperback)**

- Trafficking in Drug Users (Brenner)
  Regularly $17.85; now $7.50

- Opening and Closing: Strategies of Information Adaptation in Society (Kaplan)
  Regularly $24.00; now $5.50

- Manufacturing Green Gold (Friedheim, Barter, and Thomas)
  Regularly $11.00; now $7.00

- Religion and Family: Changes
  Regularly $9.50; now $5.50

- Understanding Events: Actor and the Construction of Social Action (Wright)
  Regularly $12.00; now $6.00

- Education, Employment and Mobility: Israel and Comparative Perspective (Rothman)
  Regularly $9.50; now $5.00

- From Student to Nurse: A Longitudinal Study of Socialization (Rispens)
  Regularly $22.00; now $6.00

- The Paradoxes of Parenting (Kaplan)
  Regularly $20.00; now $6.00

- Players and Participators: The New Working Class in Italy (Law-Beres)
  Regularly $20.00; now $6.00

- Middle Stairs: An Experiment in the Educational Treatment of Young Adolescents (Vinger, Berda, Laycock, Cutler)
  Regularly $13.50; now $3.00

- Sociological Explanation as Translation (Turner)
  Regularly $20.00; now $5.00

Please send me:

**Name**

**Member ID**

**Mailing Address**

**City**

**State**

**Zip**

**Quantity**

**Title**

**Price Each**

**Total**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Index of Sociological Journals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASA Index</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory of Members</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociological Methodology 1986</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Monograph Series (paperback)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NSF Fellowships Valuable to Scholars and Institutions

by Edward Marques, Arizona State University

The National Science Foundation, through its Research Science Institute, makes annual fellowship awards for graduate work in sociology. The stipends given the awardees are substantial: $12,300 per year, renewable for three years. Additionally, the university at which the fellowship is held receives a cost of education allowance of $6,000 per year to cover such items as tuition and fees. The fellowship, then, can be worth as much as $54,000 per scholar over a three-year period. Importantly, these fellowships are portable; they can be taken to the fellow’s university of choice, whether in the United States or abroad. Since awards are made on the basis of a national competition, an NSF graduate fellowship is prestigious both to the fellow and to the institutions at which they choose to study.

The basic eligibility requirements are that the applicant be a U.S. citizen (or a national of a U.S. possession) at the time of application and that he or she have taken less than 20 hours of graduate coursework (20 hours for an NSF Minority Graduate Fellowship). The overriding criterion on which awards are made is that of the ability of the applicant as judged by a panel of scientists in his/her field. The application, then, should be filled out carefully with this in mind.

The application calls for providing basic background information such as the baccalaureate institution of the applicant, the undergraduate grade point average, Graduate Record Examination scores for the verbal, quantitative and analytical exams, and the GRE Subject Test (in this case, the test in sociology), plus two essays. The applicant is asked to write two brief (two-page) essays, the first pertaining to previous research work he/she has done, and the second concerning a plan of study for the fellowship to be awarded to the candidate. These two essays are particularly telling. Applicants who have had some previous research experience, who are able to express some theoretical knowledge in combination with some methodological sophistication, either quantitative or qualitative, score well here. Their essays have a scholarly and professional air about them resulting in readings by the evaluating panels.

The applicant should have a definite purpose in mind when selecting a university in which to do their graduate work, usually a desire to work in a department noted for graduate training in a certain area. Having said all of the above, it seems to me that one of the best ways to help a student gain a NSF fellowship, assuming that the student has the potential for graduate work in sociology, is to have the student apprentice with you on an actual project. The resulting letters of recommendation from mentors with whom the applicant has worked on actual research projects tend to be rich, detailed and three-dimensional. A detailed, thoughtful letter of reference certainly is better than the “Well, I think I had the student in one of my classes and I think he/she did well” type.

In sum, encourage your students to apply for valuable NSF Graduate Fellowships. If one of your students is a member of a group severely underrepresented in science (American Indian, Black, Hispanic, Native Alaskan, or Native Pacific Islander), then there are NSF Minority Graduate Fellowships available based on competition very similar to that described above. NSF Fellowships try to insure that the nation’s able and deserving young scholars receive the best training possible, so that the next generation of sociologists will be fully able to continue the development and the enrichment of our field.

For additional information on fellowships, application forms, and/or competition deadlines, write to:

The Fellowship Office, National Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20550; (202) 334-2872.

NSF Celebrates 25,000th Fellowship

by Robert Allhauzer, Associate Program Director, Sociology Program

In March, 1989, the National Science Foundation awarded its 25,000th Graduate Fellowship. To commemorate this milestone award, NSF has endowed a series of lectures by former NSF Graduate Fellows. These lectures are being given at the annual meeting of the professional associations representing the fields included in the Fellowship program.

A gathering of all former Sociology Graduate Fellows was forwarded to ASA President Joan Zander, who has chosen Richard D. Kautzman as the Lecturer for a special program at the August ASA meetings in San Francisco. Kautzman is an Associate Professor of Sociology at Ohio State University and presently serves as Deputy Editor of the American Sociological Review.

Kautzman, a PhD graduate of the University of Wisconsin, held his Fellowship between 1974 and 1977. He has held faculty positions at the Universities of Texas and Utah, before assuming his present position in 1985 at Ohio State. He has published important articles on such topics as dual economy theory, industrial and occupational structure, black-white earnings differentials, clustering and log-linear methods. He is an active member of the "gang of five" at Ohio State who have undertaken an ambitious program of research in the areas of the sociology of work organizations, work outcomes and technological change.

The NSF Graduate Fellowship program currently awards fellowships to 1,200 annual stipend for each of the three-year term of the Fellowship. Also granted is tuition and a fee waiver, in lieu of which a cost-of-education allowance to the graduate institution is provided. Fellows attend the institution of their choice, or very near the beginning of their graduate study in science or engineering. Eleven Fellows have been awarded Nobel Laureates. Many Fellows have gone on to distinguished careers as productive scholars and academic leaders; yet they can count an NSF Fellowship as one of their earliest honors. Their collective success reflects the overwhelming goal of this program to seek out the best among our young scientists and engineers and to give them the means to pursue graduate study without institutional, disciplinary or economic restriction.

Information about this program, and a related Minority Graduate Fellowship program for outstanding minority students, can be obtained by writing the Division of Research Career Development, Room 630, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC 20550 or calling (202) 357-7706. The opening date for the next competition is September 1, 1989, and the closing date is November 13, 1989.

Urgent Need for Sociology Departments to Encourage NSF Graduate and Minority Fellowship Applications

A recent review of the National Science Foundation Minority Fellowship Programs revealed a major decline in the proportion of fellowships going to social science graduate students as compared with students in engineering and natural sciences. According to David Wiley, member of the NSF Fellowship Review Committee, this decline by approximately 18% has increased importance to sociologists because NSF plans to double the total number of fellowships available in this decade. NSF Director Erich Bloch has made doubling the NSF Graduate and Minority Fellowships a major priority for new funds in this five-year period.

Wiley (Professor of Sociology at Michigan State University, and a member of the National Science Foundation (NSF) Advisory Committee on International Programs) noted that the declining number and proportion of sociology and other social science fellowships was an artifact of two factors. First, recently NSF has decided to designate a portion of the fellowships exclusively for women candidates, and to allocate fellowship funds to minority faculty members in those fields. These fellowships are taken from the total fellowship pool before allocating fellowships by disciplinary field. Second, and more importantly, he noted that the NSF proportionately allocates fellowships based on the number of "high quality" student applications from each discipline in the previous year, and the number of high quality social science applications has declined over the past decade.

"Social science departments can remedy this decline in the years ahead only by a more aggressive policy of nominating high quality students for the fellowships. Each increment in the proportion of social science applications with high levels of GPA, GRE scores for the verbal, quantitative, analytical, and disciplinary subject exams and with strong recommendations will increase the proportion of Graduate and Minority Fellowships for the social sciences," he said. Even high quality students who do not receive awards in a given year serve to increase the fellowship pool for the discipline in succeeding years, and unselected nominees from their undergraduate institution can be nominated the following year by their graduate institution. Only graduating seniors and first year graduate students (less than 20 hours graduate work completed; 30 hours for minority applicants) are eligible for the awards, which, however, can be renewed for a three-year period. For information or application forms for the NSF Graduate or Minority Fellowships, write the Fellowship Office, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington, DC 20418; (202) 334-2872. The deadline for completed applications normally is mid-November. Only U.S. citizens and "native residents of U.S. possessions" are eligible for the three-year awards.

Upcoming Teaching Workshop . . .

Teaching About Substance Abuse and Prevention Efforts

October 9-21, Rueller, Montreal, Canada, and
Co-sponsored by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA)

Participants will:
- review recent research findings including monographs and journal articles about substance abuse, the social construction of social life
- receive current bibliographies or other references to the most current materials available on the topic of substance abuse from NIDA as well as other sources
- discuss issues involved in teaching about substance abuse including theoretical perspectives, research findings, and the applications of these to prevention and treatment
- work on the development of units for various sociology courses or on full courses devoted to teaching about substance abuse
- share insights about presentations on substance abuse in various types of undergraduate classroom settings ranging from large lecture classes to seminars
- discuss the use of campus drug abuse surveys as a research training experience for students
- learn about national survey data available from NIDA used for computer analysis exercises for students

Workshop Staff: Richard Clayton, University of Kentucky; Cynthia Robbins, University of Delaware; Steve Martin, University of Delaware; and staff at NIDA

Workshop Fees: $225 for ASA members; $275 for non-members (includes lodging for non-members)

For more information, contact J. Michael Brooks, Academic Services, Texas Christian University, Box 38797, Fort Worth, TX 76129, (817) 921-7476. The first 25 registrants received can be accepted up until September 18, 1989.
Engineers Confer on Technological Change

by Stephen A. Belfi

Recently, I attended two conferences on technology—Nelson N. Lichtenstein’s conference on the role of work co-sponsored by engineers’ associations, whose sociologists played crucial roles. It is interesting to compare the massive mix of sociologists, engineers and business practitioners, all of whom seemed to agree that the technology of the 1980s will be the most important to our society, and organizational questions connected with the implementation of technology, as distinct from its purely technical elements, that are problematic. It was the purpose of both conferences to create a dialogue between technologists and social scientists about the management of technological change.

The first conference, March 1-3, “Designing for Technological Change: People in the Process,” was co-sponsored by the National Academy of Sciences (and held in their West Coast congress center at the University of California, Irvine) and the National Research Council’s Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences; the major question posed by the conference panelists centered around concerns that the U.S. might be at a relative competitive disadvantage in worldwide markets in part due to implementing the new technologies and not using them to full advantage. Second, the conference panelists talked about new workplace technologies (four times faster than U.S. firms). In the keynote address, Robert F. Ashton (University of Wisconsin-Madison) noted that organizations that are highly responsive to business imperatives have been in a position to use the characteristics which make them want to implement technology and able to do so. Drawing on her own work, Webster (University of Illinois) pointed to the growing case studies from Ocean Spray to Procter and Gamble with flax, Kender noted the four factors of effective organization in the 1980s: fast, flexible, centered around related activities, and focused on the organization’s areas of competence, with leaders transmitting the core values and reward systems reinforcing them. Such organizations are better able to concentrate their key skills and want to invest in skills rather than remain fragmented and diversified. Executives concerned only with returns on investment and engaged in empire building are unable to center their organizations sufficiently.

3. Fast. Able to move quickly from ideas to execution, emphasizing innovation in every part of the company, from R&D to manufacturing systems for new ideas and channels to pursue them, and eliminating the communication barriers between functions. They are “integrative” rather than “segmentalist” with employees showing speed and receptivity in cross-functional, cross-level, cross-business relationships. Managers use metaphors that stress cooperation or collaboration, not competitive, entrepreneurial “cowboy” metonymies.

4. Flexible. Able to use internal resources in flexible ways, deploying people in broader assignments that use diverse skills and encouraging mobility across functional and business lines to create synergies.

5. Friendly. Able to work with other organizations, forming alliances & partnerships to transfer technology, and public relations.

Kender’s remarks often served as the touchstone in sessions which featured cases dealing with reengineering, medical technology, and automated manufacturing technology in such organizations as: Concorde, Business Peace, General Motors, JPL, International Business Machines, Airplanes, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Los Angeles Times. Social scientists, mostly sociologists, responded to these cases and led summary discussions to point out critical success factors. For instance, Paul Attewell (SUNY Stony Brook) identified a number of factors central to successful use of large office automation systems: the decentralization of systems staff, “puffing up” of system staff, and the need for user interface expertise. Over the last decade or so, there has been continual decentralization of computing (as the advent of the personal computer) and of systems expertise. In the most advanced firms, systems analysts find themselves reporting to line managers at the departmental head level, where they are assigned to tasks groups and work on solutions alongside users. (At Sherman Lehman Commercial Credit, for example, analysts also had to learn “the bond business” as end-users helped them build the systems.) Attewell suggested that social scientists need to address factors that will help guide practitioners in their quest for new organizational arrangements that will support close collaboration of system analysts, managers and operational employees. Attewell also pointed to the emergent quality of computers. In his research on thirty companies, in not one case did the end product look like the designer’s original plans. Rather than a handicap, this is a learning and modifying process for the entire organization and can be accommodated by designing for flexibility. Finally, given the excessive tendency of errors to ramify throughout highly integrated information systems, he stressed the need to recognize, track, and develop shopfloor expertise through on-the-job learning and knowledge acquisitiion.

At the second conference, Shoshana Zuboff (Harvard University) author of In the Age of the Smart Machine, presented this: in the past, automation was used to replace human functions either in deskilling work—a substituting unskilled labor for craft labor, or by replacing functions entirely (e.g., a robot replaces a welder) and thereby eliminating jobs. In short, automation was a piece of Taylorism—the ideology of management developed by Frederick W. Taylor that sought to load all knowledge and control over work with management—resulting in systematic deskilling of the labor force. The new information technology, however, according to Zuboff, is the first technology that radically reverses this process (potentially) by increasing rather than decreasing the intellectual content and character of work. The new work environment is “informing” as well as automating—creating responsiveness, value, and meaning. In this environment, learning itself becomes a new form of labor. While the traditions of management are based on control, managers must now learn to think of themselves as teachers—rather than as sole guardians of the explicit knowledge base. Indeed, unless they take on new skills, roles and ideologies they will become barriers to change. “A few years ago,” Zuboff said, “I would have been bowled off the stage with this thesis.” Today, however, there is more than an inkling that the problems of technology are problems of the human organization of work. Now that the problem has finally been named, there is a desire on the part of some managers and engineers, characteristically, to fix it. As Zuboff said, “It is a danger to move forward with technology and not simultaneously with an understanding of people and organizations. Unless proportional resources are spent in building the force, then you are building a monster.”

The growing recognition that the organization of work must be addressed (as evidenced by these conferences) indicates that the door is opening wider for sociologists. Nevertheless, we must approach this as the nature of the problems we confront. All the elements are there for sociological analysis: power, stratification, ideology, the organization and culture of work, comparative organizations, and wrenched technology. Whether the technological solution turns out to be a monster or empower folks to the society, whether the U.S. stays competitive or lags behind, whether managers and workers are gripped by grief, loss, and fear or rise to the challenges—adapting new self-definition, roles, modes of thinking and working—all these dramatic questions require the sociological imagination and offer abundant opportunities for basic and applied research and practice.

Plagiarism Discovered: ASA Takes Action

by Stephen A. Belfi

An ad hoc committee of the American Sociological Association concluded that a Dean at Eastern New Mexico University has plagiarized an ASA member’s research. William V. D’Antonio, ASA Executive Officer, in consultation with Professor Joan Huber, Secretary Michael Aiken, ASA Council, the Executive Officer and Budget and the Publications Committee, has taken appropriate action to help defend both the interests of Dr. Jerzy A. Husch, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Tulia University, and the academic integrity of sociology itself.

In August, 1988, a colleague suggested that Husch read a newly published book on her specialty, Muzak. (Her 1984 doctoral dissertation is a critical history of the development and current use of Muzak in the workplace.) The book to which she turned, Muzak: The Hidden Message in Music, by Stephen H. Barnes, Dean of Fine Arts at Eastern New Mexico University, turned out to be of more than ordinary interest. At first glance, it seemed to bear an uncanny resemblance to her dissertation with only minor changes and footnote removals. Barnes devoted a short paragraph in the acknowledgments at the end of the book to Jerzy Husch for providing a “number of commentaries in this book.” To Dr. Husch goes a great measure of gratitude for bringing the implications of Muzak to the scholarly community.

When legal referees seemed at an impasse, Dr. Husch asked the ASA to try to mediate the dispute. She provided the committee with copies of relevant portions of her dissertation and of the Barnes book with hundreds of similar sections marked. The committee, composed of Gerald Martin, Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, and Editor-Designate of the American Sociological Review; Linda Berkover Bourque, Professor of Public Health, University of California at Los Angeles; and Paul L. Goldsmith, Dean of the Faculty, Scripps College found substantial portions of the book had been drawn directly from the dissertation. They concluded that the acknowledgement by Barnes was misleading in light of the extent to which they found Husch’s work had been inappropriate. Furthermore, they were unanimous in their conclusion that Barnes had plagiarized Husch’s dissertation.

In February, the Executive Officer sent the full committee report to Barnes and Herbert D. Larson (University of Mississippi) with a cover letter demanding: (1) withdrawal of the book from the public; (2) return of all copies of the book; (3) agreement not to publish the book; (4) apology and explanation in writing to Husch; and (5) a public acknowledgment by Barnes, publishing formal letters to Husch and the ASA acknowledging improper appropriation of Husch’s dissertation; expressing regret and expunge any mention of the book from his vita; and (5) attorney’s fees and minimal personal damages for Husch. Accepting no satisfactory reply, D’Antonio wrote on March 29 to William D. Engeman, Vice President of Eastern New Mexico University, informing him of the actions of Barnes, asking that he use the enclosed documentation of the case “to take such action as may be appropriate in accord with the regulations of the University” and stating his intention to inform the Chronicle of Higher Education about the case by May 1. The Executive Officer informed the Chronicle by that date and the article appeared May 10.

Engeman responded in mid-May, informing the Executive Office that his University’s review process regarding the plagiarism charge against Barnes. The ASA awaits the outcome.

According to Debra Bluks, who reported the case in the Chronicle, both Barnes and Richardson claimed the contribution to Husch was explicit and sufficient. Richardson said that in response to ASA concerns, The Melvin Press had published a second edition of the book which includes “full documentation.” (D’Antonio found the republication an affront to academic integrity which not only fails to resolve the issue but perpetuates and compounds the wrong. “No attempt to correct this by inserting later will suffice,” he told the Chronicle. “Once you’ve stolen a person’s work, you’ve stolen it.”

Footnotes


COPAFS: Confronting the Challenges

by Katherine Wallman

"The numbers of the associations share responsibility for the integrity and technical adequacy of the statistics, the sufficiency and quality of the data on which the OMBs of Management and Budget and the Bureau of the Census. As a result of efforts made by the professional community, the decennial census content and sample size ultimately were reduced to the levels essentially prepared by the Bureau of the Census. The Council’s initiative during the past year to provide the first forum for discussion of OMB’s proposed "Guidelines for Federal Statistical Activities" proved to be a significant event in promoting a sound view of both the underlying philosophy and the specific requirements of such OMB draft. Developed to replace and existing official policy directives covering the conduct, design, and publishing of statistical surveys and studies, and the use of certain standard classifications, definitions, and data sources, the circular also would have established for the first time guidelines for documenting all methods, procedures, and models used to produce statistical estimates, and would have revised and strengthened guidance on planning statistical surveys, treatment of respondents, publication of statistical data, and use of zonal geographies. The OMB draft guidelines, in turn, would have provided a framework to clarify the role of Federal Government in the public’s understanding of statistics. The OMB draft guidelines also would have provided a basis for the development of a national statistical system. The Council set out to provide a forum for discussion of OMB’s proposed "Guidelines for Federal Statistical Activities" and to promote the development of a national statistical system. The Council set out to provide a forum for discussion of OMB’s proposed "Guidelines for Federal Statistical Activities" and to promote the development of a national statistical system.

NRC Releases AIDS Report

Typing AIDS research to social and behavioral science in general, a recently released National Research Council report claims that "a history of misunderstanding" of social and behavioral science research has hampered efforts to understand and control the disease. The 368-page report, AIDS: Sexual Behavior and Intermittent Drug Abuse, outlines various social and behavioral science findings on the epidemic and offers a wide range of specific recommendations. Among them, it calls for the federal government to expand its current programs for monitoring the spread of HIV infection, begin an unprecedented effort to collect data on sexual behavior and drug use, and provide better support for programs designed to change risky behaviors. The report, compiled by NRC’s Committee on AIDS and Social, National, and Social Sciences, chaired by Lincoln Morse of Stanford University, in many ways echoes the recommendations of the other groups that have advised the federal government on how to respond to the AIDS epidemic. One of the more important recommendations is that the report’s support of explicit and targeted education campaigns, advice made by the President’s Commission on the Epi- demic and the National Academy of Sciences—Institute of Medicine (see Update, June 16, 1989), among others. Because the National Research Council report deals exclusively with the social and behavioral sciences, it is more specific in detail than mere country-wide reviews on AIDS and the report’s recommendations:

- High priority should be given to methodological studies to determine ways of improving the quality of self-reports of sexual and drug-use behaviors.
- AIDS research should be considered for exemption from the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act.
- The Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health should take responsibility for an AIDS education program that will provide timely information on the various effective programs.
- There should be a substantial increase in the number of trained behavioral and social scientists employed in AIDS-related activities at federal agencies responsible for preventing the spread of HIV infection.
- Public Health Service (PHS) fellowship programs and Intergovernmental Personnel Agreement should be expanded as an interim means for rapidly expanding the cadre of senior behavioral and social scientists working on AIDS programs at PHS agencies.

AIDS: Sexual Behavior and Intermittent Drug Abuse is available for $24.95 from the National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20418-3333.
Revised Code of Ethics Applies to All Sociologists’ Work Settings

by Ruth L. Leac, Portland, Oregon

The revisions to the ASA Code of Ethics that Council adopted in January 1989 are most welcome because they place all professional sociologists, whether or not they enroll in teaching, research or other ethical ground rules that govern their professional conduct. The revisions, especially the one that reads, "There exists no ethical dimension to ALL work, whether it be research, teaching, consulting, or whatever," make it clear that there are ethical dimensions to ALL work, regardless of whether the work is research, teaching, consulting, or whatever. The revisions should be given wide publicity, both in the academic and professional communities, to ensure that all sociologists are aware of them and are encouraged to follow them.

In a similar vein, students with callings for practice should now receive the same professional education that they require. The ASA now requires sociology departments to help students find employment in both academic and practice settings (see BLA3). This is particularly useful because it can have some very interesting social consequences for sociologists if departments begin to recognize that their students are as deserving of help in finding jobs as are students from other academic disciplines.

Allowances are made in the revised Code for legitimate sanctions against those who violate the Code. The topic of discrimination research findings is no longer a near-absolute, constrained only by avoiding harm to research subjects, but is now also constrained by such situational factors as the subject’s right to confidentiality.

The same is true, by the way, of the ethical stipulation in the previous version of the Code that applied only to the policy-making arm of the ASA. It now applies to all sociological work, namely that we are always obligated to state all significant qualifications that are related to the nature of our research and interpretations. After all, we cannot always anticipate when a "false statement" issue will arise. The Code might indeed be discovered and used for policy purposes. The revised Code also requires sociologists to be careful of research, regardless of its quality or how it is used, so that their work does not harm others, clients, research participants, and others (I.A.4).

One inquisitive distinction among work activities has been reasserted in the revised Code with intelligence work being singled out. Section I.B.1 states that sociologists are to use their professional roles for intelligence purposes or as a pretext for gathering intelligence. Since intelligence work is hidden and fraud, the issue appears to be that a sociologist should not be allowed to do what he or she desires. This is a reasonable restriction on sociologists, especially those who might use their positions in the intelligence industry for personal gain.

Although a code of ethics can outline general principles for moral conduct, it cannot include rules covering all cases, as Aristotle, Durkheim, and others have already demonstrated. There will always be ambiguities about what constitutes the ethical high road, and how to cope with mandates for pursuing several goals when available resources are sufficient only for one. The practical choices to be made in these situations require careful, innovative thought to stay on the high road of ethical conduct. Sociologists, however, are often faced with difficult ethical choices and must be equipped with tools to handle them. The Code is intended to be a guide to handling these decisions.

The Center for the Study of Ethics in Society was founded in 1985 to promote interdisciplinary discussion of applied ethics on issues of current concern such as affirmative action and whistleblowing. It holds presentations throughout the academic year on these matters. Sociologists who have participated in these include Ronald Kaprow, Western Michigan University (Topic: University Responsibility on Issues of War and Peace), and Peter Vranes, Boston University (Topic: Ethical Decisions in Business—Assessing the Organizational Dimension). Each year the Center publishes four of the presentations, distributing single copies without charge. Six copies of each are available to addressees as "Limiting Norms in Science" by R.D. Hold-lander and "Biomedical Ethics in the Soviet Union" by R.G. De George. The publications and more information can be requested from the Center for the Study of Ethics in Society, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008-3889.

Agricultural scientists have enlisted philosophers to help examine the moral implications of the evolving technology, knowledge, and institutions of modern agriculture. The result of this interdisciplinary collaboration appears in the Journal of Agricultural Ethics, started in 1986, which should be of particular interest to sociologists wanting to promote equity and distributive justice in our social life and institutions.

Durkheim Studies Moves to Illinois

The annual volume, Durkheim Studies, is now being published at the University of Illinois. The first number will be published in 1989 and, like its predecessor (published in Paris), will include a variety of materials beneficial to Durkheim scholars. Contributions will be accepted and published in both French and English.

Durkheim Studies supports other activities of the Group d’études Durkheim-manes, e.g., the publication of books and special numbers of professional journals devoted to Durkheim and Durkheimism; the publication of standard editions and translations; special sessions of international meetings; the collection and cataloging of unpublished manuscripts and letters; and, in general, the support and encouragement of Durkheim scholarship of the highest possible quality. The Group is planning a special session on "Future Directions in Durkheim Scholarship" at the 1989 ASA annual meeting, and other sessions are being prepared for the ISA’s World Congress in Madrid in 1990. For more information, contact Robert Alan Jones, Department of Sociology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL 61801.
Doris Wilkinson’s Odyssey Back In Time

by Susan Tremblay

Doris Wilkinson, a Professor of Sociology at the University of Kentucky, recently embarked on what she calls “an odyssey involving the creative use of sociology.” Last May, she designed a multidisciplinary project on early African-American physicians, which she referred to as “forgotten pioneers.” With her project, “Forgotten Pioneers in A Southern Community: New Orleans Physicians in Lexington from 1800 to 1950,” she sought to answer questions such as: How did African-Americans between post-Reconstruction and the pre-Civil Rights era become physicians? Who were their role models? What contributions did they make not only to scientific medicine and the health of the African-Americans they served but also to the culture and the improvement of race relations from the late 19th to the mid-20th centuries? How was it possible to become a doctor at the end of the 19th century as a descendant of slaves and in the face of seemingly insurmountable obstacles?

Wilkinson became interested in tracing the history of these doctors when she came across their names in a directory of early African-Americans. She combined her sociology skills with history and cultural anthropology to create not just another research paper, but an informative and unique social and medical history exhibit that resulted in very good public relations for the field of sociology. This project enabled me to combine my skills as a researcher with the vocabulary and paradigms of sociology and my interest in history. It reflected the emphases of Mills and others about the importance of history and biography in the “sociological imagination.”

With a grant from the Kentucky Humanities Council, Wilkinson tried to create an innovative, positive image for sociology and what sociologists do. She created an exhibit using primary data sources of old newspaper clippings, historical documents, photographs, transcripts, local city directories, and works about medical artifacts.

The exhibit was held at five different sites: The Martin Luther King Cultural Center, the Lexington Public Library, the University of Kentucky Special Collections and Archives, the Kentucky Historical Society/Kentucky History Museum, and the Medical Center of the University of Kentucky. Each different site created its own public, however, the University of Kentucky Public Relations office played an important role in informing the press.

Public response was overwhelming to Wilkinson’s project.位. While the exhibit was at the University of Kentucky Medical Center, the Chancellor’s Office was immediately supportive. Despite her reception there, doctors, nurses and other staff members came in good numbers to hear her presentation.

Once the local papers reported on her exhibit, community support and interest grew. The project was eventually widely covered by any funded by the Kentucky Humanities Council. Wilkinson credits the media access to the informants who promoted her work and the fact that the exhibit had community attractiveness as well as scientific and historical accuracy.

She became a celebrity in Lexington after her interviews about the project appeared on local TV and cable stations and in local papers. Kentucky Educational Television (KET) celebrated Black History Month with a production of “African-American Physicians in Lexington 1890-1950” which highlighted her exhibit. One of her interviews is shown intermittently on a cable station.

Wilkinson is still doing research on the contribution of African-Americans to science and history of the state. She has received an ACU grant and plans a research article for publication.

Wilkinson feels her project is a creative way to use sociology and an effective public relations medium for sociologists. For a project to get this kind of publicity from the media and such great community response, it must appeal to ethnically diverse audiences, as well as have scientific merit based on thorough research. She began work on “Forgotten Pioneers” in 1986. The fact that it is also multidisciplinary (integrating the methods and substance of sociology with local history and cultural anthropology) may help explain its success.

It was community oriented, interesting, informative, educational, unique and innovative. Wilkinson says, “Sociology is a heterogeneous discipline. There is room for the mathematical and space for history and the humanities.”

### Eisenstadt Honored

Shmul N. Eisenstadt, Rose Issacs Professor of Sociology at the Hebrew University, has received the 1988 Balzan Prize for Sociology. Since 1961, the Balzan Prize has honored someone who has “fostered outstanding humanitarian ventures, and peace and brotherhood among peoples, regardless of nationality, race, or creed.” Three annual prizes, each worth 300,000 Swiss francs are made in the humanities, social sciences, and natural science and medicine.

Eisenstadt was honored for his efforts to combine sociological theory with historical and empirical research to promote our knowledge of the uniqueness, affiliation and interpretation of ancient and modern societies of Africa, Asia, Europe, North and Latin America. By world-wide teaching, his numerous writings and innumerable colloquia, he has made social studies interdisciplinary and international and has contributed to the appreciation of sociology by scholars in other fields.

Born in Poland, and now a citizen of Israel, Eisenstadt is a sociologist who promotes international collaboration. As a student and assistant of Martin Buber, Eisenstadt completed his post-doctoral studies at the London School of Economics before taking his position at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. His first book addressed The Formation of Israele (1959). (See related article on Sociologists in Israel in April Footnotes.)
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Comparative Historical Sociology

Barbara Linklater, Department of Sociology, 100 Social Sciences Tower, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Crime, Law and Deviance

Joan McCord, 623 Broadway, Pismo Beach, CA 93450.

Culture, Sociology of

Gary Alan Fine, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Education, Sociology of

Richard B. Rabbins, Department of Sociology, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306.

Emotions, Sociology of

Thomas J. Rieff, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley.

Environment and Technology

William R. Frumdze, Department of Racial Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706.

Family, Sociology of

Andrew J. Cherlin, Department of Sociology, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218.

Marxist Sociology

Rhoda L. Levine, Department of Sociology, Colgate University, Hamilton, NY 13346.

Medical Sociology

Hue Hing, 2485 Russell Heights Blvd, Cleveland Heights, OH 44106.

Methodology, To be announced.

Microcomputing

Ronald Anderson, Department of Sociology, 809 Social Science Bldg, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

Organizations & Occupations

Anita L. Edgerton, Department of Sociology, 155 Hallham Hall CB30210, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-0006.

Peace and War, Sociology of

John Lofland, 523 E Street, Davis, CA 95616.

 Political Economy of the World-System

Harvey Dickerson, Department of Sociology, University of Toronto, 363 Spadina Avenue, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1, Canada.

Political Sociology

Richard A. Flacks, Department of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106.

Population, Sociology of

Richard, Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514.

Racial and Ethnic Minorities

Ralph L. Albers, Department of Sociology, University of California, 405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024.

Science, Knowledge, and Technology

Henry Eckstein, Department of Sociology, State University of New York, Purchase, NY 10577.

Sex and Gender, Sociology of

Christine Bos, Department of Sociology, SUNY: Albany, Albany, NY 12222.

Social Psychology

Karen S. Cocker, Department of Sociology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195.

Sociological Practice

Arthur B. Shostak, Department of Sociology/Psychology, Drexel University, 33rd and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, PA 19104.

Theoretical Sociology

George Ritzer, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20740.

Undergraduate Education

Steven Shvet, 901 Randall Road, Sevener Park, MD 21161.
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