



Published by the American Sociological Association
1722 N St. N.W., Washington, D. C. 20036 • (202) 833-3410

Footnotes

U. S. Postage
Permit No. 43089
Non-profit Org.
Washington, D. C.

1974

PRESIDENT-ELECT POSTS PLANS FOR MONTREAL MEETING

The 69th Annual Meeting of the ASA will be held in Montreal August 26-29, 1974 at the Queen Elizabeth Hotel. This meeting will follow immediately after the Eighth World Congress of the International Sociological Association in Toronto, August 18-24.

In posting plans for the ASA meeting, President-Elect Peter M. Blau, who also serves as Chairman of the 1974 Program Committee, identifies the theme as the "Focus on Social Structure" which he defines as follows:



President-Elect Peter M. Blau

The idea of social structure is at the very core of sociology, and a focus on social structure provides the theme for the 1974 meeting in Montreal.

Many different approaches have been developed to improve our understanding of social structures and their dynamics, as the program illustrates. They center attention on a great variety of subjects and problems, including the class structure and its significance for historical developments; the evolutionary process of increasing differentiation in social structures; the dialectical processes of structural change; the division of labor with its consequences for interdependence and conflict; the forms of associations that structure social relations; the structural-functional analysis of institutional subsystems; the status-sets and role-sets that help clarify the dynamics of social structures; the structural roots of deviance and rebellion; the interrelations between environment, population, and social structure in the ecosystem; the microstructures emerging in face-to-face interaction; the construction of social reality; the structural analysis of kinship and myths.

Everything in social life can be viewed with a focus on social structure as well as from a socio-psychological perspective. Whatever the specific orientation, the structural approach is designed to explain, not the behavior of individuals, but the structure of relations among groups and individuals that finds expression in this behavior. The ultimate objective is to advance by means of such sociological explanations our knowledge about society, how it changes, and how it can be changed.

President-Elect Blau has planned four plenary sessions and a series of panel discussions around this theme. Each will afford opportunities to represent and discuss divergent viewpoints and approaches to the study of social structure while offering contrasting perspectives from sociology and other disciplines.

In addition, Professor Blau, with the assistance of his Program Committee, consisting of James S. Coleman, Lewis A. Coser, Sheila Klatsky, Raymond W. Mack, Matilda W. Riley, William J. Wilson, and J. Milton Yinger, has organized a series of Didactic Seminars, designed to acquaint interested members with recent developments in the field of sociology, particularly in specialties that are not their major professional

See 1974 PROGRAM, p. 6

1973

PRESIDENTIAL PERSPECTIVE FROM NEW YORK: THE YEAR IN REVIEW

The 1973 Program Committee did not designate a single theme for the 1973 Annual Meetings, but the three sets of featured sessions reflect a common concern. These sessions are the Refresher Lectures, the "What Have We Learned?" sessions and the two plenary meetings on "The Role of Sociologists on Presidential Commission". Underlying all of these is a concern with a theoretical challenge confronting our discipline.

The growing specialization within the field of sociology has created a need for some intra-disciplinary rapprochement. Keeping abreast of recent developments in fields outside the individual scholar's specialty is becoming increasingly difficult. One purpose of the Refresher Lectures was precisely that of "continuing education" for those members who were not primarily identified in their teaching or research with the ten selected areas. But Refresher Lectures were intended also to serve another function. Sociology appears to have reached a stage when the acknowledged advantages of inter-disciplinary work apply also to intra-disciplinary cooperation. Empirical data being accumulated in one branch of sociology may be illuminated by concepts existing in another. Models, theoretical orientations, and hypotheses developed in one specialty may open new problems for another. The exposure to a method perfected in one field may lead to its adoption in another. Above all, such intra-disciplinary scrutiny should stimulate the search for more general theories that transcend and bind the various specialties.

A related objective, that of consolidating empirical findings within each specialized field, inspired the other featured sessions. Thus, the four presenters in the first Plenary Session have all been participants on Presidential Commissions and have accepted the assignment to reflect upon their experiences in a systematic manner, starting off with an elaborate common outline. The presenters at the second Plenary Session will examine the four "case studies" for whatever generalizations they suggest. From a substantive point of view, both Plenary Sessions address themselves in a somewhat unique way to the pressing issue of the social uses, non-uses, and misuses of sociology.



President Mirra Komarovsky

We were able to organize these special sessions without sacrificing, indeed enhancing, the variety in the format of the meetings. The 1973 Program will have, apart from regular and section-sponsored sessions, 130 luncheon roundtables and 35 seminars. Whether or not we achieved the optimum balance, the Program Committee was aware of a certain dilemma. On the one hand, we must provide for the maximum opportunity to explore whatever interests members have. But it is also desirable (for scientific as well as expressive purposes) to bring the membership together to consider some major issues of the discipline.

The range of functions currently performed by the ASA is a tribute to the efficiency and dedication of the relatively small full-time staff of the Executive Office and the work of the elected and appointed officers. But there was a growing sentiment that the Council, the main executive body of the Association, See YEAR IN REVIEW, p. 3

Our New President

Peter H. Rossi

Distinguished in appearance and prolific in his scholarly accomplishments, Peter M. Blau is clearly among the foremost sociologists of his generation. His contributions to sociology are unique in several ways: First, he has made contributions both to theory and empirical research, being equally proficient in either skill. His volume "Exchange and Power in Social Life" was a strong contribution to sociological theory that sparked a new direction in theoretical inquiries. "The American Occupational Structure" (written with O.D. Duncan) is among the best empirical studies of the past several decades. Secondly, Peter Blau is one of the few sociologists who takes seriously the principle that the proper subject of sociology is social structure. A constant theme that runs from his earliest work "The Dynamics of Bureaucracy" to the more recent "Structure of Organizations" is a concern for the structural framework of social life, the principles that relate elements of social structure to each other and the effects of structure on human behavior. In this respect, he is most clearly in the Durkheimian and Weberian traditions. Finally, Peter Blau is a great teacher. In the years that he spent at the University of Chicago, his classes attracted the best graduate students and he supervised considerably more dissertations than was his proportionate share, traits he is undoubtedly continuing to manifest in his current position at Columbia University.

The rise of Nazism in Europe brought Blau to this country as a young man after Hitler's armies overran middle Europe. Born in Vienna, he came to the USA in 1939. received his undergradu-

See PRESIDENT, p. 6

Panels to Probe Publishing and Federal Research Funding

Sociologists who are interested in writing textbooks, or who are concerned about the future of federal funding for sociological research, should take special note of the entries in the Final Program announcing sessions where these topics will be discussed by experts from both areas.

In New York on Tuesday, August 28 at 2:30 p.m., in Session 81 (note that this is a change from the listing in the Preliminary Program), a panel of representatives from several federal agencies including NSF, NIMH, NIE and DOD, will discuss problems, prospects, and

procedures for federal funding of sociological research. The presenter for the session will be Albert J. Reiss, Jr., of Yale.

On Monday, August 27 at 2:30 p.m. in Session 34 (note that this also is a change from the listing in the Preliminary Program), a panel of representatives from four major publishing houses will discuss: "Textbook Publishing in Sociology in the Seventies: A Dialogue." This panel was organized by the Association of American Publishers. The presenter for the session will be Melvin L. DeFleur of Washington State U.

ELECTION RESULTS: COSER, SMELSER, AND FORM

As a result of the recent ASA elections, Lewis A. Coser of SUNY, Stony Brook has been elected the 65th President of the Association. His term of office will begin at the close of the 1974 Montreal Annual Meeting, succeeding Peter M. Blau whose term as President begins at the 1973 New York Meeting.

Neil J. Smelser has been elected Vice-President to serve with Lewis Coser during the 1974-75 term. He will succeed Matilda White Riley who will serve coterminously with Peter Blau.

William H. Form, University of Illinois, has been elected to serve a three-year term as ASA Secretary. During the 1973-74 year he will be Secretary-Elect and assume his position at the end of the Annual Meeting in Montreal in September 1974.

The four new members of ASA Council serving from September, 1973 through August, 1976 are Renee Fox, University of Pennsylvania; Gary T. Marx, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Melvin L. Kohn, National Institute of Mental Health; and Joseph H. Fichter, Loyola University of the South.

The Committee on Publications will have three new members: Charles H.

Page, University of Massachusetts (two-year term); Lee Rainwater, Harvard University (three-year term); and Morris Zelditch, Jr., Stanford University (three-year term).

Serving two-year terms, beginning at the opening of this year's Annual Meeting on the Committee on Nominations will be: Richard J. Hill, University of Oregon; David J. Bordua, University of Illinois; James D. Thompson, Vanderbilt University; Elton Jackson, Indiana University; Helen M. Hughes, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Harriett Zuckerman, Columbia University.

Members of the Committee on Committees also serve a two-year term which begins with the 1973 Annual Meeting. The six new members are: Phillip E. Hammond, University of Arizona; Nicholas Babchuk, University of Nebraska; Donal E. Muir, University of Alabama; Eleanor P. Wolf, Wayne State University; Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Brandeis University; Elinor G. Barber, Ford Foundation.

Finally, the referendum on the graduated dues structure was approved by a vote of 2,304 to 926.

Change in By-Laws Proposed . . .

VOTE ON NOMINATIONS PROCEDURES SCHEDULED

Six years ago, under a major constitutional revision, the ASA Committee on Nominations became an elective rather than an appointive body. The result was that persons designated by region but elected by the entire voting membership undertook the challenging task of getting people to run for elective offices in the ASA. To produce a slate of candidates requires long hours of deliberation. When the Committee convenes at the Annual Meeting, it processes recommendations from many sources, it checks membership lists for eligibility, and it exercises judgment in producing lists of nominees. The list is necessarily longer than that required for the final ballot. The reason is that many persons will not accept the calling to run for office. Sociology has its Shermans, too.

But, even a democratically elected Nominations Committee may not cast a net wide enough to identify all the available and appropriate candidates. At least, so goes the reasoning of some members of the Radical Caucus who introduced the issue at the Business Meeting in New Orleans (*The American Sociologist*, December 1972, p. 7). Accordingly, the ASA Council has now taken steps to provide voting members with an opportunity to modify the procedure for nominations. As a result of recent Council action, Members will, in October, receive a special ballot asking them to vote for or against a proposed change in the By-Laws of the Constitution. Council developed this proposal in an effort to provide members with an opportunity for more direct participation in the nominations process. It is believed that this might produce candidates with a wider range of backgrounds for the annual election slate. To do this will require considerable elaboration of the machinery for nominations and will add more steps to the election process.

If the proposed change in the By-Laws (see text in the minutes of the June Council meeting recorded elsewhere in this issue of FOOTNOTES) is passed in the forthcoming referendum, how will the election process be changed?

The proposed change would introduce a two-stage nominations procedure and the possibility, for some offices, that several official ballots would have to be sent out before a final decision could be reached.

The Committee on Nominations will proceed as now to produce a slate of

candidates. That slate of nominees would be sent as a preliminary ballot to all voting members and it may or may not become the final official ballot. It all depends on the reaction of voting members within a thirty-day period.

If during those thirty days at least 50 voting members for some positions, or at least 100 voting members for other positions, support the addition of other persons (voting members) to the ballot, and if those persons accept the nomination thus offered, then the names will be added to the final official ballot, and the election will take place.

With the ballot thus augmented, a majority vote will be required before a candidate is declared elected for the positions of President-Elect, Vice-President-Elect, and Secretary-Elect. For all other elected positions, the candidate receiving the largest number of votes shall be declared elected. Thus run-off elections would only be required, when necessary, for three major positions in the governance structure of the ASA.

In essence, the proposed change will confront voting members with the following questions: (1) Are you satisfied with the present nominations procedure whereby the elected Committee on Nominations produces the official ballot? or (2) Do you want to augment their work by introducing a petitioning process that permits additional nominations to be made and changes the basis for a decision from a plurality to a majority vote for major offices?

Whatever the outcome of the vote on this proposed change, three steps in the current procedures affecting membership participation in the present nominations process will not change: (1) The candidates for positions on the Committee on Nominations will continue to be nominated by the elected at-large members of Council; membership on the Committee will continue to be determined by the vote of the Members of the ASA; (2) The Committee on Nominations will continue to solicit, receive, and be advised by suggestions for nominees from all members of the ASA; and (3) At the time of voting, provision will continue to be made for the addition of names to the ballot (when 1/10 of the returned ballots include the same name for the same office, assuming that person consents and is a voting member, another ballot will be issued to decide the election).

Special Fund Created and . . .

STUDY GROUPS ON THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES AUTHORIZED

The appointment of yet another ASA committee is not startling news. And, yet, this time something a little different has been created.

A recent act by Council has produced an Ad Hoc Committee on Problems of the Discipline. This committee will not do the studying. Rather, it will receive and process proposals from members who seek support (travel and per diem) to get together with a few colleagues to exchange ideas and produce working papers on basic theoretical and methodological issues in sociology including its special areas.

Serving on this committee that hopes to be a catalyst to promote concern with core problems in the discipline are: Hubert M. Blalock, Jr. (Chair.), University of Washington; Gary Marx, MIT; and, Matilda White Riley, Rutgers. The Committee will meet in New York at the Annual Meeting to draw up guidelines for action. Council has appropriated \$7,000 for committee allocation in 1973-74. Inquiries about the program should be directed to Professor Blalock.

The formation of this committee emerged from a considerable history of deliberation by Council. Over the past year, through its "open forums", Council explored a variety of ways through which the ASA might exert appropriate leadership to advance the state of sociological knowledge without imposing pressures for ideational or

methodological uniformity. Against a backdrop of continuing concern for problems of the profession and constant demands to attend to pressing administrative matters, the discussions spurred Council to try to move some of the limited ASA resources into a more direct attack on problems of the discipline.

Other projects could follow. The resources of the present committee could be expanded. Whether this happens depends in great part on the availability of funds. Here Council took another action in the hope to generate response to permit a strengthening of ASA activities for the discipline. Council authorized the Executive Officer to establish a SPECIAL FUND FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE DISCIPLINE. Contributions to this fund are welcome at any time. Two persons have already indicated that they plan to assign royalties from their books to this fund. Expenditures from the fund will be made on decision by the Council. No decisions on projects to be supported have been made. Among those that might be considered are a reinstatement of the Visiting Scientist or Visiting Lecturer Program and Workshops for Journal Editors.

Contributions to the SPECIAL FUND FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE DISCIPLINE may be sent to the Executive Office.

Faulty Engineers or Neglected Experts?*

Social scientists are being made scapegoats for the failure of dozens of domestic programs. The October 1972 issue of *Fortune* reports that "social engineers retreat under fire"—a main source of the shots fired being *Fortune* itself. Its staff writer Tom Alexander reports: "There's plenty of material for recrimination." He then recites the by now familiar catalog of failures of the domestic programs, failure to abolish welfare, poverty, school segregation, and so on—problems that have not been solved despite "record" investments.

The charges against social scientists are about as well founded as those brought in the early 1950's, equating social science with socialism. The discipline, as such, is no more at fault for the failure of many Great Society programs than the study of international relations is for the American involvement in Vietnam.

First, most programs did not receive the funds and manpower they needed. Alexander is, of course, technically correct: the investments in domestic programs reached "record" levels. But this does not make them high, and certainly not high enough.

Second, many solutions require tradition-bound citizens and legislatures to reexamine their views about the world, human nature, and human values. If they balk and block progress, there is little a social scientist can—and maybe should—do. Thus, crime is usually ranked as the number one domestic problem. Recently the President, on the heels of the governor of New York, has sought to reinstate the death penalty because, it is alleged, all other efforts to turn back the rising wave of crime have failed. But the fundamental remedies that most social scientists favor have not even been tried. Many politicians prefer to stand against crime with "tough" speeches and suggest "tough" measures that they must know are either ineffectual or unconstitutional or both. Why point the finger at social scientists?

The social sciences could be more vigorous than they are—if the politicians would let them. The social sciences, as a group, have been the neglected branch of the sciences, receiving a mere 2 to 3 percent of the resource pie, and even that much only in recent years. No wonder there are fields in which little is known: how to help disadvantaged children catch up, for example, or how to respond to the growing dissolution of the family. But even in these areas social scientists can at least point to what will not work. The Coleman Report pointed out that the kind of efforts undertaken, at a cost of roughly \$1.2 billion a year, had no discernible results.

If America now seeks to attend to its long list of social problems, an increased investment in social science is the order of the day—not a chopping of their sources of support. Furthermore, social programs, in which the findings of social scientists are utilized, must be allowed to go through the same research and development sequence that missiles and lunar landing crafts go through. An initial mistake made by social scientists was agreeing to the use of their theories in attempts to plan societal changes. They should have insisted on design or table-top or wind-tunnel models in order to initiate, not to bypass, the research and development sequence. We must stop trying to jump directly from sociological blueprints into multibillion-dollar programs.

We can no longer delay facing our domestic needs, and we cannot deal with them without the help of the social sciences. But the social sciences themselves will require much nourishment and fortification before they will be able to fully measure up to this mission.—AMITAI ETZIONI, Professor of Sociology, Columbia University, and Director, Center for Policy Research, 475 Riverside Drive, New York 10027

*Reprinted, by permission from *Science*, July 6, 1973.

CORRECTION:

In the April, 1973, FOOTNOTES, an article appeared identifying the Center for Policy Research as part of Columbia University. The Center is a not-for-profit corporation and is not a part of Columbia University.

YEAR IN REVIEW, cont. from p. 1
was in need of some reform. The pressure of on-going administrative work required that the Council meet in full-day sessions at the Annual Meeting. One consequence of this scheduling was that the officers of the Association were virtually in seclusion during their term of office, and were barred from participation in the formal program as well as in the informal give and take of the Annual Meeting. Moreover, a similarly crowded administrative agenda characterized one or two Council meetings held apart from the Annual Meeting. This provided little opportunity for the Council to be innovative with respect to professional or scientific development of sociology. In the hope of remedying this problem, the 1972-73 Council scheduled quarterly meetings (in August, December, March and June), with time set aside in the agenda for "open forums". It is too early to calculate the cost/benefit of this innovation, but some reflections are in order. The first "open forum" evoked a spirited discussion of new activities the ASA might undertake to further the development of our discipline. Some proposals were wide-ranging—e.g., the preparation of a volume on "Sociology in the Year 2000: Alternative Projections—Probable and Prefactual". Others urged periodic stock-taking to locate methodological needs such as the lack of replication research or of longitudinal studies. It is hoped that the authors of various proposals may accept the invitation of Otto Larsen, the Executive Officer, to submit statements for the "Open Forum" column he inaugurated in the February 1973 issue of the Footnotes. The Council discussions, even at this early stage, can be put before the membership for consideration and reactions.

The diversity within the field of sociology being what it is, we might have foreseen that the very question, "What else might the ASA be doing to advance the discipline?", would raise the issue of priorities and, beyond it, the sinister specter of orthodoxy.

Does this or that emphasis entail the official approval of one particular "scenario" for sociology at the expense of another? No one, of course, favored imposing uniformity upon the field. The mere existence of such dangers should not immobilize the Council. Once these dangers have been acknowledged, the ground should be clear for proposals that eschew them. If nothing else (and consensus can surely be reached on many other proposals), some Council members have suggested that the very controversies in the field should be debated and examined in a more incisive and systematic way.

More inhibiting than the issue of priorities among possible proposals is the problem of finding sources of revenue for expanded programs. Clearly the Council, even with four quarterly meetings, can only stimulate but cannot execute new projects. But if the pace of

activities is not to be too leisurely, some funds must be provided for task forces, special committees or, in the case of more ambitious enterprises, the search for outside funding. This budgetary challenge comes at a time when the on-going activities of the Association strain its resources.

This report will not attempt to summarize all the activities of the past year. These are recorded in the minutes of the Council and in the reports of other officers and committee chairpersons. I would like, however, to note that two ad hoc committees, on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities and on the Status of Women have been changed into standing committees. This reflects the recognition that the problems these committees addressed are deep rooted

and that the Association has made a commitment to persist in attaching them. The new section on Undergraduate Education gives promise to focus attention on an important and neglected area.

I wish that words expressing gratitude and admiration were not so worn with use. I would like to thank members of the Council, the 1973 Program Committee and all the staff members of the Executive Office for their contribution to the activities of the year. Jay Demerath, Otto Larsen, Ray Mack, Alice Myers, and Milt Yinger have given me unflinching, abundant, and cheerful support. I am greatly in their debt and full of respect for the quality of their dedication to the work of the Association.

Mirra Komarovsky
President

CHILD CARE SERVICE

Monday through Thursday
August 27-30

9:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Robert Benchley Room, New York Hilton Hotel. Parents are urged to sign up early—and to bring a favorite toy or game.

Snacks provided
Fee: 50¢ per hour

Services will be operated by the
Sociologists for Women in Society

A Mentor of Sociologists Retires After 42 Years at Harvard Post*

By Robert Reinhold

Unlike the works of some other mandarins of modern sociology, the writings of Talcott Parsons are not likely to turn up on book stands in bus stations and drugstores. Nor is he likely to be found declaiming on the human predicament in glossy magazines or being quoted in the public press.

But both disciples and detractors would agree that no other living scholar has had more impact on modern social thought and theory than Professor Parsons. At age 70 he retired the other day after 42 years on the Harvard University faculty, during which he educated three generations of sociologists.

In his honor, 150 or so of Professor Parsons' past and present students and colleagues converged on Cambridge recently for a testimonial dinner. His former students ranged in age from 23 to 63 and came from as far as Germany and California, which suggests the scope of his influence in both time and space.

Controversial and Vital

While his abstract theories about how human social systems work remain highly controversial—for both political and methodological reasons—Talcott Parsons has achieved an almost immortal status as a man of thought.

Even younger sociologists, many of whom differ with him sharply about sociology, accord him a religious-like reverence before going on to do things their own way, much the way Italian Catholics kneel before the Pope and then vote Communist.

"Everybody has got to kneel and make a sign of the cross before him," said one former student. "Talcott Parsons is a god whom it is okay to take a potshot at."

A Body of Theory

Sociologists talk not about "Parson's theories" but about "Parsonian theory," the way one would refer to such landmarks in human thought as Copernican theory or Darwinian theory. His original works fill a large shelf in any sociology library, and his name weaves in and out of the literature of sociology and related disciplines like Einstein in physics and Freud in psychology.

From this reputation as an intellectual giant, one somehow expects a tall and overbearing figure, striking fear into the hearts of young graduate students. In reality, Professor Parsons is a short, roundish and avuncular looking man with a small brush mustache and gravelly voice. Humble and unassuming, he strikes one as shy, and his kindness to students is legendary.

"It happened to be my particular role as it were to act as an importer," he said, as he lit up the first of six cigarettes consumed down to the filter in the course of a one-hour interview the other day as he was tidying up his affairs after submitting his last grades as a teacher at Harvard.

The importing, he explained, consisted of focusing the attention of American sociology in the nineteen-thirties on two great European social theorists, Max Weber and Emile Durkheim, who, though very different, tended to think in grand theoretical terms. Until then, American sociologists, with one or two important exceptions, had been concerned mainly with empirical studies of rather localized phenomena.

General Theory of Activity

While up til then there had been many

attempts to build "middle range" theories that explain limited social functions—such as the doctor-patient relationship—Professor Parsons pioneered in offering an all-encompassing general theory of human activity. To do so, he incorporated into sociology elements of biology and medicine, economics, anthropology and Freudian psychodynamics.

The substance of Parsonian theory, so complex and abstract that few professional sociologists claim to understand it fully, defies simple summary. It is, as Edward C. Devereux Jr. of Cornell once wrote, "vast and tangled, a veritable jungle of fine distinctions and intertwining classifications."

And Professor Parsons himself, not best known for a concise style, is not much help, adds Professor Devereux, "because of his exasperating tendency to insist that each and every point in his entire system is fundamental."

The theory rests on the premise that all human societies, no matter how complex or simple, shared the same basic organizing principles.

Professor Parsons is a leading proponent of what sociologists call the "structural functionalist" approach, which holds that all social phenomena have a necessary function in holding society together and that societies have an over-all structure that governs the interactions of its members.

He views society as basically a system, operating on many different levels, with each of its parts interdependent on the others. A change in one elicits an appropriate reaction on the part of the others.

The theory is often called an "action theory" in that the central mechanism involves "as actors" either individuals or institutions, who behave, according to various goals, values and normative standards. Professor Parsons likens the social system to the biological system, in which all organisms are in equilibrium with their environment and with each other.

Like biological systems, he argues, social systems have regulatory mechanisms that allow them to return to equilibrium after each disturbance. Thus, while many conflicting forces are crossing through the body of the system, the mechanisms of social control tend to keep the system as a whole in dynamic equilibrium.

One of the main cornerstones of Parsonian theory is what he calls the "four-function paradigm." According to this concept, a social system's structure is governed by the way it meets four basic needs. The system differentiates into subsystems that serve to satisfy these needs.

The four are: "goal attainment," or the methods by which the system mobilizes to achieve its goals; "adaptation," or adjustment to the environment for survival and to acquire facilities, such as capital, to reach the goals; "integration," the internal relations of the units of the system to each other, designed to reconcile conflicts and maintain cohesion; and "pattern maintenance," the means by which the actors deal with pressures to deviate from accepted norms.

By way of illustration, this concept has been applied to a Navy destroyer. Goal attainment comprises the activities related to sinking enemy ships, as when all hands are at battle stations. Adaptation involves keeping the ship afloat and operating—repairs, drills, recruitment and training.

Integration is the maintenance of smooth relations between the various departments—gunnery, supply, engineering and so on—to reduce jealousy and enhance cooperation.

Finally pattern maintenance involves the efforts of each crew member to reconcile the goals and standards of the ship with those of his other roles—as husband, church member and so on.

These ideas and much more were developed over many years in a series of constantly evolving works in which theories were stacked one atop the other and related to each other in extremely complex ways.

Some of the most important books were "The Structure of Social Action" (1937); "Toward a General Theory of Action" (1951), written with Edward A. Shils; "The Social System" (1951), "Working Papers in the Theory of Action" (1953), with Robert F. Bales and Edward Shils; and "Economy and Society" (1957), with Neil J. Smelser.

The net effect of all this, according to one of Professor Parsons' most devoted students, Prof. Renée Fox of the University of Pennsylvania, was to provide a "scaffolding" within which other sociologists could talk about culture, personality and society—and relate them to one another.

But after having dominated the field for so long, Parsonian theory is no longer in vogue with young sociologists. They have tended to shy away from abstract theory and focus on more immediately relevant problems, on social critiquing and on the "microdynamics" of human interaction.

Moreover, Parsonian theory is often considered conservative politically because it stresses the tendency of societies to resist change by re-equilibrating themselves.

Younger sociologists, many of them radical politically, have favored the "conflict theory," which stresses conflict between social institutions rather than interaction.

"I have not been an immediate social problems sociologist," Professor Parsons agreed, "but a lot of biologists are not immediate particular disease pathologists either. If biology were nothing but coping with particular human or animal or plant diseases, it would not be much of a science."

Friends contend it is unfair to say that Talcott Parsons has removed himself from worldly affairs or that he is conservative. They note his strong stand against Nazism and McCarthyism, and the constant unselfish devotion, both from himself and his wife, Helen, lavished on a long parade of students.

A few of the many leading sociologists who have studied with Professor Parsons are Robert K. Merton, Kingsley Davis, Clifford Geertz, Robert Bellah, Neil J. Smelser, Bernard Barber, Jesse Pitts, and Renée Fox.

Retirement will not mean complete rest. He is in the midst of a major theoretical analysis of the American university as an institution, in collaboration with Gerald Platt of the University of Massachusetts. The first part of the study is to be published soon by the Harvard University Press under the title "The American University." In addition he expects to teach two courses next semester at the University of Pennsylvania.

As he steps aside, sociology today seems to many to be in great flux, perhaps even disarray. There is no central focus like that provided by Parsonian theory. But despite the decline in interest in theory, Professor Parsons, the son of a Congregational minister, remains sanguine.

"I am rather optimistic," he said. "We do not have very much you could call highly salient publicity worthy stuff coming out, but we might be on the threshold of quite major theoretical developments."

*Reprinted by permission of The New York Times, June 14, 1973.

ASA FOOTNOTES

Published monthly except June, July, and September. Distributed to all persons with membership in the ASA. Annual subscriptions to non-members: \$10; single copy: \$1.50.

Editor: Otto N. Larsen
Assoc. Editors: Alice F. Myers
Maurice Jackson
Advertising Mgr.: Sue Gorman

Send communications on material, subscriptions and advertising to:

American Sociological Association
1722 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: 202/833-3410

Copyright © 1973, ASA. Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C. and additional mailing offices.

Open Forum

Reactions to Coleman on Policy Research

In the March, 1973, issue of Footnotes, a brief summary of James Coleman's thoughtful address to the AAAS on the conduct of policy research was presented.* Coleman argued that, since research on social policy has often failed to promote the public good, a methodological foundation for such research is badly needed—a foundation that spans more successfully the world of action and the disciplinary world of science.

Coleman's remarks, in my opinion, were of such importance that I should like to see a growing dialogue on them. Of special interest to me are the politics of policy research, an issue that Coleman touched upon, but did not treat in detail. Coleman noted that the policy researcher, as researcher, is outside any action system. While his research problem may be derived from that system, and while it may also be reflective of his own personal values, it may also produce conflict and change when injected back into the system. Yet, research procedures, per se, must be neutral, and independent, if findings are to be valid.

My first concern is with the problems of keeping the research procedure neutral. While the investigator must strive to adhere to the canon of neutrality, my own experience indicates that the process of doing so is rarely so ascetic as Coleman implies. The investigator may want to remain outside the action system, but others are increasingly disinclined to let him do so.

Politics of Policy Research

We are now entering an era where perhaps, as never before, scientists are being asked to formulate their research in terms that seem relevant to the conceptual world of the policymaker or to that of the average citizen. While this trend is often reviewed as desirable, it should not be forgotten that it has come about, at least in part, because of a mounting distrust of science. **Whereas science was once relatively sacrosanct, it is now viewed with considerable suspicion, and often treated as but one of a host of competing vested interests. Once it is injected into the policy arena, therefore, there are many who see it less as a means for resolving problems than as a selfish competitor for a limited number of scarce resources.** It is difficult under such circumstances to keep the research act, if not the investigator, in a neutral position. Consider an example.

A recent policy study was funded after exhaustive review by an interested agency. Apparently, there was agreement that both its approach to policy issues and its design were appropriate. But once the study became public, a chorus of political protests arose from an interested group of local citizens. As it turned out, however, they were less concerned with the substance of the investigation than with a host of issues over which the project had relatively little control—over the lack of community impact on policy decisions at university and government levels, over hiring and educational practices, and over the merits of action versus research programs. While many of these general concerns were legitimate, very little could be done by the single research study to resolve them. In short, it had become a pawn in a larger political game. How, then, should the investigator respond?

Relative to Coleman's point, for example, that any policy research problem should enter from outside the academic discipline, and be translated from the real world of the client, who was the client in this case—the funding agency or local constituents? Actually, the funding agency helped to answer that question by responding politically; that

is, it took the position that, while the project had to retain its general objectives and to remain within its original budget, all other major elements of the study—specific foci, management, and the research design—were to be renegotiated between the investigator and the self-appointed group of local people. The agency, itself, would relinquish all decision-making to interaction between community and research people.

Although it was possible ultimately to achieve some consensus on the nature of the research problem, what about the neutrality of the research procedure? In this case, the political response of both the community and the funding agency resulted in a serious blurring of the lines between problem definition and disciplinary procedures for conducting research. Hence, the investigators were faced with three difficult alternatives: (1) to discard the project as scientifically unworkable; (2) to run the risk of seeing their disciplinary procedures corrupted; or (3) to work out a series of political tradeoffs by which community people could gain some benefits in return for granting research people the right to conduct the investigation without interference. Although no one of the alternatives was especially desirable, I find that it is increasingly necessary for the investigator to choose among some variation of them if he is to conduct policy research, or even field research of his own choosing.

It is for this reason that I should like greater consideration given to the political, extra scientific role that the investigator must often play. At the same time, the reciprocal role of the policymaker should also be examined, since he is as often a villain in this piece as he is a saint. Untold volumes have been devoted to disciplinary methodologies in sociology, but virtually none to appropriate political strategies by which the vested interest of independently neutral research can be protected. Such protection is needed, however, not merely for the investigator and his research, but for other reasons.

Studying As Well As Surviving Conflict

The fact that conflict often attends the conduct of policy research is significant in substantive as well as political terms. It means that the investigator, and hopeful the interested policymaker, may not only have to consider whether impediments to neutral research can be reduced, but whether those impediments should be made the object of study. The political and ideological realities that lead to resistance to policy research are often the very ones on which systematic study could be very important for policy implementation.

In the evaluation of service, educational or delinquency programs, for example, it is common to find that the interest groups and conditions which inhibit or facilitate the conduct of these programs also inhibit or facilitate evaluation. Policy research, like policy implementation, does not operate in a vacuum. **A basic question for the discipline, therefore, is not just whether neutrality of investigation can be protected, but under what conditions policy research on extremely sensitive issues should be encouraged or discouraged.** What are the ethical and political, as well as disciplinary, issues that must be considered by scientists? Also, what impediments to research should be protested, in what manner, and to whom?

Expectations for Research

Another major concern I have is that more is often expected of policy and applied research than it can deliver. I am wholeheartedly in sympathy with Coleman's argument that we need the kinds of designs for policy research that will have the greatest possible payoff in the shortest possible period of time. To get such designs, however, we must again consider the interplay of extra scientific and disciplinary matters.

Despite the lip service given to the need for policy or evaluative research,

it is the exception rather than the rule for policymakers to invest seriously in it. The amounts budgeted for the evaluation of service programs, for example, are little more than window dressing, an infinitesimal fraction of the total costs of service programs. How, then, can the complex forces that impinge upon, and result from, them be measured effectively? In addition to the tendency for social scientists to treat complex, "real world" social systems as laboratory situations, and thus to fail in their attempts at measurement, policymakers have also been unwilling to invest in the kinds of analyses by which some improvements in basic designs might be supported.

In the same issue of FOOTNOTES in which Coleman's principles were summarized, Hubert Blalock, Jr. questioned the usage of simple disciplinary designs to measure complex realities. He was not concerned primarily with policy research, but his comments were certainly appropriate to it. For many policy questions, as Blalock implied, we must often account "... for many variables, all well measured, at several points in time and with large samples" if we are to do a responsible job. Not only need we rectify disciplinary failures, however, but find adequate funding by which to do so. Moreover, policy and applied research is often hampered by the ill-defined objectives and the record systems that are characteristic of operating agencies. In most cases, they are unsuited to definitive research. Unless, therefore, any research project can provide an alternative set of records, research findings will be of limited use. But since research is not an ordinary component of these agencies, the researcher often tries to set up his own record system which, in many cases, also turns out to be inadequate.

These kinds of problems are related to Coleman's questioning of the role of traditional funding agencies—NIMH, NIH, and OE—in the conduct of policy research. I believe he exaggerated their divorce from policy issues. They often respond to changing political and public interest in crime, drugs, education or poverty. Yet, even if these agencies are relatively divorced from political decisionmaking, I think it is still an open question as to whether research funded by them has had proportionately less impact on policy, at least in the long run, than that which has been funded directly by policymakers. In the first place, I believe that this research, because it is less inhibited by political pressure, often benefits from superior design. But beyond that, there is the uncertainty of research funded directly by policymakers.

My own research, much of which has been applied, and conducted in the open community, has been supported both by traditional agencies, and by local policy groups. Yet, had it not been for the support of the former, the research probably would not have been completed. Not only did traditional research funding provide greater independence for these studies, but the winds of political change resulted in the withdrawal of directly supplied policy funds in midstream. In the case of the Provo Experiment, for example, a change in political parties at election time resulted in the elimination of local support. Hence, such financial support was not dependable while that derived from agencies whose basic mandate was research were.

Finally, there is the question of financial support for the public relations aspects of any policy research—i.e., for the educational tasks that are necessary to engender public support for such research, and for the staffing, supplies and time necessary to produce materials that might communicate more effectively with policymakers and user groups. Finding ways to make a more effective utilization of scientific findings is a task worthy of careful effort and investigation in its own right. Once again, however, it has been difficult to

develop adequate mechanisms for this related segment of the policy research process.

Clearly then, policymakers, as well as the scientific community, bear some responsibility for the limitations of policy research. If expectations for productive outcomes are not to be violated, therefore, changes on the parts of both will be required. Insofar as scientists are concerned, however, it seems to me that three things are needed. First, it is clear that we must become a more effective lobby in behalf of responsible and respectable policy research. Scientists as a group and particularly social scientists, are a relatively powerless lot. Hence, in seeking to fund their research, they often seek transient alliances with politically powerful decision makers. While this may result in some support for research, it possesses many dangers. **The scientific community can only be hurt by research that is expeditiously conducted, poorly conceived and which fails to provide a knowledge-building, as well as service, function.**

Secondly, as both Blalock and Coleman have suggested, we must seek to develop complex models within the discipline that are more appropriate for the complex world we seek to study.

Finally, and this may be where we are most vulnerable, we must incorporate into our own work the kinds of skills that are necessary if we are to confront effectively the extra-scientific political realities that impinge upon research. Not only do these realities help to set the context for research, but because they also set the context for policy formulation, we may have to find more effective ways for making them the object of study.

LaMar T. Empey
University of Southern California

*Coleman's AAAS address was an abridgment of a paper published by General Learning Press as a separate "module", titled, "Policy Research in the Social Sciences," and priced at 90 cents.

The Problem of "Policy"

At least since the time of Comte many sociologists, eminent and otherwise, have expressed interest in and (in the case of many) specific positions on possible relationships between the discipline and the ongoing social and political process. The current high level of interest in the problem, and the number of possible stances regarding it, was well illustrated in the "Open Forum" (ASA FOOTNOTES, February, 1973), not to mention other specific studies and reports such as the Brim Commission a few years ago. It is scarcely likely that any pronouncements, organized or otherwise, will resolve a debate that has endured so long, and so fruitlessly, and I am more than a little reluctant to enter the debate at all. Yet I am troubled enough, intellectually, to offer the following observations.

If the general discussion were to be placed in a more familiar format it might resemble this: an independent variable (sociological knowledge, research) can, cannot, should, or will anyway—take your choice—influence a dependent variable (social, political, public policy). We are all aware of some of the difficulties attached to the independent variable here (different paradigms, accuracy of indicators, implicit or explicit value premises and so on) and, for the moment at least, I am not concerned with the choice of a connecting verb. **What troubles me is the dependent variable: that simple, elusive, beguiling word "policy."** Now if there is one thing that we, as good sociologists, should be clear about it is the necessity of specifying the characteristics of dependent variables, and the properties (frequency, direction, strength, magnitude or whatever) of those particular characteristics assumed to be influenced by the independent variables. It is this specification that I miss so much of the discussion on the problem of social science and social policy.

Perhaps all the sociologists who are concerned with policy issues know what they have in mind, and it is even possible that they all mean the same thing when using the word "policy." The trouble is that I don't know. I don't know how to grasp it, intellectually or operationally, and dictionaries do not help: "Policy—a plan of action; way of management," not only because these phrases seem to refer to two quite different things, but also because they do not provide any further useful distinctions, i.e., the characteristics and properties of the dependent variable. Nor do I find much assistance on these matters in the sociological literature with which I am acquainted—which, needless to say, is scarcely exhaustive. (In what follows I am acutely aware of the irony involved in using the word "policy" in order to discuss its difficulties—an observation that not only expresses my intellectual discomfort, but also may illustrate a more general dilemma.)

In order to clarify some of the ambiguities and vagaries surrounding the concept of policy, one gambit might be that of exclusion, that is, to attempt to specify all, or most, human activities that are devoid of, or unrelated to, policy considerations. If, for example, it is assumed that "policy" refers to a particular category of phenomena, and that within some known frame of reference there is a finite number of other categories, the policy category (its characteristics and properties) can be identified by excluding all other categories within the frame. This is a logical possibility but on the face of it, it sounds much too cumbersome and awkward to be very useful.

Another possibility would be to assume some general notion of "policy," and then analyze that notion into various sub-categories or more manageable "portals of entry" into the maze. For example, if one arbitrarily assumes (or defines) "policy" as being a preferential statement about desirable means to attain goals that are more just or equitable, then one could become more specific by distinguishing among policy makers, policy interpreters, and policy executors (a nasty word, that, but is "implementers" any better?). This at least would help locate the particular "pressure points" in a complex process that one wishes to influence, and these may vary depending on the policy issue at hand.

Presumably, sociologists could be concerned with policy issues of any organization (including the ASA), but if I read the current debate correctly, most interest centers on policies of the federal government. Assuming this to be the case, for present purposes, and to illustrate the range of possible concerns, I take it, for example, that few of us are genuinely interested in re-writing the Constitution of the United States, or its Preamble. What then? Seek glittering generalities from the President or a National Commission or a Congressional Resolution? Change existing statutes or Supreme Court decisions? Influence upper and middle echelon administrators who interpret or execute policies so as to modify either existing interpretations or modes of execution or both? Throw out one set of administrators, judges, legislators, and replace them with another set closer to heart's desire? (As Mr. Nixon is teaching us, if we did not already know, policy matters are often considerably simplified by merely changing personnel on the Supreme Court, the FBI, or Cabinet positions rather than by attacking policies directly.) The question is: at what points and in what ways do sociologists seek to influence policy?

Another formulation would employ different categories altogether. Here distinctions might be made between substantive and procedural policies; strategies and tactics of action; value statements, goal statements, normative statements, and instrumental statements; social policy (public opinion, the mores) and public policy (statutes, court deci-

sions, administrative rules and regulations); flexible policies (which allow options) vs. firm policies (which require or prohibit something, irrespective); long-range and short-range policies; selective policies (aimed at some categories of people, but not others) vs. uniform policies (aimed at everyone in some collective role, e.g., citizens); and so on. This listing is by no means exhaustive, but it may indicate some parameters which, singly or in combinations of various kinds, may be worthy of consideration.

Frankly, I have no policy about the policy implications of sociology, or the extent to which such considerations should or should not enter into graduate training, or the professional activities of ASA, other collectivities, or even individual sociologists. There are no criteria of which I am aware, other than sheer personal preference or predilection, to guide us one way or the other. But in the constellation of contemporary sociology it would appear that only the "stars" cannot afford to be neutral.

The critical point relating to policy matters, it seems to me, is "intervention": when, where, how, and by whom? Timing is important, but so are the points of intervention and the means used. It is one thing to try to influence policy makers, and quite another thing to influence policy interpretation and execution. The levels of intervention are different, as are their results. Policies to correct social ills (however defined) usually attract more attention than policies aimed at prevention—for the latter require more knowledge and long-range wisdom than mere noble intentions. Given the present state of the art and science of sociology, I am much more concerned about which sociologists decide where, when and how policy interventions are to be made, than I am about what policies sociological knowledge can justify, since the former are much more existential than the latter. And, as Everett Hughes pointed out many years ago, queer things can happen when persons and roles interact.

It is almost de rigeur that papers by sociologists conclude with the sentence, "More research is needed." In the present case, I conclude that more thought is needed—about the independent and dependent variables of sociology and policy, and the connecting verb.

Edmund Volkart
 University of Hawaii

On Obstacles to the Development of New Fields in Sociology

I am afraid that our current procedures for professional communication may constitute a serious obstacle to the development of new areas of knowledge in sociology. The leading and most widely read journals in sociology have criteria for publication which favor established fields within the discipline and discriminate against new fields. And because the lesser journals tend to copy the leading journals, this problem tends to pervade the written mediums of communication in sociology. The same problem appears, to a somewhat lesser extent, with regard to papers for professional meetings.

In order for an article to secure publication in almost all sociology journals, it must: 1) be tied in detail to an existing body of theory and research, and 2) report the results of an ambitious (large-scale) verificational study; or 3) it must document a new methodological technique of obvious value in the established fields of research. The new journals on methodology, mathematical sociology, health and social behavior, etc. reflect increased specialization and strength within certain established fields of sociology, not necessarily a broadening of the base of sociological knowledge. These same comments apply to the array of sessions at professional meetings.

What happens when a sociologist stumbles into a new area of inquiry?

If he is true to his training, he begins with a pilot study and attempts to develop a classification which can be used to diagnose cases of the phenomenon in question. He may also do some preliminary research to develop some theoretical propositions. But where does he go from here?

It is widely recognized that a single individual can rarely do all of the work necessary to codify and develop theory in a given field of inquiry. Moreover, it is desirable to increase the number of investigators working in the area in order to lessen the probability of bias due to the observer. In established areas of inquiry it is relatively easy to keep up the flow of new researchers into the field. The structure of introductory texts and courses insures that the student's first contact with sociology carefully delineates the field and its "major elements." Journals and professional meetings constantly remind us of what is going on in research on stratification, formal organizations, political power, religion, research methodology, etc. In addition, graduate departments structure their programs in such a way that students become quite familiar with the theory and research in various established fields within sociology, especially "theory" (which usually means the history of sociological theory) and methodology. Likewise, the student's choices of substantive fields (i.e. family, criminology, social psychology, social organization, sociology of education, social stratification, etc.) for examinations and thesis research are usually limited to established areas.

The investigator interested in pursuing a new subject beyond the preliminary stages has a serious problem on two fronts. First, **he cannot get published in the journals because his theory and research are "impressionistic" or "descriptive". There is little more than lip service given to the notion that knowledge develops in stages. There is little appreciation for the fact that forcing research and theory in new areas to compete on equal footing with research and theory that has been in the process of development for a hundred years means closing the door on communication concerning work in new areas.** This matter is complicated by the fact that the editorial boards of journals and session organizers for meetings are made up of people who have achieved recognition for their performance in established fields and who, therefore, have a stake in the existing hierarchy of specialties within the discipline. Kuhn speaks of the need for new paradigms in order to advance theory and research in substantive fields. To that I would add that if sociology is to advance, we need to be more flexible concerning our paradigms for structuring sociological knowledge and for how knowledge is to be developed.

On the second front, the researcher in a new area quickly finds out that basic research funds go primarily to those who are doing verificational studies (or studies which have been written up in such a way that they appear to be verificational). There is little money in the basic research pot for pioneering. The only way to secure money for research in a new field is to include its cost in a larger piece of basic or applied research, and the less said about it the better. Funding agencies will often quickly recognize the potential of beginning research in a new area, but when the crunch comes, as it often does these days, the bureaucrats put their money on the horses with established track records rather than on the long shots. This is understandable and might even be reasonable if it did not lead to the almost total exclusion of research support for new areas of inquiry.

I am not arguing against verificational studies based on existing areas of theories and research. I am arguing against making this type of effort the end-all, be-all of sociology. **I am asserting that there is a need for an expansion of the base of questions with which sociology**

is concerned and that our current preoccupation with existing established areas of research constitutes an obstacle to a balanced expansion of the base of our knowledge.

The structural obstacles to developing new lines of inquiry have several outcomes. First, investigators in the field remain unsensitized concerning emerging areas of theory and research. New fields of study do not emerge full-blown. Except in cases where the government provides financial incentive to develop a new area (as has been done in the sociology of aging, medical sociology, etc.), grass-roots development is necessary before a new subject area can gain a foothold in the discipline. But grass-roots development is dependent on communication, and the two primary legitimate routes for both formal and informal communications, journals and meetings, are structured in such a way as to stifle communication about new areas.

The second important outcome of this situation is that researchers cannot afford to spend too much of their time in fields in which work goes unrewarded. Thus, many researchers leave new areas of inquiry when it becomes obvious that the recognition (publications) required by the departmental committee or the dean as evidence for salary raises or promotions can only be secured by doing verificational studies in an established field. Thus, sociology finds itself in the unenviable position of offering few rewards to those who seek to widen the base of sociological knowledge.

By default, the result of such a system is a certain amount of narrow-mindedness among sociologists. There are large numbers of articles on occupational mobility, minority problems, formal organizations, etc.; and the wide range of topics gives the illusion that the field is broad. **But where are the articles on language, the life cycle, leisure, the arts, griping and bitching, adoption, widowhood, eating, obscene symbols and gestures, insult behavior, humor, and countless other areas of social life which have been decreed by some unseen force to be "peripheral" to the field of sociology?**

I do not think that the absence of these topics has resulted by accident or as a result of their unimportance. The basic lines of inquiry in sociology have changed very little in the past forty years, but the same cannot be said of the world sociologists study. Topics such as aging or nonrelative adoption are commonplace today but they were not when the field was being organized by the European classical sociologists. The fault does not lie with the early sociologists, however. It lies in our all-too-willing rejection of new subjects which do not easily fit into the organization of the standard introductory textbook.

Robert C. Atchley
 Miami University, Ohio

Editor of ASR Responds

I have been asked to respond to your statement concerning "obstacles to the development of new fields in sociology." I suspect most editors are sensitive to the problems you raise, but would probably analyze those problems somewhat differently.

Let me begin with the observation that if "lesser journals" tend to copy the leading journals, this is regrettable. To some extent I suppose emulation is inevitable, but I recall a conversation with a prominent sociologist associated with the *American Journal of Sociology* in which he remarked that it seemed ridiculous for *AJS* to try to do what *ASR* does. I must admit that I do not fully agree with that judgment, for I feel there is ample room in the field for several "leading journals," whatever that may mean. Indeed, by my lights there are several leading journals. These journals specialize or generalize variously, depending upon their audiences. See OPEN FORUM, p. 9

PRESIDENT, *cont. from p. 1*

ate training at Elmhurst College and his Ph.D. from Columbia. He has taught at Wayne State University, Cornell, but spent most of his professional life at the University of Chicago (1953-1969), leaving Chicago for his present position at Columbia in 1970.

He has served in a number of important positions, among which were, the Editor of the American Journal of Sociology for six years, a member on the Board of Directors of the Social Science Research Council, member of the Council of the ASA, and ASA representative to the International Sociological Association.

Peter Blau is a fine colleague, a distinguished scholar, and a great teacher. We can be truly proud that he will be our President, fulfilling that role with as much skill and solid accomplishment as he has fulfilled the role of leading sociologist over the past two decades.

1974 PROGRAM, *cont. from p. 1*

concern. Didactic Seminars, an innovation of the 1972 Program Committee, proved of such interest and value to the members that they were continued in 1973 under the title "Refresher Lectures". The 1974 Committee has decided to return to the earlier designation and the format of limited attendance and pre-registration.

The Committee has also planned a wide-ranging program covering thematic topics, innovative topics, and those of traditional areas of interest. The list of topics and organizers for "programmed" sessions appear below. "Supplementary" sessions will be added as the need dictates. Charles H. Page has agreed to chair a sub-committee consisting of Gila J. Hayim and Peter Park to review those contributed papers which do not fit into the programmed topics and organize them into supplementary sessions under appropriate headings. Details covering the submission of contributed papers are given below.

The Luncheon Roundtable Discussions will be organized by a sub-committee under the guidance of Daisy M. Tagliacozzo. Members wishing to be considered as presenters, or those wishing to suggest topics or presenters for the luncheons may contact Professor Tagliacozzo at the Department of Sociology, University of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts 02116

The list of program topics and organizers is essentially complete at this time; the Program Committee does not plan to add any sessions other than the supplementary ones described below.

Submission of Papers

Papers should not exceed 1,500 words and should be submitted directly to the appropriate organizer as listed below. Papers that have been read at meetings of other professional societies or that will be published prior to September, 1974, are ineligible for inclusion in the program. Papers that have been modified only in secondary respects after similar reading or publication are also ineligible.

Papers must be submitted to the organizers prior to January 15, 1974. Once the Executive Office is informed of the titles and authors of papers accepted for inclusion in the program, authors will be notified of the date by which they must submit abstracts and final copies of papers. This deadline will be no later than June 1, 1974.

If you have prepared a paper but can find no appropriate session topic in the list below, you may submit it to Charles H. Page, Department of Sociology, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts 01002. Professor Page's sub-committee will read these papers and refer them to appropriate organizers. In those cases where no suitable topic exists, the sub-committee will attempt to organize several supplementary sessions around suitable topics. If you plan

to submit such a paper, it is advisable to do so well before the January 15 deadline in order to give the sub-committee adequate time to screen your paper and forward it to the organizer before the session is filled.

As with submissions to journals and publishers, the practice of submitting the same paper to more than one organizer is discouraged. If there is a multiple submission, the author must make this perfectly clear to both organizers that this is the case. Another situation which creates a serious problem for organizers is when an author submits different papers to different organizers. If both are accepted, rules of participation force one to be dropped, thereby leaving the session short.

Rules of Participation

ASA Council recently reviewed and reaffirmed the rules governing multiple participation in the Annual Meeting Program. No individual shall be accorded more than two participatory roles in the program, including not more than one in which he or she is the sole author of a paper. Participatory roles are those in which participants are listed by name in the program: e.g., presenter or author of a paper, presenter in a roundtable, participant in a seminar, panel member, chairing a session, discussant of a paper. These rules also govern programs arranged and sponsored by a Section.

Session Topics and Organizers

Age Structure and Social Change: Zena Smith Blau, 5737 S. Dorchester Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60637

Arts and Society: Frederick L. Bates, Department of Sociology, Baldwin Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia 30601

Black Community: Charles V. Willie, Office of Student Affairs, Steele Hall, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210

Bureaucracy: Eugene Litwak, Department of Sociology, 405 Fayerweather Hall, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027

Section on Community: Roland L. Warren, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University, Waltham, Massachusetts 02154

Community Power Structure: Delbert C. Miller, Department of Sociology, Ballantine Hall, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401

Comparative Study of Society: Daniel Lerner, 46 Chestnut Hill Road, Newton, Massachusetts 02167

Conflict and Violence: Edna Bonacich, Department of Sociology, University of California, Riverside, California 92502

Context and Impact of Evaluation Research: James Fennessey, Department of Social Relations, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Criminology: Donald Gibbons, Department of Sociology, Portland State University, P.O. Box 751, Portland, Oregon 97207

Section on Criminology: Marvin Wolfgang, Department of Sociology, Dietrich Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Ecology: Jack B. Gibbs, Department of Sociology, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721

Economy and Society: Ida Harper Simpson, Department of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27706

Sociology of Education: Will Scott, Department of Sociology, A&T State University, Greensboro, North Carolina 27411

Section on Sociology of Education: Ronald Corwin, 2006 Collingwood Road, Columbus, Ohio 43221

Environmental Sociology: Harvey Molotch, Department of Sociology, University of California, Santa Barbara, California 93108

Family Structure: Barbara Laslett, 4 Southwood Lane, Highgate, London,

N6, England

Section on Family: Clark Vincent, Bowman Gray School of Medicine, Winston Salem, North Carolina 27103

Formal Organizations: Koya Azumi, Department of Sociology, Rutgers University, Newark, New Jersey 07102

Incarceration: The Uses and Abuses: Sister Esther Heffernan, Edgewood College, 855 Woodrow Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53711

Innovations in Undergraduate Education: Frederick L. Campbell, Department of Sociology, Savory Hall, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195

International Sociology: Problems and Avenues for Cooperation: Reuben Hill, 3941 Beard Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55410

Law and Society: Philip Selznick, 89 Hillcrest Road, Berkeley, California 94705

Mass Communication and Social Change: Thelma McCormack, 205 Chaplin Crescent, Toronto, Ontario M5P 1B1, Canada

Mathematical Models: Gordon H. Lewis, Social Relations Department, Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Medical Sociology: Mary E. W. Goss, 25 Hillcrest Drive, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854

Section on Medical Sociology: Rose Laub Coser, Department of Sociology, State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York 11790

Methodological Issues in Social Evaluation: James Fennessey, Department of Social Relations, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Methodology: Sanford Labovitz, Department of Sociology, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada

Section on Methodology: James A. Davis, National Opinion Research Center, 6030 South Ellis, Chicago, Illinois 60637

Microstudies of Social Relations: Sheila Klatsky, Department of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Occupations and Professions: Joan Stelling, Department of Sociology, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario N6A 3K7 Canada

Section on Organizations and Occupations: Richard Hall, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Phenomenological Sociology: Helmut R. Wagner, Hobart College, Geneva, New York 14456

Police and Other Agents of Control: James Leo Walsh, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio 44074

Political Sociology: Maurice Pinard, Department of Sociology, McGill University, P.O. Box 6070, Montreal 101, Quebec, Canada

Population Studies: George Myers, Department of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27706

Race and Ethnic Relations: Rodolfo Alvarez, Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024

Sociology of Religion: Benton Johnson, Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon 97403

School Context, Aspirations, and Achievement: Edward L. McDill, Department of Social Relations, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218

Science and Society: Stephen Cole, Department of Sociology, State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York 11790

Sociology of Sex Roles: Cora Marrett,

Department of Sociology, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Section on Sociology of Sex Roles: Cynthia Epstein, 425 Riverside Drive, New York, New York 10025

Social Indicators: Robert Parke, SSRC Center for Social Indicators, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, Washington, D.C. 20036

Social Movements and Collective Behavior: Ralph Turner, Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024

Social Psychology: Richard Emerson, Department of Sociology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195

Social Stratification and Mobility: John Porter, Department of Sociology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Social Structure and Revolutions: James B. Rule, Department of Sociology, State University of New York, Stony Brook, New York 11790

Structural Sources of Deviance: Troy Duster, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720

Theory: Harold Fallding, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada

Section on Theoretical Sociology: Ralph Turner, Department of Sociology, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024

Section on Undergraduate Education: Hans O. Mauksch, Department of Sociology, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri 65201

Urban Sociology: Butler A. Jones, Department of Sociology, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio 44115

Welfare: S. M. Miller, Department of Sociology, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts 02215

Sociology of Work: Theodore Caplow, Department of Sociology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

World Conflict: Ruth Jacobs, 14 Warren Street, Needham, Massachusetts 02192

Surplus Books? Help Build Library In India

India's Dean of the Social Scientists, Professor M. N. Srinivas, has recently been appointed Co-Director of a new Institute of Social and Economic Change. In view of great costs and other obstacles to getting books from abroad, the Institute would welcome the receipt of relevant books from donors to help build their library. Of particular interest are books in the following areas: Social Change, Urbanization, Industrialization, Sociology of Education, Comparative Sociology, Theory, Changing Family Structure, Sociology of Religion, Modernization, and Changing Patterns of Social Stratification.

Packages may be sent book rate, surface mail (delivery in about three months). Book packages have upper limit of 11 pounds in weight, and they must be unsealed but should be tied with heavy cord. Rates: First 4 lbs.: 46¢, each additional 2 lbs.: 24¢. Send packages to:

Professor M. N. Srinivas, Co-Director
Institute of Social and Economic Change
Bangalore University
Bangalore, Mysore INDIA

Recently 143 books were sent to this address from the ASA Office. We urge others to follow suit.

For further information on this project, write to:

Professor R. A. Schermerhorn
155 N. Cambridge Avenue
Claremont, California 91711

Correction on Routing of Manuscripts For Rose Monograph Series

Until January 1, 1974, Members and Student Members of the ASA may submit manuscripts (100 to 300 typed pages) for consideration for publication in the ASA Arnold and Caroline Rose Monograph Series to: Sheldon Stryker, Department of Sociology, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

After January 1, 1974, manuscripts should be submitted to: Ida Harper Simpson, Department of Sociology, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 27706.

Letters

GRIEVANCES?

The Committee on Freedom of Research and Teaching would like to remind members of the ASA that it stands ready to investigate charges that may be brought by members concerning infringements upon their rights to conduct teaching and research. Such infringements might involve hiring, promotion, or dismissal cases in which political views may be at stake or cases in which discrimination on the basis of race, sex, or other irrelevant grounds may be involved.

The Committee would also be interested in hearing about practices of government agencies, foundations, or commercial firms which impinge upon the freedom to undertake research, including the right to publish findings.

Although the resources of the Committee are limited, it will make a strong effort to look into all cases brought to its attention.

Persons knowing of possible cases should communicate directly with the undersigned.

Peter H. Rossi
 Johns Hopkins University

RESPONSE TO BLALOCK

Blalock's (March 1973) letter was useful and deserves close attention. Much of his diagnosis and most of his suggestions come across as valid, and needed. One idea, however, common among both social scientists and their critics, needs a closer look. He made a misleading distinction between research strategies: studies of "very simplified kinds of realities of the types that we create in laboratory experiments" ("artificial") versus those which "deal more directly with the much more complex 'real world'..." Further, the unwary reader may hear him saying that theories based on artificial data are not useful for solving practical problems in the real world.

On the contrary, everything that is observable and verifiable may be considered "real." The interactions among variables in an experiment are really occurring. The difference between experimental and non-experimental situations is one of degree, not of essence, and is based on the number of variables and degree of control over them. Under experimental conditions events can be predicted, within margins of error which can be estimated. When variables are relatively uncontrolled, we forecast. That is, we estimate or guess at values for the variables at a given moment in time; then predict what would occur if our "guesstimates" are approximated.

Most of what is called engineering relies on forecasts about the "real world" based on theories developed from "artificial" experimental data.

It was useful to learn statistics from R.A. Fisher texts, based on data from agricultural experiments. Few relationships have proved more practical or productive than that among agronomist (experimental scientist), extension worker (engineer), and farmer (manipulator of the real world). None of the three confuses the agronomist's plot (artificial experiment) with the farmer's cotton field (real world). They despair neither because the plot is "not a real field" nor because most variables in the cotton field cannot be controlled.

Observations under the simplified, controlled conditions of the plot lead to an equation (theory) which describes the relationship among variables, not in the cotton field, but only under the experimental conditions. These conditions never obtain, exactly, in any situation to which the theory is applied. However, a few soil samples plus the farmer's approximate knowledge of his field are enough for practical purposes. Using that, theory and forecast lead to better decisions about kind and amount of fertilizer than the farmer would make if the "artificial experiment" had not been made. Theory useful for practical purposes could not be developed from observations of uncontrolled variables in the "real world" field.

Blalock is properly and intelligently interested in better theories for practical purposes. However, the metaphysical distinction between "artificial experiment" and "real world" is an obstacle, not an aid, to building and especially to applying social theory. Sociology would be more practical if theory-builders worked more directly with "social engineers." If our theories were applied under test conditions, the corpus of sociology theory would be much smaller—but better. If we want to be useful, the question about an experiment—or any other data-gathering situation—is not "Is it real?" but "Is it appropriate for the use intended?"

Morton King
 Southern Methodist University

UTOPIAS, POWER, LOVE

By mutually excluding the notion of Social Power from that of Natural Law, of "political sources" from nature, Ivan Chapman (May FOOTNOTES) falls into a familiar short-sight among nearly all of today's social thinkers. Planners of Utopia (i.e. most social scientists) feel they deserve the prestige of objectivity, while pursuing pet ideological theories about Human Nature. Their notorious fear of pragmatism (which springs from too much school) keeps them from discerning law as-written from law as-practiced. Amidst loose talk of "freedom" and "individuality" there plods a profound evasion of political facts of life....

You see, to get what they want, people often manipulate one another, in fact often must obscure their motives to circumvent impractical or counterconstructive rules. Look especially at leaders, who must exploit their targets' adherence to certain cultivated and cost-effective norms such as "Rich People Are Unhappy", cultural myths that congeal to disqualify citizens from over-involvement in power behaviors. Whenever advising leaders we're reminded time and again that to head off the anarchy to which social conflict naturally extends, they must limit conflict itself. Toe to toe with the sensualists who become excited whenever power is mentioned, stand the de facto controllers who until such splendid tools as now promised by Social Psychology are unwrapped, must cope here and now with leaks from the scarcity of power. And one of the ways leaders de-fuse and harmonize large masses is with plain old-fashioned planned change. An ounce of status quist propaganda is worth a pound of unplanned change. It shouldn't be that hard to understand why research money goes mostly to conformists who "operate solely and meekly in the policy-approved areas", or why innovation in all forms is made unfashionable by governments. And it shouldn't really outrage anyone at this lusty epoch of human bloom, that such behaviors appear to be natural to our adolescent animal, at least as inexorable and reflexive as Love and Hate.

By way of these examples, the reason social scientists' image is dominated by that of natural scientists, lies with that very contradiction in the terms "social" and "science" which sociologists have forlornly defended unto themselves. Things they don't "like" about human nature, such as its insistence on seeking social power, they hope will just... go away, will shrivel to insignificance either by starvation from scrutiny and by moral hauteur, or can be cauterized from our catalog of behaviors by that fashionable brand of internal medicine called psychoanalysis. Their failure to fathom the responsibilities attending the label "scientist" is the reason why Humanists must inevitably lose out in any Ideological Warfare to Exterminate Wide Ranges of Human Values and Choices. The very choices that Humanists furiously revile, those acts of transactional power such as manipulation and persuasion, those nontherapeutic behavior controls, alone can defend precious Individualism from the maw of Monster State! It's high time social values were treated as operating from impersonal natural law, capable of precise prediction and control, and exempted from the futile tinkering of students not of what is, but of What They Think It Should Be, indeed time for thinkers to stop selectively in attending power behaviors from their much-belabored Humanness, their Love. Until these people transcend the dichotomy of Power and Love, these designers of utopias will see their paradigms confounded by the hard, harsh glare of history.

Don Brockway III
 Mental Karate Institute
 El Porto, California

NO PURGE

There has been no "purge of radical and Marxian sociologists" at Washington University, contrary to Jack N. Porter's assertion in the letters section of the May FOOTNOTES. This is the allegation, predictably, of several ex-members of our Department. But the facts are these.

- (1) Some instructors failed to get their doctorates as promised, even after extensions of the contracted deadlines. They were terminated with due notice as required by Washington University's personnel policies (and AAUP norms).
- (2) Others were judged by the tenured faculty to lack the qualifications the Department (students included) sought as scholars or as teachers. They were terminated with due notice.
- (3) There have been resignations.
- (4) There could have been no categorical purge in any event because not even "the new sociologists" could agree as

to just who was radical, critical, Marxian, neo-Marxian. Or, for that matter, who is and what is "sociology". (Our most distinguished Marxian scholar repudiated the label to the confusion of avowed disciples.) Last year's radical became this year's reactionary, cast down by the elect.

As practically everyone in the profession knows by now, sociology at Washington University has had more than its share of troubles. Some of us confused sociology with theology and politics. There was a misguided enthusiasm for participatory democracy. And we also had a weak Dean who thought departments make a university, and that departments are always right. These were the factors principally responsible for some junior faculty appointments between 1967 and 1972 we had no business making. I hope our experience may be a lesson to others as it is now, I think to us.

Nicholas J. Demerath
 Washington University, St. Louis

GRE SCORES AGAIN

Dudley Duncan's letter (April, 1973) and reference to a recent ASA Council action regarding GRE scores requires response. In fact, the issue of GRE scores needs further exploration; the controversy so far is only the tip of the iceberg of potential problems with this instrument.

Duncan's letter rests upon thinly-veiled racism, to me. He makes a straw man of the use of the word "knowledge" in the ASA motion in order to imply that we do not have any knowledge of the biases inherent in GRE testing. He further implies that GRE scores amount to a criterion measuring "expected performance in graduate study." They do not; there is little evidence of any attempt to correlate better with graduate school performance. Indeed, I wonder if the Princeton folks even systematically record the later graduate performance of GRE testees.

I teach at Tougaloo College, in Mississippi. I used to teach (and study) at Harvard. At Tougaloo, GRE scores range from 230 to 500; at Harvard, among my students, they ranged from 550 to above 800. Within Tougaloo, there is some but not perfect correlation between GRE performance and later graduate school performance. To my knowledge, which is only impressionistic, the same is true at Harvard.

But what are we to make of the vast differences between school means? Is a Harvard 550 "better" than a Tougaloo 500? Is the lowest Harvard scorer likely to do better than the highest Tougaloo scorer? Not in graduate school! Tougaloo students in the past five years have completed graduate study or are now doing well at such places as Wisconsin, Chicago, Michigan State, Harvard, and Princeton. Indeed, I believe I could get a number of graduate educators to agree with the statement that a top Tougaloo graduate (and the same doubtless holds true for other schools, black and white, whose graduates are afflicted by poor GRE scores) is as likely to do as well in graduate work as a top Harvard graduate.

GRE scores do measure something, I'm sure. Their regional distribution itself indicates as much. I would even grant that the skill (or perhaps the "knowledge") they test is of importance. But GRE scores and tests are most certainly culturally and regionally biased, and any graduate department of sociology which uses them as the primary or even a major entrance criterion ought to be explicitly aware that in doing so it has chosen deliberately to discriminate against students of a certain race, region, social class, and/or nonurban background. It would be more honest for such a department to state openly that it feels that such a background is a handicap and that no persons with such background, unless they be truly superb, need apply.

Dr. James W. Loewen, Chairman
 Social Science Division
 Tougaloo College

URGE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

I am amused and infuriated at the movement afoot to discontinue Affirmative Action Plans at universities, as explained so well in the Barnes article reprinted from *The Washington Post*. Where was all that concern for academic integrity when schools were systematically discriminating against women and minorities? How loudly did those concerned white males yell for equal pay for the few female academicians they allowed to enter the august halls of academe? Did they shed tears over all the highly qualified women who spent their careers as part-time instructors or worse, unemployed because of nepotism rules? More likely they were argu-

ing against giving a woman financial assistance because, after all, she wouldn't use her degree or she had a spouse to support her. They were probably engaged in theory building that ignored half of the human species and concentrating instead on things of interest to males. Those fine Jewish scholars of whom Barnes speaks were turning out mountains of work on discrimination against Jews but as a Jew I saw little of relevance to me; I am, after all, only a female.

Few scholars I know would argue for hiring a woman or a member of a minority if the individual in question was incompetent. It is time we all realized, however, that there are a large number of highly qualified people in those groups. Indeed, there may simply be too many qualified people for the available jobs. If that is the case some must lose out and a sense of history, decency and responsibility to students should tell us that when some must lose, the some should no longer be female, black or brown. Our female and minority students need role models; our discipline needs a perspective that is broader than white and male (and so, undoubtedly, do most other fields).

I urge the members of ASA to write HEW, talk to their university administrators, urge their department personnel committees to actively recruit minorities and females. I further urge the ASA and its officers to go on public record supporting Affirmative Action Plans in principle and practice. It is fine to be a civil libertarian when the consequences will probably not touch you. All you liberal scholars who decry discrimination need to be consistent now when it's the office next door in question, no longer the job on the assembly line or the house in somebody else's neighborhood.

Janet Saltzman Chafetz
 University of Houston

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION MUST CONTINUE

It is not surprising to learn from your issue of May 1973 that "male faculty members" have protested efforts of affirmative action plans to eliminate systematic discrimination against women and non-White ethnic minorities in faculty appointments. White males have resisted liberation and equalization of the status of these groups for a very long time.

What was really shocking—indeed, an outrage—was the news that protests have been received "particularly from Jewish organizations." Such a development makes me deeply regret the many years of my life that I have spent opposing anti-Semitism in every context. I thought I was fighting for human rights, but apparently I was only working for the rights of Jewish males.

Having themselves once been discriminated against, one would think they would now be willing to share their hard-earned rights with others who still suffer the same lot. But no, that is evidently not the way sexual politics or racial politics works. Some of these men are perhaps the same "campus liberals" who declared themselves for Black civil rights—as long as they weren't actually implemented, especially by encroachment on "our" territory. How is this position distinguished from "rights of Whites" groups? Academics, it turns out, are not so different from hard hats, after all.

The implication of these complaints is that university scholarly standards will be lowered unless White, male (and apparently, Jewish), faculty are in charge of learning. Of course: women and Blacks are notoriously inferior! Such reactions to the struggle for human liberation are not new to history; the same kind of turncoats are still around to become reactionaries after their rights have been won.

Affirmative action programs must continue with vigorous enforcement until all remaining discriminatory wrongs have been righted, including salary differentials. Only then can we abandon preferential hiring and upgrading quotas.

Meanwhile, I say "shame" to Jews who support continued discrimination against groups who are struggling for the same recognition they once sought.

Marjorie C. Kelley
 Spencer, North Carolina

NEED FOR DATA

The article reprinted from *The Washington Post* in the May issue of FOOTNOTES makes me feel uncomfortable because it is misleading. The heading ("Reverse Bias Alleged in College Hiring") leaves the reader with the impression that reverse bias is a genuine issue, that is, that such bias can be empirically demonstrated. I suppose that anyone can "allege" anything whatsoever, and that the allegation can then be reported as a fact. Yet it seems to me that the fact of reverse See LETTERS, p. 8

LETTERS, cont. from p. 7

bias in sociology ought to be established before the issue is legitimized by appearing in FOOTNOTES.

The fact that the article comes to no conclusion only increases my uneasiness, for rational refutation of vague charges is quite difficult.

It would be fruitful to encourage persons interested in the "issue" of reverse bias to present data documenting the disproportionate hiring of "unqualified" women on university and college faculties. The first step is to establish that the proportion of women in faculty ranks is increasing. (Here at Illinois, the proportion decreased from 1971 to 1972.) The second step is to establish that the proportion of "unqualified" women who are hired exceeds the proportion of "unqualified" men. What is often overlooked is the hidden assumption that the adjective "unqualified" applies only to women. In short, what is needed at this juncture is data, not deductive speculation.

Joan Huber, President, SWS
University of Illinois, Urbana

LETTER TO SKEWED ASSOCIATION

FOOTNOTES' recent discussion on "affirmative action" has prompted this letter to the editor.

There is an old story of the man who goes to heaven as a visitor and upon his return is met by anxious reporters. "Did you meet God?", is the question that roars up from the crowd waiting nervously to record every word. "Yes", comes back the answer in a timid voice. "I met with God." "What did he say, what did he say", is heard from the faceless voices milling around. Suddenly, a silence fills the air as the timid man on the stage raises his bent head to answer this most important question. "God is not a he; She is Black."

This revelation may be anxiously sought today by many chair-persons of departments of sociology who hire faculty on the basis of sex and race and eliminate the need for other preexisting measures of excellence. Perhaps it is befitting that a renewed interest in the Hitler era has accompanied the cries of "affirmative action" into the hallowed halls of academia. Once again it would seem that under the guise of new quota systems the anti-semites have successfully denied the Jews access to the universities and allowed the Kapos to be their instruments.

These Kapos, who now wear the respected cloth of the professional rather than the dirty uniform of the guard, still stand and mumble some inaudible sounds that only the Jew can understand after hearing it for thousands of years. With shoulders shrugged and hands upturned the words, "what can I do" accompany the closing door.

It is not unusual that the world's niggers for over three thousand years are again exposed to a thinly-disguised form of anti-semitism, nor is it difficult to understand the desire of the oppressed to imitate their oppressors. What easier form of imitation than to discriminate against the scapegoat that has always been easily found in the pages of history and the simple mind of the bigot.

What is somewhat disconcerting is the number of Jews who have apparently joined the ranks of the Kapos, and especially the Jewish woman who feels the pangs of servitude and through reverse discrimination feels that she can break out into what she considers to be a world of freedom. It does seem strange to this writer that the Jewish wife who suffered in the sweat-shop to support her family did not become the anti-semitic that it would appear the more affluent Jewish female intellectuals are now becoming.

I fully realize that this letter may cause me denial to the academic career I desire. I have put my career on the line, I wonder if the ASA will have the guts to publish this letter. If the ASA finds that it cannot print this letter then I would like to resign my membership in this skewed association.

Marshall I. Farkas
Office of Drug Abuse
Georgia Department of Human Resources

CWSW PROTEST

The Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology wishes to register a protest concerning the publication of the article entitled "Reverse Bias Charged in College Hiring," on page 4 of the May 1973 FOOTNOTES.

We believe that this article is designed to give the impression that affirmative action is discriminatory. Although there are a few weak statements to the contrary, they do not alter the pernicious main thrust of the article.

The Committee does not have any objection to scholarly discussions or presentations

of points of view, pro or con, on this vital issue. However, we feel that there is no place in FOOTNOTES for the gratuitous insertion of inflammatory material of this type.

The Committee requests that the attached statement by Bernice Sandler, which appeared in the Feb. 5, 1973 issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, be published along with this letter in the next issue of FOOTNOTES. (Editor's Note: The Sandler statement is reprinted in this issue.)

Corag Bagley Marrett, Chairperson
Rose Laub Coser
Karen O. Mason
Shirley Nuss
Murray A. Straus
James Sweet
Lenore J. Weitzman

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION REVISITED

Professor Hill's reaction (FOOTNOTES, May, 1973) to my position regarding letters of recommendation (FOOTNOTES, April, 1973) requires a response on two accounts. First, it suggests that my view encourages writing undeserved letters of recommendation and hence is obviously untenable. This is not so. Second, the position which he takes encourages sociologists to ignore what should be the rights of those subject to evaluation in favor of the needs of evaluating agencies. This is unfortunate and unnecessary.

It is undoubtedly true, as Professor Hill points out, that each year we receive so large a number of letters containing such enthusiastic praise that certain questions come to mind. This, however, is not the result of subscribing to a view of the sort which I outlined. It is probably the result of a general unwillingness to deny requests for letters of recommendation in face-to-face situations. This behavior is indeed unfortunate for, as Professor Hill correctly indicates, it can result in the placement of persons in positions for which they are not qualified, resulting in prolonged punishment for all involved. However, I explicitly argued that we should perform gatekeeping functions when they prove necessary, but that we should do so before we agree to write any letters. On appropriate occasions we should be willing to accept the personal costs involved in denying requests for letters of recommendation for the ultimate good of the applicant and of the profession.

Professor Hill is concerned about the needs of evaluating agencies. I am too. But I am also concerned about the rights of those being evaluated—specifically, the right to be dealt with honestly and openly. Apparently he is not. I wonder what Hill thinks about credit bureaus and about government security checks. A candidate should be clearly informed of the general thrust of the letter which a prospective reference whom he has selected would write about him. Otherwise he can be seriously misled. This frequently happens.

The system of evaluation which Professor Hill supports rewards those who are perceptive enough to know, or lucky enough to guess who are their supporters and who are their detractors. Until I can be certain that Professor Hill never misleads students who come to him for letters of recommendation, I must disregard any letter I receive from him evaluating a candidate.

Philo C. Wasburn
Purdue University

LETTERS CONTROVERSY

Regarding the Wasburn v. Hill controversy over "letters of recommendation" v. "letters of evaluation." (ASA FOOTNOTES, April 1973 and May 1973) it seems to me the professors fail to recognize the different origins of the requests for evaluative comments of a student seeking employment or entry to a graduate school.

When a student approaches a professor for a "letter of recommendation," it is safe to assume he singled out a professor who is familiar with his work and who has given him some sign of being favorably impressed, usually in the form of a grade. Only a masochist (or poor judge of character) would ask a professor who had failed him in a class to write a letter of recommendation to a prospective employer. I would hope (and this is Wasburn's suggestion) that a professor who finds himself unable to say positive things would so inform the student so that the student can request a letter of recommendation from another professor, and in the process correct his understanding of the first professor's evaluative abilities.

On the other hand, Hill is referring to inquiries from prospective employers who are specifically asking for an evaluation and rating of a student in relation to others. Hill does not appear to be aware of the amount

The Academic Woman . . .

Male vs. Female: A Bread-and-Butter Issue*

By Bernice Sandler

Some academic administrators have been raising the cry of "academic freedom" as the federal government enforces anti-discrimination laws on the campus. They claim that the government is "forcing" them to give preference to "unqualified" women and minorities.

In one sense, the term "academic freedom" has become a smoke screen to obscure the basic issues. Women's groups claim that it is analogous to the cry of "state's rights" and "quality education."

Traditionally, academic freedom has meant such things as the right of individuals to publish, to teach, to work with controversial ideas. There is no academic freedom that exempts members of the college and university community from observing the same anti-discrimination laws that the rest of society must observe.

How does it violate academic freedom to ask an end to the preferences that always existed in higher education: the preference for males, the preference for whites, the preference for the children of the rich, the preference for the members of the "old boy" club?

No one is worried about the academic freedom of women faculty and staff members who have struggled against the injustices of sex discrimination on the campus and who have suffered harassment, including the loss of their jobs, as a result of their activities.

Male administrators and faculty members are upset because they have generally relied on the "old boy" method of recruiting, the vast informal network of old school chums, colleagues, drinking buddies, and people you meet at conventions—an informal network to which women and minorities rarely have access. The merit system has always been a closed system, because large portions of the available and qualified pool have been excluded. The government is not asking that the merit system be abolished, but only that it be opened up to a large pool of qualified persons.

To recruit in a different manner means change, and change is never easy—particularly if it means that women and minorities, including minority women, are coming in to threaten the power base.

Now Asked to Explain Why

Traditionally, employers in academia have never had to specify criteria for hiring and promotion. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is now asking them to explain why Mr. X is a full professor and Ms. Y is a lecturer, particularly when Mr. X hasn't published since he rewrote his thesis and is a terror to the students, while Ms. Y is continually awarded the best-teacher award and has a string of publications that exceeds that of most men in her department.

The government, incidentally, will not set criteria for hiring and promotion. Rightfully, the institution and department heads do this.

What HEW does ask is why someone was hired or not hired, and what the specific criteria were. If you have never had to justify a hiring or promotion decision, this is a very threatening thing to be asked. On the other hand, if an administrator cannot justify a hiring or promotion decision, then either someone is in the wrong job or getting the wrong salary, or else you have a very poor administrator.

A 'Good Faith' Effort

There is no intention whatsoever to force university and college employers to hire less-qualified women or minorities. (Note the covert assumption that somehow women and minorities are not "qualified"—no one every talks about a "qualified man," only about "qualified women" and "qualified minorities.") The employer must make a "good faith" effort to recruit women and minorities, and document what was done. If, after that effort, the best-qualified candidate turns out to be white and male, then that is who is hired.

If, to get HEW off their backs, institutions hire women and minorities who are not qualified, then they have misunderstood what is required of them. It is true and tragic that some HEW personnel themselves have been misinformed as to what the federal policy is, particularly concerning numerical goals. Any institution that is forced to hire unqualified personnel ought to fight, for that is not government policy and is contrary to the law of the land.

If institutions give preference to less-qualified women and minorities over better-qualified white males, then such institutions are violating the very laws and regulations they are seeking to observe. There is a distinction between affirmative action and preference, the latter being a clear violation of Executive Order 11246, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, and the 14th Amendment.

What is at stake is not the hiring of less-qualified persons, but a very real economic threat. For every woman or minority person who is hired, one less white male is hired. There is no way around it. If more women are paid fairly, some men will get raises more slowly or perhaps not at all. White men will have to compete with women and minorities for the decreasing number of jobs in the academic community. It is difficult to maintain a commitment to equality when one's own bread and butter is at stake.

*Reprinted, by permission from *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 5, 1973.

of subjectivity involved in such "letters of evaluation." If he were interested in providing the employer with a more objective judgment about the student, the professor who felt unable to write positive comments (or whose negative comments outweighed the positive ones) might pass the request along to other professors who are familiar with the student, or at least canvass others and cite their favorable impressions.

Even the request by prospective employers for such letters of evaluation raises other ethical questions. How does the employer's inquiry happen to arrive at an evaluator's desk? If the professor's name was given by the student as a reference, I suggest the same considerations apply as in my above comments on letters of recommendation. If, however, the inquiry is directed to the professor because of his role, such as chairman of the department, I suggest my comments in reference to letters of evaluation ought to apply. Another option that might be considered by the professor would be to reply to the prospective employer that any evaluative judgments about the student should be based on the student's official college transcript and any letters of recommendation that are requested from the student.

Perhaps the basic issue here is whether professors view themselves and their roles as infallible judges of people's abilities and characters, or as persons who can assist students to enter a tight job market. The "gatekeeper role" referred to by Professor Wasburn may be one factor influencing the professor's letter-writing, but the circumstances and occasions when he performs this function should be governed by explicit and more

objective considerations than Hill's letter suggests.

Hill appears to be more concerned with reducing the volume of letters he has to read or write, and in increasing his self-importance as gatekeeper and inside-dopester. My characterization of him in this way is probably unfair when my evaluation of him is based only on his letter, but I believe it fits other professors whom I met when I was a student. That professors have this power over students is unfortunate since a climate of intimidation may be fostered. In a milieu where persons should be encouraged to be imaginative, disagreeable, and nonconforming, they are instead repaid for their friendliness and mimicking of their professors who assume the functions of personnel managers. I wonder if Hill would make his views known to his students whether they will bother him with any requests for letters of recommendation.

James Boudouris
Columbia University
School of Social Work

OPEN FORUM, cont. from p. 4

I think your second paragraph is simply incorrect. Certainly it is too sweeping. I think I would rephrase it to say something like the following:

In order for an article to be published in most sociology journals, it must either be tied through an existing body of theory and research, or report the results of a reasonably methodologically sophisticated verificational study, or it must make an advance over existing theoretical or methodological states of the art. New journals on methodology, mathematical sociology, health and social behavior, public policy, etc. reflect both increasing specialization in established fields of sociology and increasing concern with new areas of interest. These promise both to broaden the base of sociological knowledge and to extend its store of specialized knowledge. Increasingly, these special and new interests in sociology appear also in sessions at professional meetings.

The reference to professional meetings has a very specific meaning for those of us here on the West Coast. When the program for this spring's meetings of the Pacific Sociological Association was announced, it was so "untraditional" that many sociologists who practice within established fields felt they had been left out. PSA President Gertrude Selznick took steps to correct this imbalance. The point is that program committees and other officers of professional associations are constantly on the outlook for new ideas and for people who can give voice to these ideas. Thus, recent innovations in ASA meetings, as represented by the roundtable luncheons, seminar sessions, and untitled sessions for contributed papers represent bonafide attempts to broaden the base of sociology as well as the base of participation in our professional activities.

I think the problem of research funding in nonestablished areas is a more serious one, though the federal government now seems willing to fund on a large scale some areas in which we have very limited expertise, particularly those having to do with evaluation research and public policy related matters on a broad scale. Additionally, those who specialize in newly developing areas generally find ways of discovering each other and of communicating with each other. Indeed, the formal channels of communication, the professional journals, customarily lag behind these informal channels of communicating the most advanced knowledge and techniques of investigation. These informal networks, if a field proves viable, characteristically expand and become more established as fields within the discipline.

I am not adverse, incidentally, to receiving the most esoteric paper for possible publication in ASR. I am concerned that, since ASR is the field's most general journal, the articles we publish should be of reasonably general interest to the field. I do not feel that ASR should be the repository of the most specialized developments in the field, though I like to think that our articles are on the cutting edge of main line developments in sociology.

One of our problems of evaluation of articles in new fields has to do with choosing proper judges for such articles. We try very hard to select the best persons known to us in any field to evaluate papers in that field. If papers are so specialized, or so esoteric, that no one can review them, editorial options are considerably reduced. I don't recall any recently submitted articles on griping and bitching, obscene symbols and gestures, but we have received articles on language, the life cycle, leisure, and we expect to publish some of them. If and when we receive articles in the other areas you mentioned, we will be happy to give them proper review, and in the

process hope to be helpful to the scholars who submit them to us.

Yours for pluralism in sociology.

James F. Short, Jr.

Washington State University

Editor of Sociometry Responds

Professor Atchley may have legitimate grounds for complaint. The "innovator" may not be easy to recognize and it may be that such a scholar's work poses difficulties for those asked to make evaluations. I am genuinely concerned about the issue, but there are certain limitations on the mechanisms that an editor has at his command.

Let me consider some of the specific charges that Atchley levels at those of us who have some responsibility over "current procedures for professional communication." Atchley claims that "editorial boards of journals... are made up of people who have achieved recognition for their performance in established fields and who, therefore, have a stake in the existing hierarchy of specialties within the discipline." Sociometry's board certainly contains a number of members who are recognized scholars. I have attempted to balance the board with the new blood of younger scholars who have demonstrated their competence but have not yet achieved international reputations. Thus, the current Editorial Board includes members who completed their degrees in 1969, 1970 and 1973.

Such a procedure does not put Atchley's charge to rest. The less "established" members of the board are there because I have extreme confidence in their competence. Certainly the possibility exists that my biased conception of the field is reflected in the selection process. Let us look at the charge of possible bias more carefully.

I find it difficult to discern a party line that characterizes the work of the reviewers and board of Sociometry. These persons are drawn from the disciplines of both sociology and psychology with an occasional anthropologist and political scientist thrown in to add spice. I do not find a methodological orthodoxy that can encompass, for example, the advocates of participant observation like Professor George McCall and the experimentalists like Professor Robert Leik. (It may be of some historical interest to note that McCall and Leik have been the reviewers of the same article and have rendered identical evaluations.) It also is difficult for me to describe a common theoretical perspective under which we could comfortably place the interests of such scholars as G.N. Alexander, E.Q. Campbell, Melvin DeFleur, Benton Johnson, Milton Rokeach, R.A. Sommer, Fred Strodtbeck, H.C. Triandis and W.E. Vinacke. The point I am attempting to establish is that the board and ad hoc reviewers of Sociometry are an eclectic bunch both in terms of theoretical perspectives and methodological orientations. I believe that it is essential to maintain such eclecticism partly to increase the probability of recognizing provocative innovation. This, too, is no absolute guarantee, but it is an honest attempt to address the issue.

What of the content of Sociometry? Recent articles have been devoted to personal space, gambling, sexual differences in role perceptions, homosexuality, and the relevances of Heider to Levi-Strauss. If such substantive variation reflects only established traditions in social psychology then I will eat my five volumes of the *Handbook*. We have, then, a large group of reviewers who are diverse in terms of age, experience, professional status, and intellectual persuasion. Their evaluations and advice have resulted in a journal which is substantively heterogeneous. Again, I believe that the maintenance of such a review panel does enhance the probability of recognizing the importance of new areas of inquiry.

As an extension of his argument, Professor Atchley charges that some arti-

SUPPORT AND PROMOTE AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAMS

By official action at the June meeting of Council, the ASA went on record concerning its desire to have members support and promote affirmative action programs. The following motion was passed by unanimous vote of Council:

"In order to overcome the consequences of discrimination against women and minorities in employment, the American Sociological Association recommends that its members support and promote affirmative action programs with their departments, colleges, universities and other agencies and institutions, both public and private."

CAPITOL GAINS

National associations are still moving to Washington, D.C., according to the 1973 edition of NATIONAL TRADE & PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF THE U.S., Columbia Books, Inc.

In the past year, Washington gained 2% of the national associations—1% from Chicago and 1% from New York—so Washington now has 24% of the total, up from 20% two years ago.

New York still has the most association headquarters of any major city, however, with 26% of the latest count (N = 4,700). Chicago has 16% and "elsewhere" is holding steady at 34%.

cles are rejected because they are judged to be "impressionistic" or "merely descriptive." He is correct. I am not sure how this prevents the advance of inquiry into new areas of significance. Freud was more than impressionistic. Marx was more than merely descriptive. To be more current, Rokeach does more than measure and Goffman does more than convey impressions. If in 1973, an article is only "impressionistic" or "descriptive," then I find it difficult to believe that it also will constitute a significant innovation.

I do grant that one scholar's innovation may be another's impressionism. In order to guard against parochialism, I frequently send articles to reviewers whose interests are not central to those of the author. In such circumstances, I am careful to send the same article to a second reader who is doing work in a closely related area. I do pay attention to reviewers who say, "This is not really my bag, but I found this paper provocative." (A quote from a reviewer of a paper which will be published in the December issue of *Sociometry*.)

Again all of the above may not reassure Professor Atchley. Thus, let me suggest an experiment. I invite him to collect a set of 20 papers in the broad area of social psychology. These should be papers which he judges to be either (a) sound criticisms or (b) perceptive innovations but which are unpublished. I ask that he do the following things. First, he should select two reviewers for each paper. I will let him determine the qualifications of those reviewers, but I ask that he describe the basis for his selection. Second, I ask that he send the set of papers to me. I shall perform a similar task. Third, I will send him a set of 20 papers actually submitted to *Sociometry*, which he should assign to the same group of reviewers. Again I will replicate the procedures. We will use a common evaluation form. In all cases, the reviewers should be "blind" with respect to which papers are members of which set. Finally, I ask Professor Atchley to join me in analyzing and reporting the results. Such an experiment can have nothing but positive outcomes, perhaps the best of which could be the discovery of 20 papers which I would be happy to have published in *Sociometry*.

Richard J. Hill
Editor, *Sociometry*

Minorities & Women

People

Charles U. Smith, Chairman at Florida A&M University, is President-elect of the Southern Sociological Society and first Vice-President of the Association of Social and Behavioral Scientists (who presented him with the W. E. B. DuBois Award). Dr. Smith has also received the highest honorary award granted by the university.

Dawn Day Wachtel is joining the faculty at Brooklyn College and will continue consulting on a project funded by the Ford Foundation on life styles and energy at the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies.

Cora B. Marrett, Western Michigan University, will be a Resident Fellow in the Science Assembly of Social and Behavioral Sciences, National Academy of Sciences for the academic year 1973-74.

Pamela Roby, University of California, Santa Cruz, has received a grant from the Russell Sage Foundation for a study of the impact of government, company, and union policies on women employed in working class jobs and in turn on their families.

Nancy E. Williamson, Department of Sociology, Brown University, has been selected as Co-ordinator of the Women's Caucus of the Population Association of America.

Rann

Gladys Handy is one of three sociologists in the Research Applications Directorate which administers the program Research Applied to National Needs (RANN), National Science Foundation. Located in the Office of Exploratory Research and Problem Assessment, she works principally to involve minority scientists from a variety of disciplines in developing projects related to the problems of blacks, native Americans, and people of Spanish heritage. Handy is also responsible for developing studies of the problems of women, youth, and the family. Arlene Daniels, Scientific Analysis Corporation, San Francisco, has received a grant from this office dealing with the research needs and priorities related to women and policy issues. Also in this office Phyllis Wallace, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is doing a problem definition study in the area of equal employment opportunities for women and minorities.

Standards

A report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education states that criteria for employment in higher education do include subtle judgments about how much a person will contribute to balance in a department in terms of age, field, methodology, point of view, and interest or lack of interest in students, as well as traditional standards of academic performance. The commission would extend the principle of balance to race and sex as well, provided the basic standard of academic competence is met.

Admissions

U.S. Office for Civil Rights has notified graduate and professional schools and some public undergraduate institutions that they must apply non-discriminatory admissions policies beginning June 24, 1973.

Programs

The Department of Sociology, University of Colorado, Boulder, has a goal that at least 40% of new graduate students admitted be qualified Blacks, Chicanos, and Native Americans. They will provide financial aid and academic support.

Columbia University Teacher's College and Education Testing Service has established an Institute for Minority and Urban Education.

Grants

NSF has announced the following awards to predominantly black institutions to develop sociology or social science along with other science fields: Lincoln University, \$228,100; Coppin State College, Baltimore, \$228,900; and Tennessee State University, \$244,500.

SSRC has announced a new program of grants to enable scholars from minority groups to undertake research on relations between racism or other social factors and mental health. Applicants should have earned the PhD degree in social or behavioral science. Awards ranging up to \$10,000 for part-time maintenance in lieu of salary for up to 12 months, and modest amounts for technical assistance, will be made. October 1 deadline. Address inquiries to: SSRC, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017.

Obituaries

HENRY ALLEN BULLOCK 1906-1973

Professor Henry Allen Bullock, the first black professor appointed to the faculty of Arts and Sciences at the University of Texas at Austin, died in Houston, Texas, February 8, 1973.

He was born in Tarboro, North Carolina, May 2, 1906, and attended the public schools in that state. Professor Bullock received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Social Sciences and Latin Classics from Virginia Union University, Richmond, Virginia in 1928; a Master of Arts degree in Sociology and Comparative Psychology from the University of Michigan in 1929; and a Ph.D. in sociology from the University of Michigan in 1942.

His long career in the academic profession included service as a teacher at North Carolina A & L College, 1929-30; Prairie View A & M College, 1930-49, where he served as head of the Department of Sociology; Dillard University, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1949-50, head of the Department of Sociology and Chairman of the Division of Social Sciences; Texas Southern University, Houston, Texas, 1950-64, director of Graduate Research, head of the Sociology Department and Chairman of the Division of Social Sciences.

Professor Bullock's former students describe him as an outstanding educator, a noted sociologist, a prolific writer and researcher, and a master teacher. His dedication to educational pursuits began in the early 1930's when he organized a series of educational conferences in the South which were designed to train black teachers and administrators in effective and more innovative teaching techniques. Discussions and findings from these conferences pointed to basic inequities in the educational experiences of black Americans. His search for facts on education and employment culminated in the publication of "A Comparison of the Academic Achievements of White and Negro College Graduates," published by the *Journal of Educational Research* in 1950; and "Racial Attitudes and the Employment of Negroes" in the *American Journal of Sociology*, 1951.

The transition in America from a rural-oriented society to an urbanized society, and the impact of this trend on race relations was clearly evident in Dr. Bullock's "Urbanism and Race Relations," in Vance and Demerath, *The Urban South*, (1954). In this article he predicted that there would be the "harnessing and organizing of new political power by blacks in the South." He was also very concerned about the spiraling crime rates in cities among juveniles and adults. "Urban Homicide in Theory and Fact," published by the *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science* in 1955, explored the physical determinants of criminal behavior. In his examination of crime rates, he took the theoretical position that "certain physical conditions provide the habitat for human life and consequently may facilitate or impede contacts among human beings and perhaps in that sense be related to opportunities for criminal behavior." Professor Bullock discussed this "Association Theory" at the International Congress of Criminology in London, England in 1955. His further interest in crime is shown through such works as the study, "Significance of the Racial Factor in the Length of Prison Sentences," *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science* (1961), and "The Houston Murder Problem: Its Nature, Apparent Causes, and Probable Cures," a special study for the Mayor's office, 1961. In these studies, he suggested that the racial factor was a key influence in determining official reaction to crimes committed by blacks and other minorities; that this factor is a variable in the assessment of the length of prison sentences. Bullock found that juries give black persons convicted of murder shorter sentences than whites, but blacks receive longer sentences for burglary than whites. Murder by blacks tends to be an intraracial crime, while burglary by blacks is mainly inter-racial. These sociological and criminal studies contributed to his being selected as "outstanding College Professor in Texas" by the Minnie S. Piper Foundation in 1961.

Consumer motivational research was another area of interest for Professor Bullock. In 1957, he published *Pathways to the Houston Negro Market* (Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, Inc.), which called attention to his fellow blacks' earning power and buying habits and how, if this power were channeled, blacks could eventually approach economic parity with their fellow white Americans. "Consumer Motivations in Black and

White," published by the *Harvard Business Review*, underscored certain marketing orientations of black and white consumers and suggested that integrated advertising was a more feasible public relations technique for reaching consumers.

Research in human ecology also engaged Dr. Bullock. His early study of the influence of black migration to Detroit upon black family stability preceded a later one which examine the interrelation of ecological and social areas in a rural village. And, in 1943, he extended his interest in human ecology through an examination of the "Spatial Aspects of the Differential Birthrate," which appeared in *The American Journal of Sociology*.

Dr. Bullock's career as a teacher and researcher spanned more than forty years. Students of all races were motivated by his theories and experimental teaching techniques including a twelve-part film series he produced to show how human personality was shaped throughout the world. The films, demonstrating the impact of acculturation on the personality, received second place in world competition presented by the Institute for Education by Radio-Television. Continuing his interest in the communications media as a technique for research and teaching, he completed an exploratory study on the attitudes of young children toward the television series, "Discovery '63." Findings from these researches are still being used in Social Psychology classes in colleges and universities throughout this country and Africa.

Professor Bullock pursued the "Strategy of Truth" in his contribution to the struggle for civil rights in America. His book, *The History of Negro Education in the South*, (Harvard University Press, 1967), traced the evolution of black education in light of the Southern experience and set forth theories related to the black's struggle for complete emancipation in American Society. His fundamental contention fell short of a purely Rousseauistic theme through his insistence that the black education, by design, was geared toward maintaining the status quo. However, the black college developed the very leadership which eventually challenged the segregated system in American Society. It was his contention that the kind of aggressive leadership which emerged was the "unintended" force in the evolution of black education. His book won the Bancroft Award in 1968.

He shared a faith in the belief that the black college must continue to develop the leadership needed for his people and this nation; that the development of this leadership would provide the necessary legitimacy to the struggle for equality. He rejected the notion that the functions of black colleges should be dominated by a WASP-oriented philosophy. In his article, "The Black College and New Black Awareness," he advanced what may very well be unpopular with many educators. An illustrative model of his central position described the dynamics of the historical process which gave rise to "institutional discontinuity" among black colleges. The model acknowledges failures to actualize the American assimilation ideal and points to blockages to realization by virtue of American racism. He further states that "the disappointment of black people resulting from this blockage has created a new set of aspirations and, therefore, requires a new kind of institutional arrangement." His thesis reflects the "Melting Pot" apparatus and embraces the concept of cultural pluralism. His views accent rather than weaken the need for the continued existence of the black college, and introduced the idea of "cultural context" teaching as a needed ingredient in the general education program.

Dr. Bullock accepted a position at the University of Texas at Austin in the Spring of 1969. He served that institution as a professor in history and sociology and remained at the university until his retirement in 1971. In the course of these duties, he taught the first course offered by the History Department on the Negro in American history. He devised the first Black Studies Summer Institute for High School Teachers in the Summer of 1969 and he was the architect and designer of the University of Texas Ethnic Studies Program. A resolution by the University of Texas Faculty contained these words of tribute: "In addition to providing crucial services to the University of Texas, the community, the state and nation at a time of great turmoil and change, Henry Allen Bullock also stood among the very highest ranks of scholars and teachers in his generation. Throughout his long and useful career (he) never seemed to occupy the mythical ivory tower of academe. He had so much useful work to do it would never have occurred to him that such refuge was relevant to his life. . . . Students of all races will benefit from his scholarly endeavors. Graduates from colleges and

universities throughout America voiced similar tributes to this great black American. His ability to teach others; to research facts and conceptualize new theories; and the inspiration he gave to students and fellow colleagues were his noblest virtues.

Naomi W. Lede
Texas Southern University

SHERWOOD DEAN FOX 1917-1971

Sherwood D. Fox died of a heart attack at his home in Schenectady, New York, on February 24, 1971.

Born on October 17, 1917, in Canton, Massachusetts, Sherwood Fox attended the Boston Latin School. His classical, rational, almost eighteenth-century modes of thought, address, and action took from this the course they never left. He maintained his Latin, and even his Greek, throughout his life, and was to write on the sociology of art and the relation of sociology to the liberal arts. His early training was also no doubt the source of that limpid, flowing, yet clear and concise expository prose, so well shown in all his publications and manuscripts, and in his superb editing and evaluation of manuscripts and papers for publishers, colleagues, and students.

Fox began his career in sociology early in his undergraduate years at Harvard. In the then-new Department of Social Relations, he held undergraduate fellowships under Talcott Parsons and Robert Merton; he graduated cum laude, with membership in the sociological honor society, Alpha Kappa Delta.

He then followed Florian Znaniecki to the University of Illinois, to be his research assistant in the project on social roles. Dr. Fox earned his first Master's degree from Znaniecki and Hans Gerth with a thesis on *Charisma, Anomie, and Social Structure* (University of Illinois, unpublished dissertation, 1941), on the social context of the relation between anomie and charismatic leadership. Fox thereafter went on to the University of Wisconsin as University Fellow, working with Gerth and Howard S. Becker. But the Second World War put an end to this; with many another fellow-student and future sociologist, he was drafted into that graduate students' haven, the Weather Service of the United States Army. He married Marcia Seidenbond and went off to serve three years in England. While there, he wrote up an analysis of a United States Air Force fighter plane station (*What Next?*, Wormingford, 1944). Like many intelligent G.I.'s, he went to meet the more famous sociologists at the University of London, and stayed with friends at Cambridge.

Returning at last to Harvard, he became a teaching fellow and tutor, studied with Pitirim Sorokin, worked under George Homans, and served as an assistant to Parsons. He and his wife contributed the index to Parsons' and L.J. Henderson's translation of Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 1947), and he did research on class and ethnic factors in associational membership in Cambridge, Massachusetts. He soon had a second Master's degree in sociology.

Under Parsons' tutelage, he turned to his doctoral dissertation on *Voluntary Associations and Social Structure* (Harvard University, unpublished, 1952). This is an analysis of the differential functions served by 5000 national associations in the United States. It was set in a structural framework that contrasted their functional significance for each other and for larger social systems. This approach he took from Parsons, and it gave all his subsequent work a firm but fixed quality in both approach and style. But as in all his sociology, this was an analysis "of the middle range". With it, he received his doctorate in 1953.

With his concern with voluntary associations and the application of sociological theory to social problems and policy, it was inevitable that Dr. Fox would become deeply involved with policy research, and with such private voluntary organizations. He was an officer, committee chairman, and organizer of panels and conferences in the Society for the Study of Social Problems and the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. He assisted such other organizations as the New York Public Health Association in setting up conferences, training sessions, and research on diverse topics. These included polio vaccination, cardiac research, nursing education, mental health, crime and delinquency, child welfare, social science, education in high schools, aging, and the position of professionals in social research. He also served as consultant to several organizations for social research, including the Society for Applied Anthropology and the Clearinghouse for Research in Human Organization.

Fox was keenly aware of black Americans' contribution to the American scene, and their continuing struggle to be recognized for this. Long before it was fashionable, he organized an Afro-American exhibition for the Capital District in New York. He advised the N.A.A.C.P. and the Schenectady County Human Relations Committee. He was a member of the board of the local Committee for Equal Opportunity in Housing, and subsequently conducted joint research on minority (essentially Negro) housing and housing needs and desires in Schenectady. This was followed by a detailed survey of Negro employment in the city, not finished at the time of his death. Most recently, Dr. Fox had served as consultant to the research program on community action and industry in the Bedford-Stuyvesant section in New York City.

But it will be above all through his students that Sherwood Fox will be remembered. He was a thorough professional at that, too; he brought to teaching his high standards of performance for himself and others, his broad knowledge, and the twinkle in his eye as he probed some fond belief. The clarity and grace of his presentations of the fundamentals of sociology (which his editor persuaded him to work into an excellent manuscript), and his critical encouragement of original ideas and research, is a constant refrain in the comments of his former students.

Dr. Fox always remained closest to the great French traditions of reason and humanity. As the translator and editor of Durkheim's *Education and Sociology* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1956), he wrote:

"Several characteristics of French sociology . . . apply also to Durkheim himself. . . . It is not accidental that Durkheim was interested in moral conclusions, that he wanted his work to have practical results. But he very carefully distinguished between scientific analysis and the application of the findings of science.

This was the essence of Fox's own sociology, and he thus joined himself to the approach to social analysis which lies beyond positivism. He committed himself to a sociology concerned with the emerging and pressing issues of contemporary society. While preserving the apparently cool, ironic detachment of the analyst, he assayed the social definition of these problems, their probable causes and consequences, and their proposed solutions. Sherwood Fox's social concerns and his work clearly bear this out.

Dr. Fox with his family had only recently returned from a productive and satisfying year's revisit to the Sociological Institut of the University of Copenhagen. For the second time he led graduate seminars at the University as well, at the invitation of his friend, Dr. Kaare Svalastoga. While there he also continued his earlier work at the Danish National Institute of Social Research, investigating the relations there and elsewhere between social theory, sociologists, and public policy. This had been the long-term focus of his sociological interests: research, and consulting. He drew on this work in his discussion of the subject at professional meetings in Denmark, Sweden, Paris, and the United States.

He had just prepared for publication a typology and research program to build sociological theory for clarifying the complex relation of sociological analysis to social policy. This dealt with the relationship of social scientists to professional social planning practitioners who are face-to-face with their clientele, to social activists seeking to change the society or some of its institutions, and to those—usually "subjects" but increasingly "clients", of social science—who actually live and suffer in the fields where "social problems" grow. He emphasized the importance of the experience and reactions of these actors as feedback for theory. In addition, Dr. Fox had contributed the first, conceptual chapter to Erik Manniche's *Sociale Problemer—Sociale Afvigelser* (Copenhagen: Fremad, 1971). There he presented functionalist theory for considering sociologically both social problems and proposals for long-term and day-to-day policy solutions.

His concern with problems, policy, and theory grew naturally out of his life-long desire to make the world a more civilized and livable place for us all. He despised cant, bombast, and parochial complacency; in his penetrating, ironic way, he worked to make others live up to their own, and to his, expectations, as his children's and his students' interests and work attest. He quietly supported all workable efforts for peace, liberty, and equal treatment in American and world society.

Malcolm Willison
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute

OFFICIAL REPORTS AND PROCEEDINGS

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT See page 1.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

Most of the items on which the Secretary might comment have appeared, or will appear, in minutes of the Council, or in business meetings of the Association, or in various committee reports. Perhaps a few items, however, should be referred to more specifically in this annual report.

This year, the Council has undertaken more frequent meetings than ever before, in an effort to deal more fully with the many items of business on the agenda while still leaving time for less focused—but in the long run perhaps more important—discussion of basic policy questions. Following the many hours of sessions at the Annual Meeting in New Orleans, the Council met in December, March, and June. It has tried to set aside—not without some lapses—a period during each day of sessions when issues of special concern to the ASA and to sociology as a discipline could be discussed. Such discussions often lead back quickly to specific problems; but the problems are then examined with richer reference to basic principles. One such "open forum," for example, dealt with the pressures being felt by scholars to reveal sources of confidential research information, a problem that seems likely to grow. It is imperative that academic disciplines develop a clear policy on this matter and begin to design ways to implement that policy. It was a short step from this open forum discussion to Council action on specific items.

Another topic of general concern that often comes before the Council relates to the Association's committee structure. We ask a great deal of our committees; they represent a major contribution of our members to the work of the ASA. In the past, only the Committee on Publications and the Committee on the Executive Office and Budget have regularly been allocated funds that permitted them to meet in between the Annual Meetings of the Association. In recent months, however, Council has set aside a small amount of money to support the work of several other committees—mainly to allow them to meet regularly, even if infrequently. Council will be watching the effects of this allocation of funds carefully, hoping and expecting that it represents a wise investment in the work of the Association.

Our total budgetary situation for fiscal 1973 is fairly hopeful. It appears now that we shall end the year with a surplus of a few thousand dollars. This will add slightly to our equity (most of which is in our Executive Office building at 1722 N Street). It should be added, however, that our equity continues to be a small fraction (less than 1/6) of our annual budget, and thus falls well below the margin of safety that an organization of the size and complexity of the ASA probably requires.

By a resounding margin, the membership has adopted a new dues structure, based in some measure on "ability to pay." Income from the increase in dues (for those making over \$20,000) is difficult to predict. Not only are actual incomes of members not known, but one must also try to guess the comparative weight of the "boasting" factor and the "modesty" factor—if I may coin a couple of euphemisms. All those responsible for the budget are hoping for prosperity among the members, with a bit of reinforcement from a touch of boasting.

The ASA continues to be served by the skilled and devoted work of its executive office staff. Although Otto Larsen has been Executive Officer for less than a year, he has a thorough grasp of the many aspects of the Association's work. He is taking the lead with great effectiveness in both program and fiscal activities. One is tempted to name all thirteen of the men and women who keep the office running smoothly, but I will simply thank "Alice Myers and her crew" for their marvelous combination of efficiency and good humor that has become the hallmark of the executive office. Special thanks are due to Maurice Jackson, who will be returning to the academic world in the fall after serving ably for a year and a half as the staff specialist on minority and women's matters. He has not only carried out skillfully the policies set by Council, but has helped to define goals and has worked out procedures that will be of great value to his successors.

J. Milton Yinger
 Secretary

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Overview

An annual report, even one based on ten-months experience, is obliged to convey facts about performance, to post problems, and to suggest directions for future activity. This I will try to do. In the process, I hope the information offered will stimulate reflection on the following general question that continues to trouble organizations such as ours: Must we govern our affairs through a disjointed, incremental, remedial approach, or can we find ways for more coordinated, systematic, and anticipatory effort?

This year the ASA has taken some steps to seek better ways to anticipate needs and serve the interests of both its members and the discipline. This prospect began as more members participated more frequently in the activities of the Association than ever before in its history. The following elements reflect this growth in participation:

- More persons from our total membership roster were eligible to vote than any other time in recent history (56.2% of 14,398 members in all categories; in 1971 the comparable figure was 38.7%).

- A total of 48% of eligible persons cast their vote in our annual election, the highest turnout yet achieved.

- The Annual Meeting in New Orleans involved more sessions (179 as compared to 142 the year before), more papers (515 compared to 429 in 1972), and more participants (949 compared to 790 in 1971) than any other ASA convention. Incidentally, the percentage of persons participating who were members of the ASA increased from 62% in 1971 to 81% in 1972. [Not so incidentally, the percent of participants in the program who are women increased from 10.7% in 1970 to 15.4% in 1972. For 1973, 20% of the participants in New York will be women.]

- Council stepped up its participation by meeting quarterly in 1972-73 for ten full days of deliberation.

- Committee activity has greatly increased. Since the Annual Meeting in New Orleans, the following ASA committees have met in special sessions in Washington: Publications, Executive Office and Budget, War and Peace Studies, International Cooperation and UNESCO, Freedom of Research and Teaching (2 times), Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Sociology, Status of Women in Sociology (2 times), and 1974 Program Committee (New York). In addition, meetings were held with persons who chair the Committee on Employment and the Committee on Undergraduate Education.

This degree of participation naturally stirs activity much of which is reactive to pressures but some of which represents new initiatives and innovations to which many persons have contributed. The columns of FOOTNOTES have reported the details of such action. The following twelve items may be singled out for special note:

- The *American Sociologist* was returned to a quarterly journal format under a new Editor, and FOOTNOTES emerged as the instrument to reflect current activities.

- With support from the Russell Sage Foundation, and the superb editorial work of Helen MacGill Hughes on a report by the CSWS, a 60-page booklet on *The Status of Women in Sociology, 1968-1972* was produced and distributed without charge to all members of the ASA and subscribers to the ASR.

- Concern for undergraduate education began to receive priority attention in the ASA this year. A Section was launched, By-Laws approved, and a professional Newsletter circulated. To strengthen activities in this area, Council allocated \$2,200 for a workshop to plan programs in undergraduate education.

- Under funding from NIMH, the ASA organized a three-day conference of some sixty sociologists where two principle questions were explored: (1) Is policy research a worthy objective for the discipline? and (2) If so, what kinds of changes might be contemplated in the current state of graduate training and professional practice? The proceedings are currently being edited for a volume on "Policy Research and the Challenge to Graduate Training in Sociology."

- Efforts to expand the employment opportunities for sociologists continue to command central concern in the ASA. The office publishes the *Employment Bulletin*, maintains a Talent Bank, collects data and disseminates special rosters on available PhD's, monitors departmental input and output and issues an annual report on employment trends, and distributes data and guidelines

on affirmative action programs. The Employment Committee, under John W. Riley, Jr., is exploring ways to open up non-academic areas of employment for sociologists. The ASA, with support from NIMH, will organize a conference on "The Future Employment of Sociologists" to be held in conjunction with the American Anthropological Association this fall.

- International concerns moved into sharper focus in the ASA. Council increased its support of the International Sociological Association, retitled and reformulated the mandates of the Committee on the Development of World Sociology and the Committee on Sociology of World Conflicts, and allocated \$500 to support the Newsletter of the subcommittee on Liaison With East European Sociologists.

- An annual Samuel A. Stouffer Award was established to give recognition to a work or a series of works which has notably advanced the methodology of sociological research. The award carries a stipend of \$500.

- To encourage efforts to improve the knowledge base of the discipline, a committee has been formed to allocate funds for small study groups to produce working papers on theoretical and methodological issues in sociology including its special areas. Council allocated \$7,000 for the first year's activities.

- Vigorous support for minorities and women in sociology was maintained. Dr. Joan Harris of Howard University has been appointed to replace Dr. Maurice Jackson as Executive Specialist.

- NIMH has approved a grant to the ASA to conduct a minority fellowship program whereby, over several years, at least ten students will enter graduate training in sociology each year with full support to complete work for a PhD.

- To assist members who request the ASA to investigate alleged discrimination such as improper grounds in hiring, salary, or other aspects of employment, the Committee on Freedom of Research and Teaching, chaired by Peter Rossi, is now actively processing cases. The Committee is operating under a budget of \$5,000 for 1973.

- To facilitate storage of journals and other publications, and to improve the mailing services of the ASA, parts of the Executive Office building have been refurbished.

The foregoing material provides an overview of the quickening pace of participation by members in an expanding variety of activities by the ASA. Such activity could not be undertaken without money and without considerable voluntary effort by the membership. Some notes on these and other resources are now in order.

Finances

In sociology, as elsewhere, there are no free lunches. All ASA activities come with a price-tag. As new initiatives arise, or as pressures for projects emerge, available resources force the setting of priorities. Only the gain of new income can relieve that force.

The current financial status of the ASA will be reported in detail elsewhere. Suffice it to note here that at present we are solvent. In 1972 we began the recovery from the recession of 1971 which involved a deficit of over \$75,000. That recovery was sustained in 1973. While we will show a small surplus of income over expenditures this year, we are far from the goal of having the Association's net worth be at least equal to the size of the annual budget. With realistic programming, prudent management, and expert investment skills such as those provided by Martha Rios-Ricagno who joined our staff this year as a most efficient keeper-of-the-books, we can, I believe move steadily toward that goal.

Whether we do or not will depend on a number of variables. A key one is membership renewal. Concerning the payment of dues, some facts may be recalled from our report of "A Decade in Review and a Preview of Dues" (*The American Sociologist*, December, 1972, p. 2). Ten years ago, dues represented 46% of total ASA revenue. In 1972, due accounted for only 36% of total income; at the same time, dues supported 36% of our total expenditures. Thus, it appears that dues buy a "bargain" in today's mix of organizational activities.

With inflation and other forces at work in the economy, there are constant pressures to increase dues or to seek other sources of income to meet new demands for services, the increase in mailing and other costs, and to continue to build the reserves of the ASA. Some changes in the dues structure, and some efforts to seek other sources of reve-

nue, have taken place this year and should be noted.

By overwhelming vote, Members of the ASA approved a revision in the dues structure based on a graduated-income principle. Accordingly, in 1974 the dues billing will ask Members to pay dues on self-reported annual income in accord with the following schedule:

Below \$20,000 annual income, pay \$30
 From \$20,000 to \$30,000, pay \$40
 Over \$30,000, pay \$50

This schedule will only apply to the "Member" category. Dues for Associates will continue at \$20, International Associates at \$12, Student Members at \$15, and Student Associates at \$10.

How Members will respond to this new schedule is not known. The need for their continued support may be seen in the costs of publications, which provide the most direct link for most members to the ASA. Here, the following facts are relevant. In 1972, dues produced \$251,703, or about 36% of total income. At the same time, publications costs were \$319,973, or about 46% of total expenses.

A further fact is that the ASA provides, for dues payment, the most extensive offering of publications made by any social science association. Each year, the payment of dues brings 25 direct mailings including six issues of the *American Sociological Review*, six issues of *Contemporary Sociology*, four issues of *The American Sociologist*, and nine issues of ASA FOOTNOTES. In addition, the Preliminary Program is sent to all members.

The latter item, the mailing of the Preliminary Program, presents a case revealing some aspects of costs worthy of brief note. No one today is satisfied with the postal service. For example, it takes at least three weeks for FOOTNOTES to reach the West Coast after it has been sent from Washington. The same time-gap develops for all of our mailings, and, of course, it is slower yet when mailings to other countries are involved. To overcome the latter effect, special mailing procedures are now used, and the cost is considerably greater. To illustrate, the following represents expenditures for postage involved in sending the Preliminary Programs to all members:

Destination	Number	Unit Cost	Total Cost
Canada & Mexico	744	38c	\$ 287.84
Other Foreign	876	48c	420.48
Domestic	12,392	4.5c	551.20

On the side of seeking funds from sources other than dues, the major income continues to come from subscriptions by non-members, advertisements, and revenue from the Annual Meeting. This year efforts are under way to bolster response in two other areas.

First, we have negotiated or renegotiated more favorable contracts with publishers who reprint, or reproduce by other means, articles from our publications. In some instances, the contract provides additional remuneration to the ASA in the form of a modest "override" or "reinvestment" percentage based on sales of all sociological materials offered by the given organizations. Thus, such progressive firms as Warner-Modular Publications, Inc., Johnson Associates, Inc., and a division of Xerox, are giving tangible support to the efforts of the ASA to improve the quality of sociological work and to encourage the creation, publication, and dissemination of sociological materials. Claude B. McCaleb, President of Warner-Modular Publications, deserves special credit for his vision and pioneering in this effort. A precedent has been set that I hope other publishers—as well as editors and authors—will emulate. Funds collected from this source will be designated by Council for use in special projects to enhance the quality of the discipline.

Council has also taken another important step to give visibility and opportunity for anyone to contribute to a new SPECIAL FUND FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF THE DISCIPLINE. Reference to this action is recorded elsewhere in this issue of FOOTNOTES.

Having reviewed the financial status of the ASA with particular reference to membership obligations and opportunities, we may now turn to a brief view of membership statistics.

Membership

The "Limits of Growth" in various areas has become a topic of fascination and analysis for an increasing number of sociologists.

Should principles emerge from this field of inquiry, it now appears that they may receive an additional test in our own backyard.

For the first time in the history of the ASA, we have experienced a net loss in total membership over a one-year period. Thus, 1973 resulted in a net decline of 3.6% from the total membership in 1972. The figures, presented by categories of membership, are as follows:

Membership Category	1972	1973	% Change
Members	6,701	6,950	+ 3.7
Associates	2,903	2,594	-10.6
Student Memb.	1,055	1,142	+ 8.2
Student Assoc.	3,485	2,866	-17.8
Intnl. Assoc.	790	846	+ 7.1
Totals	14,934	14,398	- 3.6

The results are mixed, and they are puzzling. Apparently something structural is going on to bring a significant decline in the categories where minimal qualifications are required for membership. The definition of "Associate" is "Persons interested in the field of sociology." A "Student Associate" is defined as "Undergraduate majors or graduate students in sociology in accredited institutions." Perhaps enrollment patterns are affecting membership in these categories. Since persons in the Associate categories usually evolve into the other membership categories, the consequences of the decline may be more significant in the future than for the present.

The three categories where there continues to be an increase in numbers represents persons who have a greater investment and presumably a deeper commitment to the field. Membership here requires more advanced and specialized qualifications. Two of these categories, Members and Student Members, constitute persons who are eligible to vote and hold office in the Association. As noted earlier, voting members are now 56.2% of all members in the ASA. From 1960 through 1971, this figure never exceeded 40%.

Whatever other interpretations are placed on these figures, it is clear, assuming that we do not want to limit growth, that more strenuous efforts could be directed to inform the "feeder" categories of the privileges of membership.

But the efforts need not rest here, however. In 1973, 2,000 persons who were members in 1972 let their membership lapse and were removed from the records as of June 1. Of these, 981 were full Members. As large as this number is, it represents a 33% decline in lapsed memberships from the previous year. Letters have gone out to remind these persons that we would be pleased to welcome them back.

Linkages to Other Organizations

A considerable portion of the time of the Executive Officer, the Administrative Officer, and the Executive Specialist for Minorities and Women is used in sessions—panels, workshops, planning groups, conferences, etc.—with representatives of other organizations who have allied interests in research, teaching, social policy, and professional matters. Despite our selective response, the roster of organizations to which the ASA relates is large and growing. It goes far beyond the listing of organizations to which we send official representatives, such as UNESCO, ACLS, AAAS, and SSRC. Such contacts often yield useful information on employment prospects, career development, continuing education, research funding, copyright laws, peer-review systems, travel for scholars, data banks, administrative procedures, government policies, etc.

While there is routine exchange of information between the ASA and government agencies, private foundations, and the like, some of the linkages involve more intensive participation. For example, one of the most fruitful commitments is our membership in COSSA, the Consortium of Social Science Associations. This year I met 13 times with the Executive Officers from Anthropology, Psychology, Political Science, Geography, Statistics, and Law. In addition to the exchange of relevant administrative information, we have engaged in a number of joint efforts to strengthen the representation of the disciplines in social policy, educational matters, scientific developments, and professional activities. In a similar vein, both the Executive Officer and the Administrative Officer of the ASA have participated in two meetings over several days this year of the Council of Secretaries of ACLS. These, too, have been instructive in learning how to balance the ASA between the somewhat competitive demands of being both a Learned Society and a Professional Association.

In addition, my office routine has been punctuated this year by attending meetings of three regional sociological associations, giving talks in four universities, and participating in several conferences dealing with such matters as non-traditional study, the use and abuse of sample surveys, career development, manpower studies, and university-Civil Service Commission relations. I have also begun work with two committees in the Assembly of Social and Behavioral Sciences of the National Academy of Science.

These linkages with other organizations serve several functions: (1) They bring a voice of sociology to many forums; (2) They yield useful information for the performance of our duties; and, (3) They provide a base for comparing our Association with similar organizations. Sometimes this mix stirs a sense of satisfaction, and other times a sense of despair. In turn, I have found that our own Council, when confronted with the transfer of ideas from these sources, is especially skilled at converting both of these reactions into an even more profound sense of challenge. In short, the more one works with others, the more one finds merit in the analytic powers of our own discipline.

Interdependence

The question most frequently directed to the Executive Officer of the ASA begins, "What is the ASA doing about _____?" The material presented above outlines some of the current answers. While they are here voiced by one person, they do of course represent the interdependent activities of a large number of actors who, themselves, draw on a heritage. Whatever the ASA does, it is a collective response molded by a tradition that is mindful of both the necessity for continuity and the desirability of change.

The current set of actors, including the officers and Council of the ASA, the members of committees, our editors, our printers, and our office staff, deserve all the accolades that are usually delivered at this point in an annual report. In my ten months here, I have been deeply impressed by their dedicated, professional services to the Association. Never have I witnessed an organization where so many give so generously of time and talent to the common cause. This one has come to expect from Presidents such as Si Goode and Mirra Komarovsky and from our Secretary, Milt Yinger. It has also become routine with the persons who so skillfully manage our manuscripts—Ed Barton, Frank Heneghan, and most decidedly with Henry Quellmalz.

But what has amazed me most is the loyalty and energy of that handful of people who labor everyday in this office where information, requests, and demands cascade in from all angles to be processed out with fidelity and with care. In daily operational terms, what the ASA is and does really translates out into the activities of Norma Blohm, Midge Miles, Martha Rios-Ricagno, Sue Gorman, JoAnn Ruckel, Jude Ruckel, Maggie Beale, Sarah Clement, Lillie Gaskins, Sharon Gray, Telza Pippin, and Denny Ruckel. This "daily dozen" does as much to facilitate the work of sociology as any other set of persons that I know.

Much of this, of course, can be traced to the leadership and the unstinting efforts of our Administrative Officer, Alice Myers, lovingly called the "Den Mother" of the Association. Her knowledge and skill is boundless. Her pace never slackens, and high standards are never sacrificed. She is beautifully responsive to both person and profession.

Soon one of our colleagues will be leaving to return to university life. After 18 months of pioneering work, Maurice Jackson, will vacate the position of Executive Specialist for Minorities and Women. Under conditions where pressures mount controversies, he has moved in a calm and effective manner to complete tasks and to solve problems while maintaining the respect of contending parties. The spring, 1973 SWS Newsletter summed it up: Right on, Maurice!

Conclusion and a Fable

By and large, the tone of this report is optimistic. It probably had to be to sustain me for the remainder of my term. To be sure, there are real problems ahead for sociologists and for the ASA. Obstacles lurk in our path. Some are tangible, others not. Money will help, but it will not automatically serve up solutions. The fact is that there is a lack of consensus about organizational goals, and a downright dissensus on desired directions for the discipline. This we must confront by all means available, including, I believe, widespread participation in "Open Forums."

In addition, we sociologists have problems with how we are perceived by others.

Images are hard to manage, and perhaps they should be ignored, or at least responded to with a sense of humor. However, it is somewhat ironic that an appreciation of sociologists has not kept pace with the growing sense that the major problems of our age are peculiarly "sociological." To illustrate, let me conclude with a fable. If nothing else, the content may convey a realistic reading of the climate in which we work in Washington, D.C.

Before coming to the ASA last August, my esteemed predecessor, Jay Demerath, not only prepared a firm foundation for effort but he also informed me that one of the major tasks to be undertaken was to establish a regular means for linking knowledge from our discipline to the complex processes of policy formulation, the main business in Washington. One of the hopes for by-products of such effort would be the opening of new career opportunities for sociologists at a time when it appears that the upper limits for employment in academia are in sight.

My first opportunity to engage this issue came in a rather unusual way, and in a somewhat unique setting. The setting was the National Zoo. After Watergate, the zoo ranks as one of the main attractions in Washington.

Actually, I first went to the zoo with a team of sociologists who were on the staff of the newly appointed National Commission on Zoos. Having served on a similar commission, I was interested to see how the state of the art had evolved since my duties on the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography terminated in 1970.

The sociological research team was charged with making recommendations concerning national zoo policy. They wanted to start by doing a study of the effects of looking at caged animals. This required the cooperation of the chief zoo-keeper.

When the zoo-keeper was approached, he said he would consider the matter, but first, as a true professional, he wanted to consult his colleagues. So, possibly because he was a Republican appointee, he turned to the elephant cage which housed three wise but blind elephants.

After consultation with his blind elephants, the zoo-keeper offered cooperation contingent on a set of reciprocal observations. Accordingly, an agreement was reached whereby a sociologist would lie down and each blind elephant would reach out, feel the sociologist, and report what he had found.

The first elephant put his foot down on the sociologist's head, and a strange, echoing, hollow sound resulted.

The second elephant put his foot down on the sociologist's stomach, and there was a dull slurp and swish.

The third elephant put his foot down on the sociologist's leg with a resounding crunch and crack.

The three blind elephants then reported their perceptions to the zoo-keeper.

The first one said that from his observations he felt that while sociologists used their heads to count, classify, and correlate, they were very weak in conceptual capacity and therefore hardly knew what to do, let alone to do what they knew.

The second elephant reported that from his observations he felt that sociologists didn't have the stomach for tackling really difficult problems and were unable to digest alternatives; therefore, why should they be fed yet another opportunity to influence zoo policies?

The third elephant went on at some length to indicate that while his colleagues were possibly correct, his observations led him to believe that the problem was really not that complex. The sociologists, he concluded, were simply unwilling or unable to do the necessary leg-work for serious policy-oriented research.

Now, I suppose, the moral of this story is that no matter where you touch, you will find a vulnerable spot in sociology.

Or, to broaden it a bit, if elephants press on, sooner or later sociologists might discover how they have created their own weaknesses as they proceed with the matter of trying to bring basic knowledge to bear on questions of public policy.

Now that is optimistic. But what else can we do when we live in a world where elephants, both operative and inoperative, abound at every watergate?

Otto N. Larsen
Executive Officer

THE REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SPECIALIST FOR MINORITIES AND WOMEN

The activities of the Office of Executive Specialist for Minorities and Women have intensified in the past year. While the year has been marked with successes, their impli-

cations are not always immediate or visible. At the least guidelines have been developed for the position which will serve as a basis for continuous activity with regard to minorities and women.

Although the situations of minorities and women have not been solved by many stalwart efforts, improvements have been made. There has been the conversion into standing status of the Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Sociology, headed by James Blackwell, and the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology, headed by Cora Marrett. The committees are in the process of expanding their scope while increasing their effectiveness. They are developing long-range programs which involve increasing relationships with the Caucus of Black Sociologists, Sociologists for Women in Society, La Junta de Sociologos, sociology departments (undergraduate as well as graduate ones), regional committees on minorities and women, and similar committees in other disciplines. At the same time they are suggesting and working on studies and supporting programs such as affirmative action which will facilitate a collective solution to felt problems of minorities and women.

Two operating principles served to organize the efforts of this office last year. Simply stated, the first principle is—if there is an issue, problem, or concern let it be known. Numerous means were employed to implement this principle. ASA Footnotes, The Status of Women in Sociology 1968-72, reports, studies, letters, telephone calls, and personal contacts all served as media of communication. The committees played a central role here in bringing together information about problems and issues in the departments and associations.

The second principle is that every expression of concern must be acted upon—either in reply or in action directed elsewhere. So although the communication was significant in its own right insofar as information was transmitted, equally important is the fact that it served as the basis for action. Useful here also were the committees who recommended action to Council and to departments. Specific areas of action in this office involved referring minorities and women for various activities, including consultation, committee assignments, and employment. For part of the year responsibility for the employment situation of women was shared with Sociologists for Women in Society. Aids that were helpful in employment were lists of new PhD's in sociology, sociologists from minority groups, and minority and women sociologists whose vitae are on file in the office. Although these lists were incomplete they served to bring people together and bring people and situations together.

Another set of actions related to the stimulation of knowledge, both formal and informal, about minorities and women. This was accomplished through referral to and contact with other sociologists, other professionals, agencies, foundations, and meetings in which minorities and women were represented (meetings focused on research, science, education, inner city education, poverty, placement, data collection, women, minorities, graduate students, training, grants, programs, legislation, affirmative action, sociology, and social science). At a number of regional meetings many discussions were held and papers were presented which related to the circumstances of minorities and women. Finally, and very importantly, a minority fellowship program has been approved for funding but it is in abeyance until it receives funds for its activation.

Two matters remain to complete this report—an assessment of the current situation and a specification of what needs to be done. Currently, both minorities and women are relatively underutilized as faculty members and graduate students. Not only that but there have not been great changes in their proportions over the last several years. This is especially true for minorities for whom there is no visible likelihood that they will become more numerous in the immediate future. On their part women tend to be more underutilized in the higher ranks and in resource-controlling positions. There are also a number of felt problems concerning marginal and non-academic positions that need to be resolved.

The relatively small flow of students into the professional ranks means that present faculty members who are experiencing great demands on their time and energies for community, university, and student services will continue to experience those demands.

This year has revealed a difference in the participation of minorities and women in association meetings. To some extent the difference in participation relates to the difference in numbers. Women have increased their involvement in these meetings concentrating on both matters of general concern

such as employment and affirmative action and those of particular relevance to women such as nepotism and pregnancy and parental leave. In contrast minorities have turned out in small numbers. Their apparent quiescence probably more correctly represents a state of watchful waiting for change rather than one of satisfaction with action on their behalf thus far.

Once this is said it is also necessary to point out that the concern with minorities and women is entering into the "collective conscience". More white male sociologists know more minority and women sociologists. It is apparently becoming a social fact that minorities and women along with other sociologists are thought of in terms of their competence, research interests, and abilities. Also the signs indicate that they are beginning to penetrate the "buddy system" of hiring and promotion, at least in name. As a matter of fact, a major part of the Executive Specialist's activity has been that of providing contacts of one kind or another.

In answering the question "What can be done?" we can invoke the principles of information and action again to organize our thoughts. Rather than to present a list of solutions I will offer only two. With regard to information, a number of studies of minority and women views and experiences are needed in which minorities and women researchers are involved from inception to conclusion. These research studies would examine the situations, both strengths and weaknesses, of minorities and women at the stages of college application, college student, graduate school application, graduate student, MA recipient, PhD recipient, and faculty. An effort would be made to establish objectives, causes of problems, and their solutions at each stage.

Beyond that, in line with the second principle of action, what is needed is a model of action that will provide the motivation necessary to solve the problems of minorities and women. We do have examples of such models. To illustrate within the perspective of social action that Max Weber proposed, John Calvin took religious elements of his time relevant to the felt problems of Protestants and molded them into an ethic that made it possible for his followers to act in the presence of an overwhelming threat. Similarly, Max Weber himself took certain thoughts and developed the ideas of ideal types and objectivity among others in a way relevant to the state of sociology at that time that motivated the involvement of many individuals in the sociological enterprise. Sociology now needs models of leadership and collective initiative, not those of reaction or inaction, in improving the situations of minorities and women.

The problems of minorities and women are related to other important issues in sociology. Part of the problem is significantly related in the minds of many individuals to the belief in standards and qualifications. Fortunately, this belief can become a matter of research. If we find that the standards can be improved or that they are declining, we can change them in a way that will bring about an improvement in the status of minorities and women. If we find that the standards do not need to be changed, we can keep them and change our behavior to achieve the same result.

Another issue involves the distinction between concern with minorities and women and the discipline or the substance of sociology. In a real way the situation of minorities and women is the discipline—the test of the discipline. Our ability to solve these matters validates our knowledge by demonstrating how effective it is. In other words, the successful inclusion of minorities and women would be a great achievement; their exclusion is not.

In short, the situation of minorities and women can be solved through the initiative of sociologists acting individually and collectively, formally and informally, in departments, associations, and other places of work and sociability. It can possibly be solved through other means as well. Ethnic study programs can develop the potentialities of minority students for subsequent training in sociology. Affirmative action, supported by sociologists, can result in an atmosphere that will facilitate the movement of minorities and women into sociology. But in the final analysis, whether we decide to act or not, we stand on the threshold of a great sociological challenge.

In finishing this tour of duty, I would like to express my appreciation to my assistant Lillie Gaskins and everyone at the ASA office and to many other persons who so conscientiously seek fairness for minorities and women.

Maurice Jackson
Executive Specialist

REPORT OF THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

Business continues to be brisk at ASR, as evidenced by the accompanying statistical summary. The rate of manuscript submission remained stable over the past year, at fifty-two per month; but there is great variation over different periods of the year. Mean decision time improved slightly over last year, to 9.34 weeks, despite a record number of evaluations received and decisions made. This is the result of the dedication and efficiency of Office Manager Sherry Bye, Deputy Editors Lois DeFleur and Lee Freese, our stalwarts on the Editorial Board, and a host of silent partners whose only public acknowledgement is their inclusion in the annual list of special readers, published in December.

Our acceptance rate (12.1%) is somewhat higher than last year. The rise from last year's 9% results primarily, we believe, from our work with authors who have resubmitted their papers (usually upon our invitation) following initial rejection and revision along lines suggested by our readers. Readers' comments to authors continue to be an important, and insufficiently recognized, professional service of the review process. I get enough irate mail to know that not all authors feel they have been helped by these comments—and regrettably mistakes are also a part of the process—but the overwhelming reaction continues to be favorable. We appreciate this reaction, as well as the fact that mistakes are often brought to our attention. Sometimes we are able to rectify them.

on this matter is very simple: submission of an article to any journal is a commitment to publish the article in that journal if it is accepted. Therefore, submission to more than one journal is unprofessional behavior. I recognize that this position places editors under a serious obligation to be efficient in reviewing manuscripts and prompt in reaching decisions. I sympathize with authors when they do not receive such editorial treatment but I do not feel this is grounds for violating the basic commitment. Authors can and should withdraw articles from consideration by a journal if they have grounds for believing they are being unfairly treated by the editorial processes of that journal.

Gripping and Bitching

A soon-to-be-published note in the Open Forum of Footnotes complains that professional journals and meetings, and the profession of sociology, are so rigidly established "that new fields in the discipline are prevented from developing." I hope and believe that judgement to be incorrect, as I have indicated in my reply to that comment through that same Open Forum; but one of the points raised in the note seems appropriate in the present context. The author (Robert C. Atchley) raises a question: "Where are the articles on . . . gripping and bitching . . . and countless other areas of social life which have been decreed by some unseen force to be 'peripheral' to the field of sociology?" Editors must become expert at parrying a good deal of gripping and bitching if they are to survive. Study of Review and editorial decision making processes and related communications ought to be proper grist for a

published as the "Articles" section of the old *American Sociologist* are now published in the new journal format. Many readers found the publication of serious research efforts and scholarly papers on the profession objectionably downgraded by placement in the inner pages of a tabloid.

Within the new format *The American Sociologist* will continue to publish research and commentary on the profession and the discipline of sociology. As I interpret the mission of the *Sociologist*, we are devoted to publication of materials relating to the organizational and intellectual problems of our profession, including (but not limited to) problems of the organization and content of sociological education, the politics of the profession, recruitment to the profession, intellectual and political biases in sociological thought, our relations with the public, our role in political life, professional ethics, the organization and impact of sociological research, and the future of sociology.

In my opinion, the temporary suspension of publication (during 1972) of *The American Sociologist* in journal form led to a diminution in the quality and quantity of submissions of manuscripts on these topics. Some statistical evidence can be invoked on behalf of this belief. New submissions dropped to a low of 145 for the period June 1, 1972 to May 31, 1973. The comparable figures were 180 for 1970-71 and 156 for 1971-72. However, the flow of manuscripts has picked up since publication of the first issue in the new format: I received thirty-six manuscripts in April and May of 1973.

Because of the recent change in editorship and format it would seem more informative to present a detailed breakdown of the status of manuscripts received during my term to date rather than over the entire year. Since assuming editorial responsibility (October, 1972) I have received 122 manuscripts whose current status is summarized in the following table:

Rejected	60
Rejected but invited to resubmit	17
Accepted and published	12
Accepted, awaiting publication	11
Under review	22
Total	122

Excluding manuscripts in the process of being reviewed, the acceptance rate has been 23% (23 out of 100 manuscripts) during my editorship to date.

One consequence of moving to the new, more expensive format has been the establishment of rather severe page limits. Given the limited space available I have introduced a distinction between articles and notes. The latter are items of interest to the profession that, though useful, can profitably be treated at less than article length. Many contributors are being asked to scale down relatively long proposed contributions for possible publication as notes.

A word of gratitude is due the many associate editors and appointed referees whose careful and thoughtful reading of manuscripts is the foremost contribution to the achievement of quality in a scholarly journal.

Leon Mayhew
Editor

REPORT OF THE EDITOR OF SOCIOLOGY

I suspect that all neophyte editors of *The Association's* journals feel something akin to the pain of that poor soul who moans, "I can't believe I ate the whole thing." My discomfort would have been more acute if it had not been for the assistance provided by Professor Carl Backman and his staff during the transfer of editorial function. Our correspondence with Backman and Mrs. Doris Ginsburg, former Editorial Assistant, has been extensive, and I owe both these real professionals my gratitude.

I am at a loss to explain the sudden increase in the number of manuscripts being submitted to *Sociometry*. In his report of last year, Backman noted that he had received 245 new manuscripts during a 12 month period. During the first nine months of my editorship, 265 manuscripts have been submitted. This projects to an annual submission rate of over 350. Obviously, if this trend continues, it will create serious pressures on the editorial staff and the page limitations under which we currently are operating. The situation already has resulted in a longer time lapse between the receipt of a manuscript and a decision than I had hoped to achieve.

The decisions which have been reached following the original review of the manuscripts received are reflected in Table 1. The examination of the data in that table results

STATISTICAL SUMMARY

	June 1, 1972- May 31, 1973	July 1, 1971- May 31, 1972	June 1, 1970- May 31, 1971
Manuscripts submitted	622 ^a	580 ^b	488
Not referred	24	26	110
Referred	598	463	378
Transferred from Bloomington		91	
Evaluations received	1278	919	775
Associate editors	420	434	
Special readers	858	485	253
Decisions	596	506	452
Accept	72	45	85
Reject	524	461	367
Mean decision time (weeks)	9.3 ^c	9.6 ^c	13.5
Items published			
Articles	62	56	49
Continuities		3	4
Comments	26	27	20

^aThis figure does not include sixty-seven carried over from the previous year and still in process of evaluation as of June 1, 1972.

^bDoes not include comments.

^cMean decision time does not include rejections which were "not referred."

Persistent Problems

A few problems continue to plague our efforts. Chief among these is getting the journal to our subscribers on time. We think we are on top of the problem now, as announced in the April Items; but unanticipated problems occasionally occur even among the most efficient and the best intentioned. We are attempting to plan far enough ahead that even these rare contingencies will not delay on-time publication.

Finding broadly representative and competent reviewers is sometimes a problem, since we choose to spread out the burden of review rather than to overload Associate Editors. Individual members occasionally volunteer their services. We very much appreciate such communications, and we have profited from them. We particularly invite members of the several caucuses now represented in the Association to compile lists of potential reviewers, identifying their fields of special interest and competence, and where they may be reached. Deputy Editors Lois DeFleur and Lee Freese do a fine job assigning manuscripts for review, and they join me in this invitation.

A third persistent problem concerns the lack of an ASR style manual. I am submitting for Publications Committee consideration a proposal by Copy Editor Loretta Anwalt to prepare such a manual. We hope at least to be able to provide a basic document which can be added to as demand and resources converge.

A relatively minor, but recurring problem concerns simultaneous submission of articles for review by more than one journal. Occasionally this practice is brought to my attention by a reader who tells me that he has recently received from another journal an article which I have sent him. My position

sociology of gripping and bitching. Perhaps that will be my next research project!

Acknowledgements

Support necessary for the publication of ASR comes from too many sources to permit individual mention. For their constant support, however, several people require special note: Alice Myers and Executive Officer Otto Larsen (whose name we misspelled in December by substituting a Swedish "o" for the Danish "e"), printer extraordinaire Henry Quellmalz, the Editorial Board and my very special local staff who really put it all together, and my colleagues at Washington State University who respond willingly and promptly to what must at times seem unreasonable demands from a guy who seems to subject their articles to even tougher standards than are applied to articles submitted by others. To them, and to the large number of special readers who make our review time look so good, and of course to our readers—my deepest thanks. To our authors and critics—let us continue to hear from you. We need your support.

James F. Short, Jr.
Editor

REPORT OF THE EDITOR OF THE AMERICAN SOCIOLOGIST

In 1973 *The American Sociologist* returned to the status of a journal. A number of the functions of the old *Sociologist*, particularly news items, reports of official meetings and transactions, and obituaries, have been transferred to FOOTNOTES, the newsletter of the American Sociological Association. As of the February issue (Volume 8, No. 1) we began to publish our materials in a separate and autonomous format. The materials formerly

TABLE I

Results of the Original Reviews of Manuscripts Received

Decision	N	% of	
		Completed Reviews	Total Submissions
Accepted as Submitted	7	3.8	2.6
Revision Suggested	59	32.1	22.3
Rejected after review	98	53.3	37.0
Rejected by Editor	18	9.8	6.8
Withdrawn by Author	2	1.1	0.8
Sub Total	184	100.1	
Still under Review	81		30.6
Total	265		100.1

in a most troublesome finding—only 3.8 percent of the manuscripts we have received have been accepted for publication in their original state.

The situation is more encouraging if the data in Table 2 are examined. Of the 59 articles where the original review resulted in suggestions for revision, 25 have been resubmitted and sent out for additional review. Almost fifty percent of these 25 articles have been accepted for publication. I choose to interpret this as an indication of the perceptiveness, competence, and helpfulness of the Editorial Board and Special Reviewers who have served us so well. We have received an encouragingly large number of letters from authors expressing their appreciation for

TABLE II

Results of the Reviews of Revised Manuscripts

Decision	N	%
Accepted	12	20.3
Second Revision Suggested	9	15.3
Rejected	4	6.8
Still under Review	34	57.6
Total	59	100.0

the reviews their works have received. I believe my position is reinforced by another datum. Of the nine manuscripts where a second review has been suggested, two have been resubmitted and reviewed. Both will appear in forthcoming issues of *Sociometry*. While the N is extremely small, I do believe it supports my tentative conclusion that our review process is sound.

To those who have given their time to the evaluation process, I would like to say much in the way of acknowledgment; I hope a simple but very genuine "Thanks" will convey my appreciation. To my editorial staff composed of Barbara J. Beall, Janet Kerans and Susan Rose, I and the profession owe a great deal indeed.

Richard J. Hill
Editor

REPORT OF THE EDITOR OF SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

The transfer of the editorial office, files, and duties was accomplished with a minimum of difficulty from the southside of Chicago to the northside suburb of Evanston in June 1972. The transfer, not to mention the first few months of our operations could not have been survived without the sympathetic assistance of Charles Bidwell and his very knowledgeable and patient secretary, Mrs. Lillian Hopkins. We thank them both for responding to our frequent inter-urban calls for help.

A considerable backlog of accepted manuscripts was passed on to us, and we have applied a policy of publication in order of the date of acceptance. We have had occasion to be grateful for that backlog since it has relieved us of the anxiety of having to meet those first printer's deadlines with high quality papers. A note of thanks to Henry Quellmalz is in order here for initiating us with such gentle understanding into the mysteries of "putting out a journal."

Although we have had assistance from all quarters, we have not been fast learners, and the turn around time during the first months of our tenure suffered, running one month as high as twenty weeks. Happily, we can report that this scandalous record has been reduced to an average of seven weeks for manuscripts received between January and April of this year. Less happily, we have had to notify authors of accepted manuscripts that the backlog of papers imposes a publication delay of from nine to twelve months. For the record, 212 papers were received of which 17 were accepted, 101 rejected, 10 referred to other journals, 1 was withdrawn, and 83 are in process of evaluation.

In order to facilitate the evaluation and publication process further, we have requested and have had approved the appointment of our colleague, Remi Clignet, to the position of Deputy Editor. His broad comparative knowledge of the field has contributed a new dimension of intelligence and energy to the editorial process. Clignet has lightened the load and also the spirit of our activities. The veterans on our list of Associate Editors, as well as many not on that list on whom we have imposed with requests for evaluation, have also been invaluable sources of aid and good judgment. We thank them all, with special acknowledgement for the services of Ronald Corwin, Kenneth Feldman, James Fennessey, Zeldia Gamson, M.B. Katz, and Herman Zeigler whose terms terminate in 1973.

Finally, in attending to the endless details of assembling the journal, we have leaned heavily and gratefully on the multi-talented Ms. Nancy Maes, editorial assistant, secretary, bookkeeper, etc., without whom . . .

John I. Kitsuse
Editor

REPORT OF THE EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Much of this report could underscore cogent observations by the previous Editor, Howard Freeman (*The American Sociologist*, August, 1972). For example, much work is done by others (and by the Editor), some moments are distressing and require executive fiat, and the quality of many manuscripts remains bad.

Of the 187 manuscripts received before 25 June 1973, 26 (13.9%) were accepted, 117 (62.6%) were rejected, and 40 (21.3%) are yet under review. The remaining 4 (2.2%) were returned at the authors' request. The two "in-topics" were drug-related behavior and health service evaluation. The number of manuscripts about aging probably increased over the previous year. Average "turnabout" time for manuscript processing was about three months. Manuscripts above average in length, as well as those received during major academic holidays or semester "overload" periods generally took longer.

Some accepted manuscripts required little publication preparation, but others were headaches, due largely to their authors' carelessness (e.g., incomplete references, text and table context deviations, and redundancy). Word parsimony is important since *JHSB* has limited space. Space saved is space earned for another seminal author.

Fortunately or unfortunately, my earlier "outsider's" judgments about the many subjective factors affecting publication were substantiated. However, no manuscript submitted to *JHSB* has been accepted or rejected on the basis of friendship, or because the author was black or white, female or male or at or not at the "Harvards." For those interested, 21 percent of all authors submitting manuscripts were female, and 13 percent of all authors whose works were accepted for publication were female.

A few rejected authors (all male) have protested vigorously to us, with more extreme cases including invidious diatribes. In some such cases, their extreme anxiety was induced by "publish or perish" situations.

JHSB has now adopted a policy of requiring authors submitting manuscripts to also submit sufficient postage for their return. Over the past few months, the average postal cost for processing each accepted manuscript was about \$6, with the cost for each rejected manuscript being about \$2 less. Actual postage expenses between 6 March and 24 June were \$104.43. Quite simply, not only has mail service been unusually bad, but postal costs have soared.

Overall this year has been valuable. I am even more appreciative now of Howie Freeman's frank and useful orientation (including advice about "hot kitchens") and Henry Quellmalz's careful and relaxed advice. Wyatt Jones, Robert Antaramian, and almost all of the Associate Editors (particularly the

"detailed critique" ones) have been "security blankets." Finally, constructive comments about improving *JHSB* are always welcome, as are more and better manuscripts from all sociologists.

Jacquelyne Johnson Jackson
Editor

REPORT OF THE EDITOR OF CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY: A JOURNAL OF REVIEWS

The new (1973) volume of *Contemporary Sociology* will consist entirely of reviews and feature essays that I have solicited or received since assuming the editorship, as opposed to the previous volume in which the vast majority of the reviews and roughly one-third of the features were from the backlog inherited from the old editors of the *American Sociological Review* book review section.

Statistical summary of Volume I of *Contemporary Sociology*:

Symposium reviews:	13
Review Essays:	7
Book Reviews:	329
Letters and Replies:	14

By the time this report appears in print, four issues of Volume II (1973) will have been published. The statistical summary for these four issues is as follows:

Symposium reviews:	2
Survey Essays:	4
Review Essays:	5
Book Reviews:	221
Letters and Replies:	17

Letters responding to critical reviews have been far more frequent in the past six months. Whether this is because correspondents believe that more space is available to print such letters now that a separate review journal exists, or whether we have been publishing fewer "bland" reviews, I am unable to say. Unfortunately, the time-lag between the publication of a review and that of a letter responding to it is unavoidably a long one, given the rigidities of our printing schedule and the increased volume of such letters. Several aggrieved correspondents have come close to accusing me of personally conspiring with the reviewer to assail their reputations as scholars and thinkers when I have refused to stop the presses and delay the next issue in order to run their rebuttals of a critical review. Alas, the problem, as we say in this trade, is "structural" rather than personal and I see no way of resolving it to everyone's satisfaction.

I have received many letters from sociologists offering to review books in their specialties, frequent requests to review particular books, and occasional contributed reviews. I have adopted a fairly permissive policy with regard to these requests, a totally permissive one towards those who volunteer to review books in general in their areas of competence. Some of my most reliable and capable reviewers have come from the ranks of these volunteers. We reserve, of course, the right to reject reviews, even solicited ones, that are not up to standard. I am necessarily less permissive, however, with respect to volunteered or contributed symposium, survey, and review essays, for I have usually solicited these for many issues in advance.

I shall save some of my general comments on the problems of editing a review journal for my final editorial report next year.

I should like to thank the following people for the various tasks they have performed in keeping our office running and the journal appearing not too indecently behind schedule: Gail Feit, first and foremost, but also Marylouise Dionne, Joy Hendrickson, Nancy Marvin, and Belle Mintzer. As always, thanks are also due to the staff of the ASA Executive Office and to Henry Quellmalz and his staff at the Boyd Printing Company.

Dennis H. Wrong
Editor

REPORT OF THE EDITOR OF THE ASA READERS SERIES

Two volumes of the ASA Readers Series on Issues and Trends in Sociology have appeared: *The Formal Organization*, edited by Richard Hall and *Intergroup Relations*, edited by Pierre van den Berghe. A third volume, *Neighborhood and Ghetto*, edited by Scott and Ann Greer is in press. Six other volumes are under contract and are in varying stages of completion.

The resignation of Amos Hawley, first editor of the series, provided an occasion for a review by Council of the series to date. Questions were raised concerning the distinctive contributions of the series, the problem of commercialization in the activities of the Association, and the appropriateness of restrictions placed on series editors. The editorial board of the series was asked to review its work in the light of these questions and make recommendations to Council concerning the future of the series.

At its meeting in August of 1972, the editorial board considered these matters and made a number of recommendations among the most important of which were (1) that the series was an appropriate undertaking of our Association and should be continued and expanded; (2) that the distinctive contribution of the series was its emphasis on the development and progressive refinement over time of some issue or problem area; (3) that the series to be successful required stronger backing from Council; and, (4) that editors of the series volumes should not be arbitrarily restricted to ASA sources in compiling their readings.

The Committee on Publications meeting on March 1, 1973 endorsed the recommendations of the editorial board and took steps toward the selection of a new editor, still to be announced.

W. Richard Scott
Interim Chair.

REPORT OF THE EDITOR OF SOCIOLOGICAL METHODOLOGY

The 1973 volume of *Sociological Methodology* will be the longest yet published, approximating the maximum length allowable (150,000 words) under the original publication agreement between the Association and the publisher. This volume will not have the largest number of chapters (the 1970 volume had more) nor is it the case that the number of papers submitted was especially large (only 32 papers were considered, compared to 45 for the much briefer 1972 volume). The length of the 1973 volume is a result of the exceptionally high proportion of papers submitted that met the publication criteria this year and of the unusual length of some of these.

For the first time in *Sociological Methodology*, the 1973 volume will include as chapters commentaries on other chapters in the same volume. Two of the twelve chapters in the 1973 volume were invited as commentaries, one to give an author an opportunity to present a counter-argument to a chapter critical of some of his earlier work, and the other to provide the more general context for two papers trying to resolve the same basic problem in slightly different ways.

Despite attempts by the editor to encourage the submission of papers that represent a broad range of methodological styles in current use in sociology, many readers may feel that the 1973 volume does not cover a very broad range. The primary criterion for acceptance has remained as previously, i.e., that the manuscript extend or systematize methodological knowledge in a way that promises to be useful to those engaged in social research. The restricted range of methodological styles represented in the pages of *Sociological Methodology* is a result of the self exclusion of some potential authors rather than the editorial exclusion of those who fail to meet some test of orthodoxy.

Twenty-five editorial consultants, in addition to the six Advisory Editors, have assisted in the evaluation of papers submitted for the 1973 volume. This is a smaller number of editorial consultants than for the two previous volumes, reflecting the smaller number of papers submitted for this volume, the editor's judgment that several papers did not require additional review either because they were unsuitable or prematurely submitted, and the inclination to call on some editorial consultants more than once for papers of similar specialized focus. With negligible exceptions, the cooperation of the editorial consultants and Advisory Editors has been exemplary, and their very capable and timely assistance is gratefully acknowledged. As always, the editorial staff of Jossey-Bass, Inc. deserves commendation for their patience and efficiency.

With the publication of the 1973 volume, my term as editor of *Sociological Methodology* comes to an end, and the Council of the Association has wisely selected David Heise to serve as editor for the next three years. I confess to some relief at the prospect of ending these duties after a few more months, and I am especially pleased to be able to transfer editorial responsibility to such a capable successor.

Herbert L. Costner
Editor

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

Your Committee met twice during the year, for one day at the 1972 Annual Meeting in New Orleans (August 28, 1972) and for one day in Washington, D.C. (March 1, 1973). Rather than review the work accomplished by the Committee, several problems deserving notice of or discussion by Council will

be outlined:

1. The Committee meets for a 10-hour day during the Annual Meeting and for another long day between Annual Meetings. This is not enough time to carefully work through the agenda that inevitably develops. Although it is unclear that Council authorization is needed, the Committee requests Council to authorize two-day meetings for the Committee on Publications. Indeed, it would be best did Council also authorize the Chairperson of the Committee on Publications to call a third meeting during the year, should the Chairperson consider one desirable.

2. The Committee's winter meeting has taken place in Washington, D.C. Several members of the Committee, including the Chairperson, would like authorization from the Council to hold the winter meeting (and the third meeting, should one be authorized and called) closer to the center of the country, perhaps in Chicago, at a commercial facility close to the airport. The Committee's guess is that this would not increase the cost of the meetings. It would, however, result in considerable time saving for most Committee members, providing more time for members to conduct the business of the Committee.

3. During its March 1973 meeting Council approved certain new contracts involving royalties to the Association in addition to those collected on work copyrighted by the Association. As you know, members of the Committee had strongly held differing opinions on the propriety of these contracts. The Committee hopes that this matter will receive further discussion by Council.

As the new Chairperson of the Committee, I should like to thank Stanley Lieberman, the immediately past Chairperson, for making the transition easy; the members of the Committee, and the Editors of Association publications for their diligent work; and Otto N. Larsen and Alice F. Myers for making coherent discussion and pursuit of business possible.

Sheldon L. Messinger
Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRAINING AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

This year the Committee has attempted to reassess its goals and directions. It is fairly obvious that the profession of Sociology is at a critical point of growth and development. Some major changes appear imminent as a result of changes in federal funding. Within ASA we have observed and experienced some of the problems expressed by such groups as the Caucus of Black Sociologists, Women of Sociology and other groups pressing for professional change. Moral and ethical questions are being raised about the directions of research and the implications for social policy.

In view of these problems and others it is recommended that the Committee on Training and Professional Standards begin to undertake a more critical assessment of existing standards and training procedures. One major task should be that of identifying and bringing new and additive interpretations to "training" and "professionalism" in sociology. Hence one possibility might be a broadening of the range of professional alternatives to keep pace with changing social needs and alternative career interests. To facilitate action along these lines Committee members have suggested some directions for next year.

1. *Explore and describe alternative styles of graduate training oriented to kinds of professional involvements other than those within the traditional academic arena.*

Site visits and other techniques can be used to gather information on how applied problems are defined in various programs. How does one train sociologists to work in the applied fields? What kind of training and experiences are needed to work in action groups? What types of research skills are needed for evaluation research? Are there additional training needs directly related to producing sociologists capable of responding to problems and concerns of the poor, and the racially oppressed in this country? What about professional involvement and training related to underdevelopment and development, nationally and internationally?

2. *Function as a clearing house by collecting and disseminating information about innovations in graduate training to departments and potential graduate students.*

As an example, a description of resources necessary to provide creative and adequate graduate training can be provided to departments. Established programs may wish to broaden the range of alternative training tracks; and developing programs may wish to develop specialized areas of excellence. Similarly, information can be provided to potential graduate students that will be rele-

vant and helpful in their decision about where to pursue graduate study. Another possibility is to provide special technical and educational consultation services in areas of training.

3. *Establish mechanism (forums, publications, etc.) for facilitating greater feedback into the discipline regarding the changing nature of professional problems.*

The Committee should continue to identify and monitor problems. Moreover, it should take the leadership in suggesting responses that are creative and action-oriented.

Some problems that have been identified and should constitute priority agenda items for next year are:

- The projected decline in opportunities for academic positions for sociology PhD's over the next three years.
- Federal affirmative action programs.
- How to increase the number of racial and ethnic minorities and women involved in the education and training of sociology majors.
- The recruitment of new graduate students to programs suitable to their interests and career plans and in a manner compatible with their preferences and the preferences of the departments.

These problems and other overlap with the concerns of other committees such as The Committee on Employment, and The Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in the Profession. Therefore, it is recommended that the Committee on Training and Professional Standards work closely with other committees in a coordinative effort on matters of mutual concern.

Ruth Simms Hamilton
Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL AFFAIRS

The Committee met during the Annual Meeting on August 29, 1972. Previous actions of the committee were discussed, with the following actions:

The Executive Office is requested to solicit suggestions from the regional societies for the Committee on Nominations and the Committee on Committees. This should provide a larger in-put of nominations originating from various geographic areas.

The Executive Office is requested to follow up the suggestion made by the Committee in 1971, namely, that ASA Committees on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology, Freedom in Research and Teaching, and Social Studies Curriculum in American Secondary Schools stimulate the creation of counterparts in each regional society for the purpose of carrying out the charges of these committees and of informing the regionals of their interests and concerns.

ASA Council is requested to re-examine the schedule of forthcoming ASA meetings in relation to the dates that conflict with the opening of educational institutions in late August or early September. It is suggested that Council re-negotiate hotel arrangements in order to hold meetings in the second or third week in August rather than the fourth week, and to consider even more flexible schedules to hold meetings at other times of the year.

The following new business was taken up:

The Mid-West Society is requested to transmit copies of its resolution and relevant correspondence with the Executive Office to other regional societies and request that executive committees of those societies express their opinions to ASA Council on the matter of format and content of the *American Sociologist*. This resolution deplors the metamorphosis of the original *American Sociologist* into the *Sociologist* and hence to the *American Sociologist* in *Sociolog* format. The resolution asked that the *American Sociologist* be returned to its original format. The Committee feels that the professional news and opinions, the open discussion of professional controversies, and the news about people, events, research opportunities, and new jobs, as contained in *Sociolog*, are important coverages that should be continued in whatever format the future publication assumes.

William Peterson reported on his correspondence with N. J. Demerath III concerning the regional distribution of committee memberships and related offices of ASA and his request for data showing the distribution of such assignments and nominations by region. His primary concern was the presumed inequitable distribution of such offices. The Committee is of the opinion that inequitable distribution by race and sex also is worthy of consideration, and that academic-political influences operate to interfere with the distribution of representation by whatever criteria—region, sex, color, etc. The Committee feels that these inequities are

linked to grantsmanship, university prestige, and so forth, and that these influences affect the free operation of more equitable selection processes within the Association. In lieu of an adequate exploration of these factors, the Committee requests Council to instruct the Executive Office to compile such data and distribute it to each regional society.

The problem of participation of the profession in national decision-making councils through providing information relative to national policy issues on which sociologists have expertise, was introduced and discussed. The opinion was expressed that members of the profession do not adequately exercise citizenship responsibilities concerning policy issues, particularly on matters on which sociologists have reliable information. The Committee requests that regional societies consider the matter and report their conclusions to the Committee for subsequent expression to Council.

Raymond W. Mack
Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SECTIONS

The Social Psychology Section has been inactive for several years. As a result of this inaction the committee recommended to Council that the section be terminated. The Committee on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology brought forth a new Section, the Section on Undergraduate Education. Its first regular council and business meetings will be held this year.

Professor Roland L. Warren, Chairman of the Section on Community has requested of this Committee that we recommend to Council a formal budget for Sections. His request was supported by letters from five Section chairmen. Due to lack of budget, this Committee was unable to have a special meeting to discuss this topic prior to the March Council meeting. The topics raised in this letter would be a major item for the agenda of the August 27th meeting.

It is recommended now that the ASA budget provide funds for a one day meeting in February of the Committee on Sections on a regular basis, with the provision that the chairman can omit the meeting if there is not enough business.

William Bates
Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The 1973 Committee on Committees met in full day session on August 30, 1972. (The scheduling this year meant that Committee members missed a full day of meetings, and I urge that the 1973 meeting, like that of 1971, be scheduled before the first day on which papers are presented).

We submitted nominees for 24 vacancies on 11 standing and constitutional committees, and in addition recommended a slate for the Membership Committee that we felt would tap some of the alienated or neglected blocs of potential members. We also recommended nominees for three ad hoc committees and four ASA representatives.

In addition to names submitted by Committee members and by chairmen of the committees concerned, we received a slate of nominees from SWS, in response to a notice in TAS. We welcome such a practice and hope that other caucuses and individuals submit names to next year's committee. Our work was also facilitated by the availability of rosters of minority sociologists, though we did not receive a roster of women sociologists, as requested. In all such lists, however, we were limited to action on those individuals who were known personally by the Committee membership. None of the lists carried an indication of special interest or concern with a substantive arena, and the Committee on Committees urges that a paragraph describing the nominee be submitted in the future.

Our nominations were guided by the existing composition of committees in light of (a) their function and (b) the presence of women and minority members. In passing, I might note that the Committee on Committees itself was reasonably well composed in light of both criteria. Half of us were women: there were two Black members, and we represented a wide range of methodological orientations and acquaintanceship. Though the members had an average of more than two other ASA committee assignments over the past ten years, there were three for whom the Committee on Committees was their first ASA task (excluding service on professional journals).

We also suggested that Council reevaluate the function of several standing committees whose reports indicated a degree of concern.

Richard Simpson was elected chairman for next year, and the outgoing cohort wishes him and the new committee success.

Joan W. Moore
Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND UNESCO

Sociologists interested in UNESCO matters met on two occasions at the 1972 ASA New Orleans meetings. At the first of these sessions a thoughtful and detailed position paper entitled "ASA-UNESCO Relations in Retrospect and Prospect" by Clarence E. Glick, University of Hawaii, was presented and responses were provided by Reuben Hill and Harry Alpert. Summarizing ASA-UNESCO Committee efforts over the past decade, Professor Glick indicated that first of all "our representations backed up by the ASA Council at a crucial moment played a part in UNESCO's continuing financial support for the fragile International Social Science Association." Second, he noted "the 1970 conference on the role of social sciences in development as stemming from ideas generated through this Committee was influential in getting funds allocated to the 1973-74 social science budget for three new programs concerned with training of social scientists in Africa and Asia." Third, "the activity of this Committee led to the election for the first time of the ASA to a three year membership on the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO." Fourth, "our Committee has asked for and received support from ASA Officers and Council who have communicated with the State Department at crucial moments in regard to UNESCO's social science program." Fifth, "at nine Annual Meetings this Committee has had the participation in its Committee conferences and public sessions of the U.S. State Department's Officer who prepares position papers on the State Department's policy on the social science program and budget for UNESCO." Sixth, "at each Annual Meeting since 1964 this Committee has invited the participation of leading members in other social science organizations partly to encourage them to organize committees on UNESCO and their associations or in other ways to collaborate with us in working on behalf of UNESCO's social science program." And seventh, Dr. Glick observed that "this Committee has maintained communication with the UNESCO Department of the Social Sciences through Dr. Harry Alpert when he was Director and through his successor Dr. Gene Lyons."

In response to this, Reuben Hill expressed "support specifically for the focus suggested by Dr. Glick for UNESCO's Department of Social Science: that of providing technical assistance to build cadres of social scientists in the rapidly developing countries of the world as its major contribution to these countries." This would be accomplished through the mechanism of regional training programs, post training seminars and the organizing of national or regional sociology associations. Moreover he pointed out that the International Sociological Association has made beginnings in this direction through the work of its numerous research committees. Along with the monitoring activities in national and regional associations undertaken by ISA officials, Professors Hill and Glick indicated the importance of gaining a suitable forum at the ISA World Congress in Toronto in 1974 to discuss the UNESCO role in the social sciences throughout the world.

Also turning to future activities, Harry Alpert saw the need for liaison by the ASA secretariat on UNESCO related matters, with our Committee to serve as a proposal generating mechanism in this connection; there appear to be communication problems with the general ASA membership about the activities of this Committee and he wished to suggest that new means be found to eliminate these obstacles. To this end he suggested that what is now the ASA FOOTNOTES serve as the appropriate vehicle for the dissemination of information about our several international programs. He also suggested that better understanding by the ASA of its potential international role could be achieved through the formal designation of someone in the ASA secretariat to look after international matters—for example, urging the U.S. State Department to increase support for UNESCO. Alpert also warned about taking too narrow a focus by embracing only the work of UNESCO as there are other international organizations such as ILO and OECD which properly ought to be dovetailed with various ASA efforts.

In response to the assertions of Glick, Alpert, and Hill in regard to the educational role of the ASA vis-a-vis UNESCO activities, Charles Loomis felt that there was a distinct

danger in over-emphasizing these approaches and not giving due emphasis to a problem-solving orientation. If sociology cannot demonstrate direct pay-off in the solution of pressing world problems, he argued, then it cannot lay claim to support from the citizenry.

As to the Committee on International Cooperation, no chaired meeting was held in New Orleans due to faulty notification and the absence of several members. However, an informal meeting was held with Russell Dynes, William Liu, Alejandro Portes, and Reuben Hill to discuss general matters of interest to the committee.

In response to members of the former Standing Committees on UNESCO and International Cooperation, ASA Council in September 1972 merged the two Committees to achieve closer coordination in their obviously overlapping aims and activities. Edward Tiryakian and Don Mills were appointed Co-Chairmen for 1972-73 and charged with planning the reorganization of the two Committees to bring about a more effective structure. Moreover, in response to Committee members' wishes for greater support by the ASA as an organization, the Executive Office pledged to provide full support to our efforts and the Executive Officer indicated that he would do what he could to enlarge ASA's international role.

The co-chairmen consulted past and present members of the previous respective committees and invited suggestions about activities and programs which the new Committee might undertake. A preliminary planning session then took place in the ASA office on April 21, 1973. In addition to Mills and Tiryakian, also present were Otto Larsen and Maurice Jackson of the Executive Office and three resource persons having a variety of significant experiences with sociology outside the United States: Reuben Hill (President of the International Sociological Association); Irwin Sanders (Chairman of the Subcommittee on Liaison with East European Sociologists); and John Useem (member of the UNESCO Committee).

A range of alternatives was explored in discussing the basic objectives, functions, and structure of the new Committee. Council has been requested to consider the following recommendations: (a) That the name of the Committee be changed from the Committee on International Cooperation and UNESCO to the Committee on Development of World Sociology, to better reflect the long-term objective of the Committee. (b) That a representative of Council attend the meeting of the Committee convened at the annual ASA meetings so as to maintain close and continuous liaison between the Committee and Council. (c) That Council give serious consideration to Mexico City as the location of the 1980 ASA annual meeting, hopefully to be co-sponsored by the Latin American Sociological Association. The choice of Mexico City is not only meritorious in terms of cost and intrinsic interest to ASA membership, but it also should achieve a greater rapprochement of sociologists in North America, and those in Central and South America. This would bring about a fuller realization of the title of our association, the American Sociological Association, and is in keeping with the international spirit of the 1964 and 1974 Montreal ASA Meetings. Cooperation with the Latin American Sociological Association and other sociological groups in Latin America in planning the 1980 meetings would be highly important.

The April planning session concluded that the focus of the new Committee on Development of World Sociology should be on furthering the internationalizing of American sociology (see article by Janowitz and Hill, *The American Sociologist*, May, 1973) and providing advisory and administrative services to the ASA, its Council, and Executive Office in matters effecting the development of world sociology. We see this emerging in the following Committee activities: (a) liaison with private and public organizations and agencies which deal with international social science affairs; (b) the facilitation of exchange of scholars and exchange of information; and (c) the utilization of resources of American sociology (e.g., departments, research centers, etc.) to assist in strengthening sociology abroad, particularly in developing countries.

Liaison activities are basically of a twofold nature: first, with international public and professional organizations such as UNESCO, ILO, and the International Sociological Association; second, with domestic public and private organizations such as SSRC. In addition, an important past activity integral to the Committee has been liaison with regional associations and interests outside the United States such as the Subcommittees on East European Sociologists and Asian Sociologists, and for the future with Africa, China,

and Latin America.

In keeping with the objective of providing assistance for the development of sociology abroad, and in cooperation with American departments and universities, consideration is being given to special six-week workshops for young persons from other countries interested in the sociological perspective who would come and receive intensive training (e.g., in demography, methodology, survey research, rural sociology, etc.) at such places as the University of Hawaii East-West Center, to the designation of sociologists travelling abroad as informal ASA representatives to look for people who might come to North America and speak on sociological topics.

The Washington meeting also discussed problems in the structure and staffing of the Committee. One problem has been that many Committee members who were in the process of making important contributions (preparation of reports, etc.) have been taken off the Committee and were replaced by others who have marginal interests in the work and thus, for a variety of reasons (including inability to attend Committee meetings), have not made any contributions to the Committee. Therefore, it has been proposed to the Council that the Committee on Committees consider guidelines in making appointments to the Committee designed to correct these difficulties in the future—for example, the appointment of vitally interested members, lengthening terms of appointment, and closer liaison with the ASA Council.

Donald L. Mills
Edward A. Tiryakian
Co-Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FREEDOM OF RESEARCH AND TEACHING

The history of our committee has been clearly one of troubles. Born out of the expressed concern of members that the traditional freedoms to undertake research and teaching enjoyed by sociology and sociologists were being increasingly threatened by some departments, university administrations and some government agencies, the Committee was set up to recommend appropriate action to the council. There was, in addition, some concern that the conventional academic defense organizations, AAUP, ACLU, etc., were not providing complete coverage of our exposed flanks.

The Committee's first venture into an investigation into charges of violation of academic freedom was far from a great success. Operating conscientiously and with the best of intentions, we managed to appear as if we were interfering in the affairs of a friendly neighboring country.

Since that first venture some years ago, the Committee has not been able to function very well. In part, the Committee's problems stemmed from an unclear mandate from the Council: In part, Committee members had little stomach for sticking their necks out to be guillotined by the Council. As a consequence, the Committee has done very little for the last three years.

So much for the past: The present Committee does not intend to continue a null existence. We are taking very seriously the mandate of the Council as set down in its November 1972 meeting and have started to clear up a rather large backlog of cases as well as starting on "limited fact-finding investigations" on several new cases. The cases cover a wide range, from a complaint that some schools are asking for arrest and conviction records from job applicants, to charges that a department is being purged for its political leanings.

The Committee has developed a routine procedure for handling complaints. The first step of the procedure involves determining whether or not the Committee has jurisdiction over the matter in question, the criteria of jurisdiction being those set down in the appropriate resolutions of the Council. If the Committee accepts jurisdiction, then the Chairman writes to the parties involved asking for details about the complaints, documents that pertain to the case, and ascertaining whether other organizations (e.g. AAUP) are involved in the case. The documents collected form a dossier on the case, which is then read by the Committee, which then recommends appropriate action. Appropriate action may range from a gentle letter from the Chairman suggesting to the parties involved that a slight alteration in local procedures may alleviate the ongoing conflict to recommending to the Council that the ASA go on record as censuring an institution.

The presently reconstituted Committee started on its present rush of activity in late April 1973. At that time, Committee files contained approximately 15 complaints, some

of which were obviously old and probably settled. We wrote to the complainants in each case, asking the status of the dispute and offering to undertake a "limited fact finding investigation" in each case. By the time of our next meeting at the end of June 1973, we were able to write off many of the cases as either settled or dormant (i.e. complainants could not be located or were no longer interested in pressing their complaints).

The Augean stables were not cleaned out however. The slight publicity created by the revitalization of the Committee brought in new business. At the time of the writing of this report, we have under active consideration a total of ten cases with an additional four cases in a dormant, suspended file. Our activity in most of these cases consists of correspondence with complainants and other parties asking for information on the charges made.

Obviously the most serious cases are those in which faculty members have been dismissed from their positions because, as they allege, of their political or ideological positions. In every case, the persons involved are non-tenured, usually younger faculty. In most cases, it appears as if the universities involved have observed due process procedures as locally defined for the handling of the non-renewal or promotion of non-tenured persons. Yet the circumstances of the refusals to rehire or to promote often suggest that ideological considerations played some role. In one such case, where several faculty members were non-renewed and the department chairman deposed, the circumstances quite strongly suggest a "purge". The Committee's intervention so far has been mainly to serve as a fact-finding body.

Several actions taken by the Committee are directed toward the Council, as follows:

1. We recommend that the Council pass a resolution asking that Departments not request information from job applicants concerning previous arrest and convictions.

2. We recommend that the Council pass a resolution to support the AAUP in its findings of censure against East Tennessee State University for dismissing a tenured associate professor of sociology and against the University of Missouri (Columbia) for actions taken against the Chairman of the Department of Sociology at that institution.

The Committee will continue with its work over the summer months. We hope to have additional items of business to place upon the agenda of the Council in August.

Peter H. Rossi
Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC INFORMATION

As a member of this Committee since September, 1970, and its chairman since September, 1972, I can testify to its quiescence. This was a sharp contrast with several years of effort to promote an active press-relations program, at least at Annual Meetings, pursued during the late Sixties. Perhaps the barely visible profile displayed to the press at recent Annual Meetings is a reflection of these less sanguine times. Partly, it was an unavoidable consequence of the geographic locales of recent Annual Meetings, to which a sizable number of journalists could not be attracted. How much effort should be expended on the press at an annual meeting, no matter where it is held, is the basic question in shaping a public-information policy. The question was recently broached. It is hoped at least a tentative answer will shortly be forthcoming. The coming Annual Meeting will display the answer in the pressroom.

Bernard Roschko
Chair

REPORT OF THE STOFFER AWARD COMMITTEE

This new award, created to honor Samuel A. Stouffer, 43rd president of the ASA, will be conferred for the first time in 1973 for "a work or series of works published in the last five years which in the opinion of the Selection Committee has notably advanced the methodology of sociological research." The Selection Committee was appointed at the end of 1972. As of the April 1, 1973 deadline, a total of twelve nominations had been received, some from Committee members, some from the general membership and some from publishers. The Committee is currently engaged in ranking the works and authors nominated, and anticipates arriving at a selection by the time of the New York meetings.

John A. Clausen
Chair

REPORT OF THE SOROKIN AWARD COMMITTEE

The Committee's activities consisted of a two-stage process of evaluating books for the 1972 Sorokin Award. In the first stage, the Committee examined and ranked the twelve books nominated for the Award (of the twelve, eight were nominated by members of the Committee and four by the membership). These books included:

Theodore Abel, *The Foundation of Sociological Theory*
Heribert Adam, *Modernizing Racial Domination: The Dynamics of South African Politics*
Peter M. Blau and Richard A. Schoenherr, *The Structure of Organizations*
William Chambliss and Robert Seidman, *Law, Order and Power*
Kenneth M. Dolbear and Phillip E. Hammond, *The School Prayer Decision: From Court Policy to Local Practice*
Robert L. Hamblin, *The Humanization Processes: A Social, Behavioral Analysis of Children's Problems*
Eliot Freidson, *The Profession of Medicine*
Frances Piven and Richard Cloward, *Regulating the Poor*
Lee Rainwater, *Behind Ghetto Walls: Black Families in a Federal Slum*
Albert J. Reiss, Jr., *The Police and the Public*
Richard A. Schermerhorn, *Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research*
Sidney M. Willhelm, *Who Needs the Negro?*

The second stage involved a meeting of the Committee in New Orleans on Monday, August 28, at which each of the books was discussed at some length. The Committee finally decided that the 1972 Award should go to Eliot Freidson for his book, *The Profession of Medicine*.

Patricia L. Kendall
Chair

REPORT OF DU BOIS-JOHNSON-FRAZIER AWARDS COMMITTEE

The Committee has neither met nor been in extensive correspondence since the time of the 1972 annual meeting of the ASA. Consequently there are no matters to report to the Council prior to the 1973 annual ASA sessions. A meeting of the Committee has been scheduled in New York City. At that meeting the Committee will determine the winner(s) of the award for this biennium past and consider other matters pertinent to the work of the Committee and formulate its report and recommendations (if any) to the Council of ASA.

Butler A. Jones
Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

A number of issues have been presented to the Ethics Committee which are under consideration. They include:

- 1) Protection of researchers' rights around the issue of confidentiality
 - 2) Alteration in the ASA Code of Ethics to cover
 - a) Problems of publication rights of graduate students whose dissertations are part of larger projects of professors; i.e., coauthorships, independent publication, senior and junior authorships, and acknowledgements
 - b) Specification of ethics regarding acknowledgement of use of other persons' major ideas or work in articles and books
 - 3) Issues of the rights of privacy and protection of subjects used in research
- Members of the Association are invited to express their views in writing regarding any of these issues which will be discussed at the Annual Meeting of the ASA in August.

Cynthia Fuchs Epstein
Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TEACHING UNDERGRADUATE SOCIOLOGY

The Committee on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology was essentially not active during this year. Having been instrumental in the development of the new ASA Section on Undergraduate Education, activities in the area of undergraduate teaching moved to the new Section.

A report of the Chairman of this Committee to the Executive Officer of the American Sociological Association on the future of this Committee and on the needs of the Section on Undergraduate Education was presented to the Council of the American Sociological Association. In this report the

Chairman recommended that since the Committee had supported the development of the Section, it was reasonable to shift responsibilities for undergraduate education as proper domain of this Section. Based on these developments, the report included the recommendation that the Committee on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology be discontinued. ASA Council approved this recommendation so that 1972-73 is the last year of the operation of this Committee. The needed continuity will be assured since several members of the Committee are also on the Council of the Section on Undergraduate Education.

Hans O. Mauksch
 Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN SOCIOLOGY

The 1972-73 year was an important one for the Committee in several respects. First, the status of the Committee was changed from that of an ad hoc to a standing committee of the Association. To the committee members the change indicates that the ASA supports and regards as legitimate major long-term projects designed to increase equality for women sociologists. Second, the handbook on which the Committee had worked for an extended period was published by the Association.

The Committee held two meetings during the year, the first of which was February 16-17, 1973. At that meeting the following actions were taken:

1. A mandate for the Committee was written and submitted to ASA Council. At its subsequent meeting Council approved the mandate. (See April, 1973 issue of FOOTNOTES for statement).

2. A statement supporting the establishment of a Women's Equity Officer was prepared and sent to Council. Council passed the following motion with reference to the statement: "For up to the next two fiscal years, we shall fund a staff position of Executive Specialist concerned with both minority and women's matters. The occupant of this position shall, with the cooperation of the appropriate Standing Committees, attempt to seek funds to maintain two Executive Specialist positions in these areas."

3. A request was made that Council inquire into the policies and practices of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences concerning the participation of women in the program. Council agreed to make the inquiry.

In addition, the Committee made plans at that meeting to have representation at each of the regional meetings. Although no funds were available for this purpose, Committee members were able to attend most of the regional meetings and discuss the activities of the Committee as well as solicit suggestions about possible Committee programs.

The second meeting of the Committee was held on May 18-19, 1973. A series of resolutions was prepared at that meeting for submission to Council. The resolutions are as follows:

1. WHEREAS the American Sociological Association deplores attempts to avoid compliance with the legislative acts and executive orders concerning affirmative action, and

WHEREAS the Association deplores assertions that affirmative action represents reverse discrimination and violates academic freedom, and

WHEREAS academic freedom does not include freedom to discriminate on grounds of race, creed, national origin, age or sex, and

WHEREAS, as Bernice Sandler has noted in the February 5, 1973 issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*,

Some academic administrators have been raising the cry of 'academic freedom' as the federal government enforces anti-discrimination laws on campus. They claim that the government is 'forcing' them to give preference to 'unqualified' women and minorities. . . . (Note the covert assumption that somehow women and minorities are not 'qualified,'—no one ever talks about a 'qualified man,' only about 'qualified women' and 'qualified minorities'.)

Traditionally, academic freedom has meant such things as the right of individuals to publish, to teach, to work with controversial ideas. There is no academic freedom that exempts members of the college and university community from observing the same anti-discrimination laws that the rest of society must observe.

How does it violate academic freedom to ask an end to the preference that always existed in higher education: the preference for males, the preference for whites, the preference for the children of the

rich, the preference for the members of the 'old boy' club?

. . . Male administrators and faculty members are upset because they have generally relied on the 'old boy' method of recruiting, the vast informal network of old school chums, colleagues, drinking buddies, and people you meet at conventions—an informal network to which women and minorities rarely have access. The merit system has always been a closed system, because large portions of the available and qualified pool have been excluded. The government is not asking that the merit system be abolished, but only that it be opened up to a larger pool of qualified persons.

. . . There is no intention whatsoever to force university and college employers to hire less-qualified women or minorities. The employer must make a 'good faith' effort to recruit women and minorities, and document what was done. If, after that effort, the best-qualified candidate turns out to be white and male, then that is who is hired.

WHEREAS the American Sociological Association recommends that its members support and promote affirmative action programs within their departments, colleges, universities and other agencies and institutions, both public and private.

2. WHEREAS personal information, such as a person's marital and parental status, is not normally relevant to professional evaluation, and

WHEREAS such personal information may bias objective evaluation of professional qualifications and experiences, and

WHEREAS personal information can be especially detrimental to the objective evaluation of women sociologists, and

WHEREAS the American Sociological Association wants to encourage selection and hiring decisions on the basis of professional qualifications and experiences, and

WHEREAS the continuing use of personal informal on most *curricula vitae* puts women who omit such information at a relative disadvantage.

BE IT RESOLVED that the American Sociological Association urge all of its members to omit information on marital and parental status from their *curricula vitae*, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that information on marital and parental status be omitted from the applicant listings in the FOOTNOTES Employment Bulletin.

3. WHEREAS the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology has been asked to suggest nominees to replace outgoing members of our Committee, and

WHEREAS we are concerned about the inherent tendency of committees to become self-perpetuating, and

WHEREAS we would like the broadest possible input into our consideration of possible nominees for this committee, and

WHEREAS the purpose of soliciting nominees from all members is to broaden the basis of new committee membership.

WE RESPECTFULLY REQUEST that the names of those suggested by solicitation of the general membership be forwarded to the CSWS before the August meetings and

WE FURTHER RECOMMEND that this become a standard practice in the future.

4. WHEREAS Sociologists for Women in Society represents a large and organized segment of our constituency, and

WHEREAS efficient communication between Sociologists for Women in Society and the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology is often important for the concerns of this committee,

WE RESPECTFULLY REQUEST that henceforth at least one member of this Committee be a person initially selected from among candidates recommended by Sociologists for Women in Society.

5. WHEREAS the ASA Council requested the Executive Officer to consult with all interested membership groups in seeking candidates for the position of Executive Specialist, and

WHEREAS the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology, although not responsible for recruitment to this position, is concerned with facilitating the process through which an individual is selected who is responsive to the needs of women in the profession,

WE RESPECTFULLY REQUEST that Council approve the involvement of the Committee on the Status of Women or its designated representative in the interviewing and evaluation of candidates for the position of Executive Specialist.

The Committee also spent considerable time at the second meeting working on the questionnaire dealing with the status of women and minorities in graduate departments of sociology. Data from that question-

naire are to be presented at the August meetings of the ASA in the session organized by the Committee on "The Changing Status of Women in Sociology."

The forthcoming year promises to be an even busier one for the Committee. We intend to establish closer ties with our regional counterparts; to obtain more information on and give more attention to women sociologists in community colleges and four-year institutions; to determine data needs and possible sources on women in non-academic settings; and to communicate with similar committees in other social science associations. To carry out these activities, we will need more financial assistance than we received during 1972-73. Campus visits, an important activity during the Committee's first year, were discontinued in our second and third years because of our limited funds. We are convinced that such visits should be resumed. The volume of mail that has come to the Committee or to the Executive Specialist, the size of the groups we met at the regional meetings, the comments made to individual Committee members all indicate that the Committee has a substantial amount of work ahead of it. Our activities thus far have been facilitated through the support we have received from the Executive Specialist and others in the national office as well as from ASA Council. We anticipate the continuation of that support as we pursue our principal goal: that of equalizing opportunities for women and men in sociology.

Cora B. Marrett
 Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND PRIVACY

This is the third annual report of an *ad hoc* committee and, in the face of the changes in composition of the Committee, much of the year has slipped away in getting oriented to past committee affairs and, most particularly, preoccupation with the implications of the Popkin case for the protection of the research process, which is to say the privacy of those who cooperate with the researcher on the basis of their trust in his capacity to preserve confidentiality.

Nonetheless, the experience of the past year and review of the two prior reports of the Committee seem to indicate that a point has been reached where some clarification of function is necessary, and action on the part of Council, by way of dissolving or reconstituting the Committee appropriate. This necessity seems to exist in the light of a clear overlap of some of the interests of the Committee with those of the Committees on Professional Ethics and on Freedom of Research and Teaching, and also in light of the fact that some of the interests of the Committee are not specifically problems for sociologists so much as problems for social scientists, information and computer specialists, and research and governmental institutions as such.

Let us take the overlap with Standing Committees first. Items 3 and 5 of the Code of Ethics both bear on the issue of privacy. Item 3 on the right of the research subject to privacy and dignity, and Item 5 on preservation of confidentiality of research data. Item 4 urges that subjects be protected from personal harm, and is also related in that harm can stem from failure to keep the identity of informants confidential. Concrete cases where individuals have failed to conform to the Code are clearly in the domain of the Committee on Professional Ethics, while concrete cases of institutional arrangements which prevent an individual from conforming to the Code are in the domain of the Committee on Freedom of Research and Teaching. Such should not be covered by this Committee.

If there is any special role for the Committee on Information Technology and Privacy, and if it is capable of serving that special role, it must be at the level of evaluating institutional and technological contexts of privacy—governmental agency policies, for example, the status of *de facto* or *de jure* testimonial privilege for researchers, the political climate of the nation which influences the discretionary use of power, the status of the trends toward linking files into central data banks, and the like. In the light of its evaluation, the Committee may see fit to recommend to one of the Standing Committees that more particular guidelines be laid down within its domain—for example, that in investigating highly sensitive issues, and without legal protection against subpoena of research information, the ethical researcher should keep no record at all of any identifying information, or that to guard against the possibility of future pooling of data into a central "bank," the ethical researcher should take pains to avoid any use

at all of the social security number for identification of responses, and so on. This role of general assessment and evaluation, however, is a very complex one for which the Committee is not equipped, for it requires money and staff which are not available to it.

It is also consonant with its function that the Committee could serve as a collection and transmission point for information on various techniques by which research data can be processed so as to provide maximum protection for the identities of research subjects. A few of these techniques were mentioned in the 1972 report. And indeed, inquiries about such devices were received this year from sociologists in the United States, Canada, and West Germany. But as its composition and its resources are presently constituted, the Committee is in a rather poor position to serve such a technical clearing-house function.

Finally, there is an even broader function with which the Committee could be and has been concerned—namely evaluating information technology as such, its present and likely future capabilities, its present and likely future use by and distribution in government and private enterprises, and its possible social consequences. These concerns, however, involve considerably more than the one discipline of sociology, and seem better carried out by some form of institutionalized interdisciplinary or inter-professional committee with adequate financial and secretarial resources. Earlier Committee reports suggested to Council that it initiate specially funded projects, or that it recommend a new SSRC committee. NSF initiated in late 1972 a new section on Computer Impact on Society "to support research designed to help better understand the impact computers have on our way of life." And at the same time, Quadrangle Press published Alan F. Westin's review of the issue of data banks. Many resources exist, therefore, outside of sociology which provide the kind of information sociologists need for themselves. Council can see to it that sociologists are represented in such new institutionalized endeavors, or it can initiate a proposal for gaining support of a specially formulated activity of its own if it considers the issue of information technology and privacy important enough to push, but the present Committee is neither in a position to do a study of its own on so broad an issue, nor to collect for the Association all of the information that is becoming available.

Thus, it is felt that Council should either dissolve or reconstitute the present Committee, for it does not have the resources to perform many of its potential functions, and it is in danger of merely duplicating other potential functions over which some of the Standing Committees have clear jurisdiction. The recommendations made by this Committee in 1970 and 1972 to the Council are here endorsed again, but it is the ASA, not the Committee, which has the resources to take action on such matters as communication with other social science associations, generating a new SSRC committee, actively collecting information from the membership on threats to privacy in sociological research, and cooperating with other associations in establishing and maintaining a clearinghouse for information related to information technology and threats to privacy and the confidential relationship between the researcher-scholar and those he studies.

On balance, it is felt that the Committee should not be dissolved, but reconstituted as what the 1972 report called a "policy-advisory" board. As such, composed of members who maintain some degree of continuous interest in the strategic issues of record-keeping, information technology and its social organization, ethical and legal problems of research involving human subjects, and the like, it could serve as an occasionally useful resource for some of the Standing Committees, the Council, the Executive Office and the membership.

Eliot Freidson,
 Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TEACHING SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL STUDIES IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Since the Committee seems not to have convened at all in 1972-73, the current members had no continuing business to deal with and their aim at present is to find a purpose for themselves.

Since they could conveniently meet, the two members resident in Boston drew up a proposed agenda, focussed on the evaluation of the materials prepared for secondary schools (and junior, community and teachers' colleges) by the now defunct committee, Sociological Resources for Social Studies. To this end the chairperson sought the help of the publishers, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., but,

though keenly interested, they found it impossible to provide us with any significant statistics, such as might be used to identify the more from the less successful of the SRSS commodities. The one member of the Committee who, by reason of his thesis, has information of the sort we wish, is not able to come to New York. Factual data on SRSS's present plight is apparently not to be had.

David Booth of the Committee submitted a proposal for considering the preparation of teachers in the effective use of SRSS materials. Moreover, Professor Giaquinta of the Department of Educational Sociology, New York University, sent a description of a training program leading to the MA. He suggests a joining of forces, our Committee and his program to seek funds together for a training project. This, of course, puts our Committee squarely in the middle of fields now stoutly in the possession of the schools of education. It is a question whether they lie within our competence.

Nevertheless, it is proposed that the coming meeting be devoted to a discussion of these two protocols, in the hope that some suitable, realistic, and useful program may be evolved.

Helen MacGill Hughes
Chair

REPORT OF AD HOC COMMITTEE ON WAR AND PEACE STUDIES

Introduction

The Ad Hoc Committee on War and Peace Studies appointed by the ASA Council at the 1972 Annual Meeting has defined its rather general mandate "to recommend to Council a program of action that would be aimed toward the investigation of war and peace" in the following terms:

To define a sociological area of research in the area of war and peace studies;

To survey existing research, teaching, field work, and social action activities in the war-peace field within the ASA;

To articulate the relationship of peace action to peace research, teaching, and field-work;

To propose a program of activities and publications for a standing committee in the war and peace studies field that will enable the ASA to fulfill its appropriate functions in this area; and

To make recommendations to the ASA Council, to sociology departments, and to the profession generally, that will give added strength to the work of such a standing committee.

The first meeting of this committee was held on March 17 at the ASA office in Washington, with all members present. We were fortunate in having both Otto Larsen and Maurice Jackson present to assist us in our thinking. As a result of this meeting, we make the following recommendations.

Recommendations to ASA Council

That the Ad Hoc Committee on War and Peace Studies be known as the Committee on Sociology of World Conflicts;

That a listing of "Sociology of World Conflicts" be added to the ASA roster of areas of competence used in compiling the Directory.

That the Committee be authorized to conduct a clearing house for distribution of course materials in the sociology of world conflicts on the basis of materials received in response to the inquiry letter to colleagues the Committee is placing in the May issue of FOOTNOTES;

That the Committee be authorized to seek funding for the preparation and distribution of a booklet on the Sociology of World Conflicts, that will do the following: define the field of the Sociology of World Conflicts, describe the status of that field within sociology itself, prepare a bibliography that will let sociologists know what the available teaching and research resources in the field are, and relate the sociological field to the broader interdisciplinary study of world conflicts;

That Council facilitate cooperation between this ad hoc committee and the ASA Committee on Racial and Ethnic Minorities and the Committee on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology, as well as the Committee on International Cooperation and UNESCO, by funding a joint meeting of the chairpersons of these committees. We feel that each of these committees has valuable inputs to make to the work of the other committees;

That place be made for two sessions to be devoted to the Sociology of World Conflicts in the 1974 ASA program at Montreal; and

That the Ad Hoc Committee on Sociology of World Conflicts be strengthened for 1973-74 with the addition of a fifth member and that care be taken in the appointment of Committee members to see that various perspectives and social philosophies concern-

ing world order are represented. The following statement spells out the rationale for the Sociology of World Conflicts as an area of study and the importance of support from the American Sociological Association for its development.

Rationale for the Sociology of World Conflicts as an Area of Study

To assist Council in its thinking about the future of the temporary subcommittee it appointed last fall, we offer the following statement about the sociology of world conflicts as a special area within the discipline and the importance of support from the Association in the development of this new field.

One way of indicating the area of concern is to list other terms by which the area or aspects of it have been known: war and peace, international conflict, transnational relations, imperialism, and international relations. In other words, we are interested in large collectivities such as nation states, ethnic groups, political movements, and religions, whose conflicting relations both involve and may transcend national state boundaries. In order to comprehend such conflicts, we also must take into account the non-conflicting relations at least insofar as they affect the awareness of conflicts, how they are conducted, and what their outcomes are.

The ASA should support a committee to encourage and facilitate work in this field for several reasons. The most obvious is that the subject matter is of the highest importance to humankind. World conflicts have and can again result directly in the deaths of millions of humans. The disruptions caused by anticipating violence and the dislocations from experiencing it interfere with economic, political, and social developments desired by people generally. On the other hand conflicts play a necessary role in the emergence of collectivities and their autonomy; conflicts may also be critical in the liberation of collectivities to pursue social, political, and economic development for the group as a whole and for their individual members.

Not only are world conflicts of great importance, but sociologists can contribute much to their understanding. This is discussed below and in the description of the proposed handbook on the status of the sociological study of world conflicts. It is presumed that knowledge about world conflicts will help mitigate the consequences not desired by the participants and increase the results wished for by them.

The ASA, in particular, should take initiative in encouraging work in this field because it has been a matter of major interest in the sociological tradition but has suffered neglect in recent decades. Part of the reason for neglect has been the questionable legitimacy of sociologists being concerned with large-scale questions with heavy value implications, and which seem to fall into other disciplines' domains. Some of this is changing, but the formal encouragement of the ASA can be important in speeding such developments and thus more quickly leading to greater research, training, and teaching in the area of world conflicts.

Finally, given these recent developments, this is an opportune time for such action by the ASA. There has been great concern within the sociological profession about the Vietnam War, but the formation of a committee on world conflicts at this time would be less partisan than at earlier periods. This is a time for analysis and interpretations of where we have been and where we are going. There is growing interest and support for sociological studies of transnational struggles. Students have been requesting and getting sociology courses in war and peace, imperialism, peace studies, militarism, and non-violence. Members of the sociological discipline have been drawn to and begun working in this area from the perspectives of radicals, third world people, governmental advisors, pacifists, and other stances. Underlying all this is the sociological perspective which sees world conflicts as another aspect of social life and whose study would advance sociological insight and knowledge and would also advance our understanding of transnational conflicts. It is a good time for the ASA to provide leadership in encouraging these developments.

Sociological analyses in the field of world conflicts will also contribute substantially to the development of the field of sociology itself. Contribution to sociological analysis can be in two ways: theoretically and substantively. In terms of theory and concepts, it provides an arena in which we can study fundamental social processes in new contexts. We can study socialization in regard to large collective identifications and the organized ways these are accomplished. We can study the mobilization of people by governmental authorities in crises. Further-

more, our theoretical knowledge will be better based by studying the emergence or failure of new organizations and institutionalization.

Sociological work in the area of world conflicts will also contribute substantively to sociology. We will be less likely to ignore the reality of permeable national boundaries. People, goods, and ideas follow patterns of movement which only in part are determined by political boundaries. Furthermore, each society is part of the environment of another. For example, it is not possible to fully comprehend the class structure in one society without considering the relations between each stratum with members of the strata in other societies. Such inter-societal relations affect the economic position, ideology, and power relations of strata within each society. For example, too, adversary relations between collectivities affect in many ways the solidarity and divisions within each collectivity.

Other Committee Activities

The Committee plans to initiate appropriate procedures for the establishment of a Section on the Sociology of World Conflicts within the ASA and to continue close cooperation with the Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development (COPRED), of which the American Sociological Association is a member.

It will also consider the possibility of preparing a reader on the Sociology of World Conflicts, which might be included in the Sociology Readers Series, *Issues and Trends*.

Timing problems prevented the Committee from organizing a regular program session for the 1973 ASA meetings, but an open Committee meeting will be held and publicized as well in advance as possible. In addition, the Committee will have a room reserved for an afternoon and evening during the meetings at which curriculum and resource materials in the Sociology of World Conflicts can be displayed; some Committee members will be present continuously during this display time to consult with interested colleagues about teaching, research, and field work in this new field.

A letter will be sent to the publishers who will be having displays at the meetings, asking them to include publication in the area of the Sociology of World Conflicts in their displays.

The Committee looks forward to continued development of the new field recognized by the establishment of this ad hoc committee.

Elise Boulding
Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT STATISTICS

The Committee has accomplishments to report in its efforts on behalf of improved measurement of the population of Spanish origin. One member was added to the Committee to aid in this work. Through his efforts and those of the then co-chairpersons, relationships with the Census Bureau were established which culminated in the Bureau's adding a sociologist of Spanish origin who has done considerable work on Spanish-origin population, to the Population Technical Advisory Committee which advises the Bureau on social and demographic statistics.

In addition, funds were sought and secured from the Center for Population Research, NICHD, for a Conference on Demographic Study of the Mexican-American Population. The Conference, held in May 1973, under the auspices of the Population Research Center, University of Texas, Austin, brought together some thirty-five scholars and government statisticians for an exchange of papers and for discussions on methods of improving measurement and on priorities for research on this population. The resolutions and papers of the Conference are being communicated to the appropriate statistical agencies.

In the past, the Committee has had enough of its members in the national capital area to conduct a good deal of business. With recent changes in membership this is no longer true. The present members are located in Arizona, Texas, Illinois, Virginia, Ontario, and two in D.C. Such a change is to be welcomed on several grounds. However, in the absence of travel funds, which were requested but unavailable, we have been limited to correspondence as to matters to be taken up when we meet in New York in August.

Prominent among the items under consideration is what action, if any, to recommend to the Association with respect to the recent report of the Committee on the Integrity of Federal Statistics. That Committee was convened jointly by the American Statistical Association and the Federal Statistics Users Conference in response to profes-

sional concerns over several recent developments involving federal statistical agencies. Its report, published in the April 1973 issue of *The American Statistician*, recommended principles for statistical agency practice which may merit the endorsement of the Association.

I expect we shall also discuss emerging changes in the Committee's success to its work. I am impressed by the success my immediate predecessors had, working on a limited issue with interested and receptive federal statisticians, offering to them technical expertise and assistance in recruiting expert consultation on matters of common concern. Leo Estrada has pointed out to me the contrasts between the productivity of this approach compared with past efforts to exert general pressure on agencies for improvements in their data. There should be no shortage of opportunities to be effective, and I expect we will be making some choices among these at our August meeting.

The Committee recommends that it be continued. It points out, in addition, that if we are to exploit the advantages offered by our newly-acquired geographical diversity, we should be allotted travel funds for one meeting in addition to our meeting at the Association's Annual Meeting.

Robert Parke
Chair

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT

This ad hoc Committee has been kept abreast of various studies pertaining to the demand and supply of sociologists. The evidence is still unclear and no report or summary is possible at this time.

Two meetings have been arranged during June and a session is scheduled for the Annual Meeting in August at which time the available evidence will be presented.

John W. Riley, Jr.
Chair

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIAISON WITH EAST EUROPEAN SOCIOLOGISTS

The main activity of the Subcommittee continues to be the distribution of a Newsletter on Sociology in Eastern Europe as a means of communication among members of the ASA and others. It is edited by Professor Bernard Faber, Connecticut College.

Professor Arnold Tannenbaum, University of Michigan, sought to ascertain interest of ASA members in collaborative projects with East European sociologists and stands ready to help with making the necessary contacts.

The number of requests to committee members from East European sociologists for assistance in making contacts with American sociologists has greatly accelerated during the year. The International Research and Exchanges Board had provided support for several sociologists in its exchange, research, and ad hoc programs, which partly explains the increased tempo of interchange.

Irwin T. Sanders
Chair

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

The main activity of the International Sociological Association has been to prepare the program for the World Congress to be held in Toronto from Saturday the 17th of August to Saturday the 24th of August 1974, just prior to the American Sociological Association meetings that year in Montreal. The full program was published in the *International Sociological Association Newsletter* #3 (December 1972). All persons who took out the new individual membership in the International Sociological Association received this newsletter, I believe. Those who are interested in receiving it in the future and in becoming members should write to the International Sociological Association, Via Daverio 7, 20122 Milano, Italy.

The 8th World Congress of Sociology will have four plenary sessions on, "The Scientific and Technological Revolution," "Sociologists in a Changing World," "Population," and "Poverty and Social Welfare." There will be fourteen working groups, which are essentially topical categories, each of which consists of several sessions with separate session chairmen. There will also be ten round tables, which are designed for more general discussion rather than presentation of papers. There will be seven symposia. Finally, the 30 research committees will meet, most of them several times during the week of the World Congress.

A full program was published in the January, 1973 FOOTNOTES. The World Congress is not organized in the same manner as the

American Sociological Association meetings. I am myself not entirely clear about the differences between the various types of sessions. In any case, if you want to present a paper at any of the sessions, I suggest that you do write to the appropriate individual session organizer.

It is my sad duty to report that Angelo Pagani, the former secretary general of the International Sociological Association, died of a heart attack on September 5, 1972.

Peter M. Blau
Representative

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE AMERICAN CORRECTIONAL ASSOCIATION

The American Correctional Association held its Annual Meeting in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on August 21-25, 1972. In recent decades this organization has systematically avoided addressing any important issues in the correctional field. There were few exceptions this year. There was a panel on Prisoners' Rights in which Gloria Steinem and Kate Millet (who Ms. Steinem invited to the panel) not only discussed the paternalistic approach to women in the correctional systems, but broached broader issues of rights and discrimination in prisons. However, for the most part the sessions continued to perform the major functions of the Association which are reiterating the importance of maintaining control over prison populations and dignifying the correctional establishment.

For the last two years Tom Murton, the former Warden of Tucker Farm, Arkansas (a position from which he was fired when he persisted in an investigation of past murders of prisoners at Tucker) and a professor of Criminal Justice Studies at the University of Minnesota has organized alternative meetings. His purpose has been to provide a forum for dissent to the oppressive correctional establishment. This year's alternative meetings, held in a hotel across the street from the main meetings, were moderately attended.

Next year's meetings will be held in Seattle on August 12-17 in the Olympic Hotel at the World Fair Grounds.

John Irwin
Representative

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE INTERPROFESSIONAL COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN

This again has been a relatively quiet year for official contact between me and the ICED.

There is some discussion now going on among members of the ICED regarding the establishment of a National Environmental Research Council. This Council would be charted by the Federal Government. Its principal function would be to stimulate research and policy endeavors dealing with problems of the constructed and built environment.

Robert Gutman
Representative

REPORT OF REPRESENTATIVE TO DIVISION OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES, NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Your representative to the Division of Behavioral Sciences of the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences, enacted no acts of representation during 1972-73 except to indicate to that body his willingness to serve as a member of the newly constituted Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences.

The NRC has been organized previously into eight divisions, one being the Division of Behavioral Sciences, and these Divisions have had most of the responsibility for the work of various commissions, panels, boards, etc. A reorganization is underway, replacing the eight Divisions with five Commissions and three Assemblies. The Commissions, each of which is to have, initially, a chairman and 14 members, are topically focussed bearing such real or proposed titles as Natural Resources, Human Resources, Peace and National Security, International Scientific Relations, and Societal Technologies; each Commission will have larger operating units called boards, and also commissions, panels, and other working groups, and in effect will take over the program activities now carried by the Divisions.

Each of the three Assemblies will group scientific and technical resources found in related disciplines and fields. The Division of Behavioral Sciences was replaced by the Assembly of Behavioral and Social Sciences in February 1973, becoming the first Assembly to be established. It is governed by a chairman (currently Robert McC. Adams)

and an Executive Committee of seven, later 10, members. I am not able to describe the Assembly and its work, since I do not understand it, and it seems altogether possible that it will be short-lived. It is to have responsibility for all current Division program activities unless and until the President of the Academy decides to assign any or all to one or another of the five Commissions, and it is required in its published Terms of Reference to develop a program of activities in line with its purpose. The initial membership of the Association of Behavioral and Social Sciences is drawn from present members of the Division of Behavioral Sciences, and it is the offer of such membership that I accepted. Given that this reorganization of the National Research Council is in process, the ASA probably should review its procedures for assigning representatives to the Council and determine whether any present representatives should continue in that role. My experience would indicate that serving as representative to the NRC, either its Division or its Assembly, is likely to be neither an important nor a burdensome responsibility, but perhaps there are important opportunities that I simply have not recognized. I have been to a single meeting, in the Spring of 1972, a meeting which was intellectually stimulating and, more so, socially pleasant.

Ernest Q. Campbell
Representative

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVES TO THE CONSORTIUM ON PEACE RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND DEVELOPMENT (COPRED)

The Annual Council Meeting of COPRED met in Windsor, Ontario on April 12-15, 1973. The program stressed the development of pure and applied research projects in the area of international conflict and conflict resolution and of courses in secondary and higher education institutions. Sessions were organized around the following themes: "Problems and Promises in Peace Education"; "United Nations Present Involvement in Peace Research"; "Researchers and Practitioners: Missing Links"; "Identifying Peace-Related Knowledge: A Progress Report"; "Regional Cooperation in Teaching Programs"; "Alternative Approaches to Peace Studies"; "Peace Research from the Radical Perspective"; and "Peace Action Research Collectives: Problems and Payoffs."

Since COPRED was established in 1970, it has occupied an important position as a vehicle for the encouragement and advancement of conflict and peace research. It has developed close links with other peace research associations abroad and with international organizations. With regard to the latter, of crucial importance to the sociological community is the growing relationship of COPRED to the United Nations and specifically UNITAR. Dr. Yassin El-Ayouty, Senior Political Affairs Officer and Chief of the U.N.'s African Section, gave in his keynote address to COPRED a current assessment of The U.N.'s interest in peace research. The U.N. regards, as does COPRED, peace research as any study which contributes information on the resolution of domestic and international conflict. Even though the U.N. has not developed a formal statement of policy on peace research studies, interest in seeing that the U.N. and UNITAR, in particular, fund, organize and generally stimulate peace research. Whether or not such interest develops beyond the discussion level depends on the support of the representatives of the Third World nations. The Third World nations are to a large degree unaware of the nature of peace research and what it can offer them. In fact, often they view conflict resolution research as another effort by developed countries to influence their internal affairs or at least to engage in another form of "intellectual imperialism." Dr. El-Ayouty called upon COPRED to further internationalize its membership to include more Third World input and thus act as a mechanism to gain support for the U.N. efforts. In addition, he thought that COPRED needs to work hard on convincing the United States Government to support U.N. policy on peace research being formulated. As he noted, the U.S. has not responded to efforts the U.N. has made in ascertaining the extent and quality of peace research in this country, although the United States has one of the major groups of peace researchers.

COPRED continues to work through several Task Forces: Research Inventory, Research Utilization, Peace Studies Consultation and Exchange, Curriculum Materials Development, and Radical Perspectives Working Group. Paul Wehr, at the Institute for World Order, is the Executive Director.
Louis Kriesberg
Christopher K. Vanderpool
Representatives

REPORT OF THE REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED STATES NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR UNESCO

Your representative participated in the Annual Meeting of the National Commission held in November, 1972 and in the Commission's conference on "The Environment: Man on Trial." Support of interdisciplinary approaches to the study of man and his environment is a central concern of the Commission.

The American delegation to the 17th session of the UNESCO General Conference held in Paris in October-November, 1972 included Dr. Henry David, Executive Secretary of the NAS Division of the Behavioral Sciences. The delegation expressed strong unqualified support for UNESCO's activities in the social sciences, noting that many of the pieces that were present in the social sciences of the '60's are now knit together into an integrated whole.

The UNESCO social science program in the next biennium (1973-74) will have three major thrusts: (1) building up social science facilities, especially in Asia and Africa, (2) strengthening methods to make social science research a more effective instrument of planning and (3) giving greater attention to the applications of social science in such areas as population, drug abuse, human rights, environment, and youth.

It is recognized that despite increasing UNESCO interest in the social sciences, the program remains underfunded. Your representative recommends that the Association continue its efforts to identify the areas of greatest need in the social sciences viewed in international perspective and to urge the Department of State to pursue even more vigorously its interest in strengthening the role of the social sciences in UNESCO.

Your representative was elected to the Commission's Executive Committee. He also serves on its Program Committee.

Harry Alpert
Representative

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON CRIMINOLOGY

This year has been an inactive one, as far as the Section on Criminology is concerned, although a number of individuals have expressed an interest in developing long-range plans that could be carried out despite the turnover of the section chairman. The election of officers yielded the following results: Chairman-Elect, Marvin Wolfgang; Council, Pamela Roby and Paul Takagi.

I would like to thank Professor Sheldon Messinger, Sol Tannenbaum, and Richard Quinney for their work in carrying out the election of section officers.

Gresham M. Sykes
Chair

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON COMMUNITY

The formation of the Community Section has received enthusiastic response. Both at the initial business meeting in New Orleans and through communications during the past year, numerous colleagues have indicated specific interest in the Section's giving attention to one or more aspects of community studies.

The interests expressed have converged around three principal areas of emphasis;

1. The pursuit of community research, with considerable emphasis among many members on multi-community research, including comparative multi-community studies in different countries. An important part of this interest lies in pursuing the determinants of specific community actions, such as adoption of new social programs.

2. The teaching of courses on the community—methods, syllabi, reading lists, types of field study, etc.

3. Studies which address the social problems of communities, especially of large cities, and which deal with strategies for community change.

The program for the 1973 Section day meetings in New York City has been arranged around these three main areas of interest. Under the general program chairmanship of Irwin T. Sanders, Peter H. Rossi has organized a session on Research on the Community, Philip G. Olson and Jacqueline Scherer have organized a session on Styles and Issues in Teaching Community, and John Van Til has organized a session on Social Action in the Community.

At the business meeting, organizational and program activities for next year will be

discussed. One suggestion is for a joint program with community sociologists from other countries at the International Sociological Association meetings in Canada in 1974.

Section members are urged to attend the business meeting, as well as the substantive sessions, and to offer suggestions as to points of emphasis for next year. Officers and members of the Community Section Council will make it a point to spend a good deal of time in the Section room throughout the day. They encourage all members to do likewise and to make the Community Section room their headquarters on that day, so that there will be occasion for informal chats as well as for the organized programs.

Roland L. Warren
Chair

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON THE SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

The Section's activities during the past year are largely an outgrowth of suggestions made at the 1972 Council and Business meetings in New Orleans which have led to new efforts to assure vigorous leadership and the active participation of its members. To these ends, the Section standing committees on Publications, Nominations, and the Annual Program all were reactivated, and two new committees were established: a Committee on Planning and Development which has the responsibility of preparing specific proposals for future activities of the Section requiring long-range commitments, and a Committee on the National Institute of Education which has been asked to advise the new NIE on matters related to our interests and to keep the Section informed of new developments in this area. Reports on the organization and activities of these committees will be provided at the Section's Council and Business meetings in New York on August 28.

The program organized by the Section for the 1973 meetings has several unique features. One session, chaired by Joseph Gusfield, is restricted to student papers. A special call for these papers was announced in the *Sociology of Education*, the *American Sociologist*, and in one of the Section's regular mailings. Over twenty papers were submitted for review. A second session, chaired by Paula Goldsmd, is being co-sponsored with the Section on Sex Roles. In another session, organized by Barry Anderson, some of the awardees of the U.S. Office of Education's recent small grants program will be reporting on the results of their research.

The nominating Committee, under the chairmanship of Ernest Campbell, has proposed the following slate of officers for 1973-74: Chairman-Elect: Robert Dreeben, and David Goslin; Council: Sarane Boocock, Robert Ellis, David Hansen, Robert Hauser.

This summer the members will be receiving a short biographical questionnaire as part of a survey jointly sponsored by our Section and the Research Committee on the Sociology of Education of the International Sociological Association. The results of this survey should enable the Council and officers to be more responsive to the needs and objectives of the section. The questionnaire incidentally includes a poll on the possibility of an increase in Section dues. I strongly urge all members to supply the information requested and return their forms to the ASA office as soon as possible.

Bruce K. Eckland
Chair

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON MEDICAL SOCIOLOGY

The year has been one of vigorous activity and considerable ferment in the affairs of the Section on Medical Sociology. The Council has been engaged in a good deal of self-analysis about such matters as the effectiveness of our committee structure, the financial health of the Section, and the increasing democratization of Section policy-making procedures. At the same time, a number of substantive activities have proceeded, notably those in connection with the Carnegie Corporation grant to examine health services organization and preventive health efforts, and the manifold ventures of the Committee on Disability.

Council is working toward rationalization and periodic review of its several committees; in addition, there is a thrust to make committee chairmanships more representative by moving toward election rather than appointment. The desire to involve young scholars, women, and minority members more fully in Section doings is reflected in

a variety of Council decisions, particularly the seeking of a method to bring advanced graduate student representatives into Council processes.

A Section dues increase to \$5 per year has been approved. The additional income afforded by this increase will be directed primarily to subventions to enhance the work of Section committees. An illustration of such a subvention was the awarding of modest funds to the Committee on Disability for the organization of a significant scholarly conference and for partial subsidy of graduate student participation in the conference. The money available through this means is very limited, but we recognize that even small amounts can be critical in stimulating dialogue among specialists, in opening up Section activities to a broader range of membership, and in encouraging committees to take an active stance in pursuit of their objectives, rather than a passive, caretaking one.

Work under the Carnegie grant has moved forward on several fronts. Under the energetic leadership of David Mechanic, various committees have been assessing the state of the art in their particular fields of interest. Working groups, seminars, and conferences have been among the techniques employed; substantial publications are anticipated in several instances. Examples of publications scheduled are a volume edited by Jan Howard and Anselm Strauss resulting from a symposium on Humanizing Medical Care, and a probable monograph to be edited by Jack Elinson on the basis of his seminar on Health Indicators conducted at Columbia. A full report on the progress of Carnegie grant participants will constitute a major part of the Section Business Meeting in New York.

Council has met twice during the year, each time in conjunction with the Carnegie Grant Steering Committee, at Williamsburg in December and at Chicago in May. The volume of Section activity is so great that Council finds it increasingly difficult to complete its agenda in the one-day meeting format; hence we are trying in the near future to organize a two-day retreat for more thorough discussion of the shape of the Section's programs and policies.

The Nominating Committee, chaired by Marvin Sussman, conducted the annual election. The results are as follows:

Chairman-elect: Renée Fox
Council: Betty Cogswell
Peter New

Finally, it is appropriate to recognize the fine contributions made to the Section by Ronald Andersen, who serves in the thankless but vital post of Secretary-Treasurer, and by Geoffrey Gibson, who so ably edits the Section newsletter.

Robert N. Wilson
Chair

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON METHODOLOGY

The activities of the Methodology Section since the fall meetings have been concentrated on (a) the Methodology Training Institutes; (b) planning of the program for the 1973 meetings; and (c) the election of new officers.

Initial plans for the Methodology Training Institutes were made at the time of the 1972 meetings by an *ad hoc* committee of the Section composed of William Bates (Committee chairman), B.L. Mortensen, Norman F. Washburne, Ron Wimberly, and Herb Costner (ex officio). The Council of the Association approved the tentative plan and authorized ASA sponsorship of the proposed Institutes at its December meeting. Approximately 30 members of the Section in all parts of the country were invited to present an Institute at their respective institutions. Among the replies there were eight indicating initial interest in giving such a training institute during the spring or summer of 1973 and a few additional replies suggested tentative interest for the following year. For a variety of reasons, several of the eight indicating initial interest decided to postpone or cancel their plans, and as of this date, two Training Institutes have been completed and a third is scheduled for July.

A preliminary report on the Methodology Training Institutes appeared in the May, 1973, issue of FOOTNOTES. The two completed Institutes were held at the University of Washington (Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., Herbert L. Costner, and Lowell Hargens, presenters) and at Princeton University (Robert Althaus and Kent Smith, presenters). The interest in such Institutes among faculty and students in surrounding colleges and universities was gratifyingly high; there were 24 participants at the University of Washington and 12 at Princeton. The response among

participants was clearly positive, although attendance diminished somewhat at the second meeting of the Institute at both institutions. The training Institute originally scheduled at Duke University (announced in the FOOTNOTES report) was cancelled because of another training seminar on a similar topic at about the same time at Duke. An additional Institute will convene at the University of North Carolina (Richard C. Rockwell, coordinator) in July, 1973. Since the attendance has been higher than anticipated, indicating greater interest than the original planning committee thought likely the expansion of the program of Methodology Training Institutes next year seems like a worthy endeavor.

The Methodology Section program for the 1973 meetings has been planned in coordination with Michael Hannan, the organizer of the methodology sessions for the ASA program. Papers submitted for the Methodology Section program and for the ASA methodology sessions were considered for presentation at either, and the final program reflects an attempt to divide the papers in a manner that would maximize the coherence of each program.

The 1973 nominating committee for the Section was composed of Glenn Fuguitt (Committee chairman), William Bates, Don Ploey, Dean Harper and Michael Hannan. Under the able leadership of the committee chairman, the committee completed the nominations with dispatch and efficiency. The nominees for Section Council are Robert Hauser, Kenneth Land, Robert K. Leik and Seymour Spilerman. The results of the election will be announced at the 1973 meetings.

At the 1972 meetings, the Section Council presented a proposal pertaining to the establishment of the Stouffer Award which was approved by the Section business meeting. This was submitted as a recommendation from the Section to the Council of the Association, and this recommendation was incorporated with some changes in the action of the ASA Council in establishing that award. During the fall, members of the Section Council were asked by the Section Chairman to suggest nominees for the first Stouffer Award Committee, and these suggestions, along with those of the Section Chairman, were forwarded to the ASA Council. The Council appointed the first Stouffer Award Committee at its December meeting. Many members of the Methodology Section who have worked for several years for the establishment of this award will be gratified to learn that their work has, after some delay, been fruitful.

Herbert L. Costner
Chair

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON ORGANIZATIONS AND OCCUPATIONS

The members of the Section are helping to keep the profession of sociology relevant by studying industry in an industrial society. This was evident in the range of topics dealt with on Section Day, 1973, which was devoted to the presentation of thirty separate discussions led by members of the Section on various professional interests. This format was approved at the 1972 annual meeting and a wide range of topics was offered by Section members for the 1973 meetings. This was a break in the usual format of formal paper presentation, and should the evaluation prove the experiment to be successful, it may offer an opportunity to modify the traditional Section Day program.

A special *ad hoc* committee of the Section chaired by Professor Rue Bucher has been successful in establishing a new journal that will emphasize publication in the area of the interests represented by the Section. This will not require subsidy from the Association.

Several members of the Section have served in a liaison capacity with regional societies to develop individual programs at their regional meetings that would prove attractive to Section members. An especially successful meeting of this sort was organized by Professor Charles Warriner at the Midwest Regional Meetings.

Robert Dubin
Chair

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON THE SOCIOLOGY OF SEX ROLES

This was our first year as a Section of the ASA and those of us who had worked to make the Section a reality were happy to see that our efforts bore fruit. Most of the year was spent organizing our program, negotiating with other Sections for joint sessions and cooperating and coordinating with the ASA appointed organizers of the sessions

on the family (Rae Blumberg) and on sex roles (James Sweet), so that all papers submitted would have a maximum chance of acceptance. Our efforts at having joint sessions met some success when we obtained an extra session on the family and sex roles, but we urge that the possibility of such joint sessions between Sections be facilitated.

As of this date we have sent out two newsletters as well as the ballot for next council replacements and chairperson-elect. We are working on a group of resolutions dealing with our area of expertise, in keeping with the ASA directive on the possibility of our taking in relevant areas. An array of resolutions on sex role topics such as rape, homosexuality, and Third World women will be presented to the members for their approval or disapproval shortly.

In order to encourage research in sex roles, we have notified the members of the existence of available bibliographies including one on the male role, lest sex roles continue to be a euphemism for woman's place.

Pauline B. Bart
Chair

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON THEORETICAL SOCIOLOGY

Grateful acknowledgment is extended to Norman Birnbaum and George Theodorson who organized sessions on Theoretical Sociology for the 1972 ASA meetings.

Following last year's balloting Ralph Turner became Chairman-Elect and Erving Goffman and Gerhard Lenski succeeded Leon Bramson, Arnold Nash and Stanley H. Udy as council members. The remaining members of the council are Herman Turk, Terry N. Clark, Lewis Coser and Edward Tiryakian. Roscoe Hinkle will serve as secretary until 1973.

At the 1972 business meeting, chaired by Peter M. Blau, questions concerning the organization and objectives of the Section were raised. In the early part of this year the officers and council unanimously agreed to inquire of the membership and other interested parties their views on the activities of the Section. To this end a letter of particulars was published in the April, 1973 issue of FOOTNOTES. Responses elicited from that letter may serve to initiate further explorations of the Section's objectives and procedures as understood by its members.

The nominating committee of Martin Martell (Chairman), Robert Bierstedt, Deena Weinstein, and Morris Zelditch is working on suggestions for increasing student and department representation. They have submitted their slate of candidates and the balloting is now occurring.

The program for the 1973 Section meetings is being organized by Ralph Turner. It will center around panel discussions on reductionism in sociological theory, inductive versus deductive approaches to theorizing and convergences and divergences between phenomenological and Marxist approaches to sociological theory.

Other concerns, currently under review, may be discussed at the 1973 ASA meetings.

Llewellyn Gross
Chair

REPORT OF THE SECTION ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

This Section effectively began to function during the 1972 Convention in New Orleans. During the Business meeting of the Section, attended by all those interested in the issues of undergraduate education, interim officers and members of an interim council were elected.

Two newsletters were mailed during the past year. They appear to have effectively called attention to the existence of the new Section. They were directed to a wide audience of those involved in teaching sociology in community colleges, four year colleges, and universities.

A set of By-Laws was prepared by a subcommittee, and approved by ASA Council. A slate of candidates was presented by the Nominations Committee so that the membership could proceed to elect regular officers and to approve the By-Laws.

In a report to the Executive Officer of the American Sociological Association the Interim Chairman of the Section recommended that the Section on Undergraduate Education take over the mission and mandate previously held by the Committee on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology. This Chairman further recommended that the Council of the American Sociological Association approve the funding of a special mobilizing workshop of the Council and officers of the Section on Undergraduate Education with the addition of some of the members of the previous Committee on Teaching Undergraduate Soci-

ology. The need for this meeting was presented as an unusually urgent one since the constituency of this new Section involves a segment of the profession which, in many instances, has not been active in the affairs of the Association. ASA Council approved the recommendation that the Committee on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology be discontinued and expressed its hope that the Section on Undergraduate Education would, in fact, assume genuine leadership in tackling the crucial issues affecting undergraduate education in sociology across the country.

Hans O. Mauksch
Interim Chair

COUNCIL MINUTES

MINUTES OF THE THIRD INTERIM MEETING OF THE 1973 COUNCIL

June 2-3, 1973 Washington, D.C.

The third interim meeting of the 1973 Council convened at 9:15 a.m., Saturday, June 2, 1973 in the ASA Office, Washington, D.C., President Mirra Komarovsky presiding. Members of Council present were Hubert M. Blalock, Peter M. Blau, Orville G. Brim, Rose Laub Coser, James A. Davis, Jack P. Gibbs, William J. Goode, Joseph R. Gusfield, Suzanne Keller, Raymond W. Mack, Matilda White Riley, Jerome H. Skolnick, Ruth Hill Useem, Walter L. Wallace, and J. Milton Yinger. Members absent were Karl F. Schuessler and Rita James Simon. Members of the Executive Office present were Otto N. Larsen, Maurice Jackson, Alice F. Myers, and Norma S. Blohm.

This was the last meeting of the 1973 Council unless an emergency arises which will necessitate a meeting at the annual convention in New York. The 14 items on the agenda were approved.

1. **Report of the President:** President Komarovsky noted that her Annual Report had been completed and that it dealt primarily with a concern for problems in the discipline and profession, some of which she hoped would be the focus of Council deliberation during this meeting.

2. **Report of the Secretary:** Secretary Yinger was unavoidably delayed in arriving at the meeting and appeared at the afternoon session to participate in the deliberations.

3. **Report of the Executive Officer:**
a. Progress of the Committee on the Freedom of Research and Teaching: The Executive Officer reported on the activities of the Committee on the Freedom of Research and Teaching including the following: 1) The Committee has established a set of procedures by which it will process grievance cases. 2) The Committee has undertaken steps to collect information on the 14 cases brought to its attention. 3) The Committee asked the President to appoint another member to the Committee, and the President responded by appointing Paula Goldsmdid of the University of North Carolina. It was observed that the Committee will meet again on June 29 to pass on its first set of recommendations on the cases it has received.

b. The participation of women in the Center for Advanced Study: The Executive Officer reported on the response from the Center for Advanced Study in the Social and Behavioral Sciences concerning participation of women at the Center. Council authorized release of this correspondence to the CSWS and to the executive officers of other associations. Rose Coser, liaison Council member to the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology (CSWS), presented the following recommendation regarding the Center:

MOTION: That Council express to the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences the hope that it will formulate a plan for affirmative action in order to increase the number of women participants in the future. Carried.

After passing the above, concern was expressed over the omission of information regarding the participation of racial and ethnic minorities at the Center. Therefore, Council made the following motion:

MOTION: That the Executive Officer delay sending the first motion until Council receives like data on racial and ethnic minorities at the Center. Carried.

Council did not take formal action on the second part of the CSWS request concerning the establishment of titles other than that of fellow and the establishment of a policy of logistic support. The sense of Council was that the former would run the danger of promoting a second-class status and that the Center had initiated some response to the latter problem.

c. Recruiting an Executive Specialist for Women and Minorities: The Executive Officer reported on the response to the ad announcing the opening of the Executive Specialist for Women and Minorities position. The Executive Office has received 11 applications so far. Council discussion centered around whether or not to choose a candidate as soon as possible from the applications already received since the present Executive Specialist will be leaving this office on September 1 or wait until we are reasonably assured that all subscribers to FOOTNOTES (the ad first appeared in the May edition) have had a chance to receive the newsletter and respond. The second problem concerned choosing a candidate this year and in the future. Several suggestions were made: that the present Executive Specialist continue for another year (Maurice Jackson declined), that the office remain vacant, that the current Executive Specialist be retained as a consultant, and that a search committee be formed to find a candidate by February, and that a telegram be sent to all groups having an interest in this office and that they nominate candidates by June 15. Finally, the following motion was made:

MOTION: That regarding the appointment to the position of Executive Specialist for Racial and Ethnic Minorities for this year, the Executive Officer is to process information as soon as feasible, consult with relevant persons and committees concerning candidates, and bring recommendations to the Executive Office and Budget meeting for decision. Carried.

A motion from the CSWS requesting that they be specifically authorized to interview and evaluate candidates was made but withdrawn.

d. Washington Conference on the Future Employment of Sociologists: The Executive Officer outlined the plans of the Washington Conference and invited Council members to participate in same. He also reported that feedback from the Conference will be presented at the Annual Meeting on the Employment Committee panel. (The conference, which will involve several ASA committees, has been rescheduled for fall, 1973.)

e. Information Retrieval Systems: The Executive Officer reported on a meeting convened by the Office of Science Information Services of NSF at the suggestion of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA) to explore the interest in collaborative efforts leading to more effective retrieval and exchange of information in the social and behavioral sciences. Representatives of eleven Associations were present, including Hugh Cline, Jr. and Otto Larsen representing ASA. Problems in the development of computer-based data systems were discussed, as well as problems in extending and interlinking existing thesauri for the purpose of pooling indexing effort. Council posted several cautions about proceeding with complex and costly computerized efforts that require heavy investments in the ordering of concepts, indexing, and abstracting but instructed the Executive Officer to proceed with explorations of alternatives.

4. Proposal for Stimulating Small-Scale Efforts at Theory Building, Conceptualization, and Measurement in Specific Substantive Fields: Tad Blalock briefly explained his proposal designed to develop means by which Council would support a catalyst for concern with core problems in the discipline. Discussion centered around the scope of the proposal, means of implementation including the size and term of office of a committee, and problems in funding. Council took the following action:

MOTION: That Council set up an ad hoc committee for three years, the function of which is to facilitate efforts by small groups of sociologists (probably three to six persons) to meet periodically, to exchange ideas, and to produce working papers for possible ASA distribution focused on basic theoretical and methodological issues in sociology including its special areas. Carried.

MOTION: That an Ad Hoc Committee For Study Groups on Theoretical and Methodological Issues be appointed by the President and Secretary, in consultation with the Executive Officer, to consist of three persons, one of whom will serve for three years, one for two years, and one for one year. Carried. (The following persons were named and have accepted appointment: Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., Chairman (three years), Gary Marx (two years), and Matilda White Riley (one year).)

MOTION: That a Special Fund for the Advancement of the Discipline be established with expenditures to be made at the discretion of Council. Carried. (This particular request was initiated by the Executive Officer to establish a means whereby persons could make contributions, including the assignment of royalties to the ASA, to further such projects as that indicated immediately above.)

5. Open Forum: Council discussion centered on concern about intellectual excellence, about standards of knowledge, about what people ought to know if they are sociology majors as undergraduates, about what they ought to know if they are graduate students, about what they ought to know when they finish, and about the evaluation of quality in the teaching of sociology. Attention was directed to what constitutes core knowledge and basic skills in the field and the ways in which sociology is assessed by other disciplines. Various views were expressed concerning the Association's obligation in attempting to set standards, create content, facilitate debate and exchange with reference to developing and applying criteria for evaluation, and take other steps to try to improve the state of the discipline.

6. Recommendation from the Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities:

MOTION: WHEREAS the charge of the Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Sociology is to improve the position of minorities in sociology, its composition and representation have been designed to fulfill this mandate, and WHEREAS the Graduate Fellowship Program for Ethnic Minorities is an ASA-sponsored instrument addressed to a significant aspect of the Committee's mandate; namely, improving the representation of minorities in graduate schools in sociology;

WHEREFORE we recommend that Council authorize the Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Sociology to devise a governing body and procedures to implement the grant (subject to Council approval). Carried.

The portion in parentheses was added by Council before voting approval.

A second motion was offered to expedite the appointment of a Grant Director for the project if and when funds are forthcoming:

MOTION: That Council authorize the Committee on the Status of Racial and Ethnic Minorities in Sociology to act as a Search Committee to nominate a Grant Director subject to appointment by Council. Carried.

7. Proposed Revision of Constitution Concerning Procedures for Nomination: At its last Council meeting, the members worked on a revised Article II, Section 3(b) of the Constitution By-Laws. A proposed wording was devised and sent to Council members for their further addition or deletions to be presented at this meeting for final approval before being sent out to Members in a referendum.

As a consequence of a series of motions passed with respect to Section 3(b) and Section 6 of Article II, Members of the Association will receive a ballot sixty days after this notice where they will vote to accept or reject the revisions to be presented as follows:

PRESENT WORDING

Article II, Section 3(b) -

"Prior to the submission of a list of nominees to the membership, the Committee on Nominations shall invite from the membership names for nominations for all elective offices; the Committee shall be guided but not bound by the suggestions received."

Article II, Section 6 -

"The candidate (or candidates when two or more vacancies are to be filled) receiving the largest number of votes shall be declared elected. In case of a tie vote, the President of the Association, in the presence of witnesses chosen by the candidates concerned, shall decide by lot between them. For all positions other than President and President-Elect, if the elected person dies, resigns or becomes unable to complete the full term for which he was elected, the candidate who received the next highest number of votes shall be declared elected for the remainder of the term."

PROPOSED REVISION

"Prior to the time of the meeting of the Committee on Nominations, Members shall be invited to suggest names for nominations for all elective offices; the Committee shall be guided but not bound by the suggestions received."

"Prior to the submission of the official ballot for the election, the nominees of the Committee on Nominations shall be made known to the Members. Within thirty days of the date of that notice, Members may propose additions to the ballot. A Member who is supported by 50 Members for nomination to Council, the Committee on Nominations, the Committee on Publications, or the Committee on Committees; or by at least 100 Members for nomination as President-Elect, Vice-President-Elect, or Secretary-Elect will be placed on the official ballot along with the nominees of the Committee on Nominations."

"For the positions of President-Elect, Vice-President-Elect, and Secretary-Elect, a majority vote is required before a candidate is declared elected. For other elected positions, including Council, the Committee on Nominations, the Committee on Publications, and the Committee on Committees..." (The text then reads from the start to the end of the present wording.)

8. Before adjournment, a request was made that Item 13c of the agenda be moved forward for discussion. This proposal came from the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology and reads as follows:

WHEREAS the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology has been asked to suggest nominees to replace outgoing members of our committee, and

WHEREAS we are concerned about the inherent tendency of committees to become self-perpetuating, and

WHEREAS we would like the broadest possible input into our consideration of possible nominees for this committee, and

WHEREAS the purpose of soliciting nominees from all members is to broaden the basis of new committee membership,

WE RESPECTFULLY REQUEST that the names of those suggested by solicitation of the general membership be forwarded to CSWS before the August meetings, and

WE FURTHER RECOMMEND that this become a standard practice in the future." Defeated.

(In defeating this recommendation, Council urged CSWS, and all other committees to make its independent recommendations to the Committee on Committees concerning possible future appointments and, by its action, Council also expressed satisfaction with present procedures which permits members to send recommendations directly to the Committee on Committees without any screening by any other committee.)

9. Undergraduate Education:

a. Recommendations from Chairman of Committee: The Executive Officer summarized the following three recommendations from the Chairman of the Committee on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology: 1) That Council provide a statement of commitment, support, and priorities for the work of the Committee and Section on Undergraduate Education. Council acted as follows:

MOTION: Council asks that the Secretary express to the Section on Undergraduate Education the fullest endorsement of the work of the new Section. Carried. (While Council does give specific instructions to committees, it does not infringe on the rights of Sections to develop their own priorities and programs. At the same time, Council expressed a sense of urgency about the problems that the Section might address and hoped that this Section would be successful in its efforts to improve undergraduate education.)

The Executive Officer was also urged to inform the Section of the discussion that took place during Council's Open Forum the day before.

2) That Council consider the Committee on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology as having done its task by assisting in the development of an ASA Section and that it, therefore, be abolished either this year or in 1974.

Council acted as follows:

MOTION: That the Committee on Teaching Undergraduate Sociology be abolished this year. Carried. (The Committee, as presently constituted, will terminate at the close of the Annual Meeting in New York. Council urges the Section to encourage members of the Committee who are not now involved in the Section to become engaged in Section activities. Council may, in the future, appoint ad hoc committees, as needed, to assume ASA responsibility for special projects.)

3) That Council approve a pre-convention meeting for a workshop to develop plans of action in undergraduate education, and support it at the maximal expenditure level of \$2,200.

Council acted as follows:

MOTION: That the Section be allocated \$2,200 for a workshop. Carried. (Hans Mauksch will assume the responsibility for organizing the meeting.)

b. Proposed By-Laws of the Section: The Section also requested that Council approve the proposed By-Laws of the Section so that Section members could vote on them by mail ballot.

Council acted as follows:

MOTION: That Council approve the By-Laws of the Section on Undergraduate Education. Carried.

c. In response to a request from the Section concerning a specific proposal, Council turned to a general consideration of Policy on Facilitating Distribution of Audio-Visual Materials: An initial motion was proposed, but withdrawn after discussion, that Council establish an ad hoc committee on the production and distribution of audio-visual materials.

Council then acted as follows:

MOTION: Council authorizes the Executive Officer to continue to explore ways of developing and distributing audio-visual materials. Carried.

(The Executive Officer is to report at the first interim meeting of the 1974 Council. Some members felt that eventually we may need an audio-visual editor to make decisions concerning the appropriate technique and substance of this particular form of educational materials.)

10. Recommendations from the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology: Council re-ordered the agenda to give earlier consideration to a set of resolutions submitted by the Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology. After extended discussion on the nature of affirmative action, and the appropriate means to communicate such policies, Council acted as follows:

MOTION: In order to overcome the consequences of discrimination against women and minorities in employment, the American Sociological Association recommends that its members support and promote affirmative action programs with their departments, colleges, universities and other agencies and institutions, both public and private. Carried.

MOTION: On June 3, 1973, the Council of the American Sociological Association voted that the following statement should appear in FOOTNOTES to be reviewed by Council after one year: "The Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology urges all members of the American Sociological Association to omit information on marital and parental status from their curricula vitae and from applicant listings." Carried.

MOTION: That henceforth at least one member of this committee (CSWS) be a person initially selected from among candidates recommended by Sociologists for Women in Society. Defeated. (Council reasoned that such a procedure would interfere with the rights of the elected Committee on Committees.)

11. Development of World Sociology

a. Interim Report from Committee on International Cooperation and UNESCO: The Executive Officer reported on activities of this Committee and placed the following recommendations from the co-chairpersons before Council:

1) That the name of the committee be changed from the Committee on International Cooperation and UNESCO to the Committee on Development of World Sociology.

MOTION: That Council accept the recommendation of the committee and change the name of the Committee on International Cooperation and UNESCO to the Committee on Development of World Sociology. Carried.

2) The second recommendation requested that a representative of Council attend the annual meeting of the committee scheduled to be held on Monday, August 27th from 2:30-4:30 p.m.

MOTION: That the President appoint a member of Council to attend the annual meeting of the Committee. Carried. (Ruth Hill Useem accepted the appointment to represent Council.)

3) That Council give serious consideration to Mexico City as the location of the 1980 ASA Annual Meeting, and if this becomes the site, efforts be made to develop ties with Latin American sociological associations in developing the program.

MOTION: That Council accept Executive Officer's suggestion that Council postpone its decision on this request until it has had a further review of facilities in Mexico City. Carried.

4) Regarding the organization and structure of the Committee, Council received the following recommended guidelines:

a) Appoint persons who are both vitally interested in making substantial and informed contributions and who have the time necessary to work on the Committee's objectives;

b) Six members of the ASA be appointed to the Committee with staggered terms to provide continuity, with the possibility of reappointment;

c) Two appointees serve as chairperson and vice-chairperson;

d) The terms of office for appointees be two persons each for two years, three years, and four years;

e) The Committee has the discretion of creating subcommittees each with their own membership, such as the current liaison committees with Eastern Europe and Asian sociologists.

MOTION: That Council approve the suggestions in principle and turn responsibility over to the Executive Officer for implementation. Carried.

b. Support of Newsletter: A request was made to the co-chairpersons of the Committee on International Cooperation and UNESCO by Irwin Sanders of the sub-committee on Liaison with East European Sociologists that they urge Council to support the sub-committee newsletter with a \$500 subsidy for one year.

Council acted as follows:

MOTION: That Council support the NEWSLETTER published by the sub-committee on Liaison with East European Sociologists by a donation of \$500 for one year. Carried.

c. Proposed support for ISA: Council reviewed the status of ISA relations with the International Sociological Association including the selection of representation from the United States, the dues structure, and possible forms of support from the ASA for the forthcoming World Congress in Toronto. Peter Blau, current U.S. representative to the ISA, reviewed changes in the organization of ISA and new possibilities for projecting academic and scholarly concerns rather than political and ideological ones into ISA deliberations. Council then acted as follows:

MOTION: That the current annual dues offered to the ISA by the ASA be \$2,000. Carried. (Current dues are \$1,500. Council also expressed the view that this fee should be negotiated in connection with seeking the authority for the ASA to have the sole right to designate the United States representative to the ISA.)

Council also referred to the Committee on the Executive Office and the Budget, for an August report, the question of what, if any, additional financial support the ASA might make to the ISA in connection with the World Congress in Toronto.

The problem of appointing a new U.S. representative to take office on January 1, 1974 will be resolved in August in New York.

12. Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on War and Peace Studies: The report presented to Council contained seven recommendations which were acted upon as follows:

MOTION: That the Ad Hoc Committee on War and Peace Studies be known as the Committee on Sociology of World Conflicts. Carried.

MOTION: That a listing of "Sociology of World Conflicts" be added to the ASA roster of areas of competence used in compiling the Directory. Carried. (This will become effective with the 1975 edition since the 1973 is in press.)

MOTION: That the Committee be authorized to conduct a clearing house for distribution of course materials in the sociology of world conflicts. Carried.

MOTION: That the Committee be authorized to seek funding for the preparation and distribution of a booklet on the Sociology of World Conflicts that will do the following: define the field of the Sociology of World Conflicts, describe the status of that field within sociology itself, prepare a bibliography that will let sociologists know what the available teaching and research resources in the field are, and relate the sociological field to the broader interdisciplinary study of world conflicts. Carried. (The final plan for the content and distribution of any ASA publication is subject to review and approval of the Publications Committee.)

In response to Committee requests for funds for special meetings between various committees, Council informs the Committee that plans for any requests for meetings between chairpersons of various ASA committees should be directed to the Executive Officer for possible implementation.

MOTION: That the request for two sessions to be devoted to the Sociology of World Conflicts in the 1974 ASA program at Montreal be turned over to Peter Blau and the 1974 Program Committee. Carried.

MOTION: That the Ad Hoc Committee on Sociology of World Conflicts be strengthened for 1973-74 with the addition of a fifth member and that care be taken in the appointment of Committee members to see that various perspectives and social philosophies concerning world order are represented. Carried. (Council substituted the word "strengthened" for the word "funded" in the first sentence.)

13. Request for Resolutions:

a. On Soviet Emigration Policies Affecting Minorities: A letter from Irving Louis Horowitz requests that Council issue a statement publicly and directly to our Soviet counterparts, indicating our opposition to the Soviet Union imposing an education tax on scholars wishing to emigrate to foreign countries and to any limitations on the right of persons to relocate in other nations and areas.

MOTION: That the President, after consultation with knowledgeable sources, take responsibility for drafting such a statement and submit the letter to the Executive Officer to issue in the name of Council. Carried.

b. On appointments of Director of Census Bureau and Commissioner of Labor Statistics: Council felt that, along with writing a letter to support the position of the American Statistical Association in opposition to current nominees for these positions, having an ASA representative present at the Senate committee hearings would strengthen our opposition.

Various delegates were then discussed and the following motion passed:

MOTION: That the Executive Officer seek appropriate persons to represent ASA at hearings regarding appointments of Director of the Census Bureau and Commissioner of Labor Statistics and that appropriate letters be written to support the position of the American Statistical Association. Carried.

14. Request from President of SWS regarding Childcare at ASA Convention: A letter from the president of SWS, Joan Huber, requesting that childcare be made available at the Annual Meeting in New York

New Publications

FILM GUIDE: Sociologist Gerard Hunt and Allen Mondell have rated 40 films that focus on links between health care and social characteristics. *Social Factors in Health Care: An Evaluation of Selected Films and Videotapes* is available for \$2 from Dr. Hunt at the Department of Psychiatry, University of Maryland School of Medicine, 645 W. Redwood Street, Baltimore, MD 21201.

MEDICAL ANTHROPOLOGY, a special issue of the *ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUARTERLY*, available July, 1973. Single copy price \$2.50, yearly subscription \$7.00. Address orders, enclosing payment to: A.Q.—C.U.A. Press, Administration Building, 620 Michigan Avenue, NE, Washington, DC 20017.

WORKING PAPERS. The Department of Sociology, University of Singapore, is publishing a series of "Working Papers" providing reports of ongoing research by staff members and postgraduate students including data and tables from social surveys carried out in Singapore and elsewhere in Southeast Asia. The papers are distributed free to scholars and institutions in Southeast Asia. Orders from outside the region should be accompanied by 50¢ per copy to cover cost of postage and packing. For further information and orders write: Prof. Hans-Dieter Evers, Head, Dept. of Sociology, University of Singapore, Singapore 10.

JOURNAL OF APPLIED COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH. A new journal devoted to field research on communications—interpersonal, small group, organizational, mass. Articles focus on interdisciplinary research on communication problems such as adapting to change, personality conflicts, and ambiguities. Those interested in subscribing or submitting manuscripts should write: Editor, Journal of Applied Communications Research, 7612 Linton Hall Road, Gainesville, Virginia 22065.

THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK: A REPORT TO THE CHANCELLOR, by the Chancellor's Advisory Committee on the Status of Women at CUNY, is now available. The report may be purchased for \$2.50 from the Office of the Special Assistant to the Chancellor, Rm. 717, Board of Higher Education Bldg., 535 East 80th Street, New York, New York 10021. Checks should be made payable to City University of New York.

COUNCIL, cont. from p. 21

was considered. Council expressed gratitude for SWS initiative in this matter and recommended that SWS take responsibility for organizing and managing childcare services. While Council felt that this service should be largely user supported, it took the following action to aid the SWS efforts:

MOTION: That ASA arrange for space for two connecting public rooms for childcare center at Annual Meeting in New York, and that the ASA subsidize the operation with \$250. Carried.

15. 1975 Program Committee: Council was asked to approve persons chosen by President-Elect Lewis Coser to be appointed to the 1975 Program Committee.

MOTION: That Council approve the list. Carried. (Names to be announced)

16. Open Forum: The second Open Forum of this meeting began with an assessment of the evolution of Council concerns over the past several years. Note was taken of the implications of the partial shift from Council responsibilities as political or constituency representatives to intellectual or discipline representatives. Emergency action in response to pressures has been replaced to some degree by Council initiatives to anticipate needs and address issues on such matters as teaching, research, and the development of the substance of sociology.

While there have been achievements in broadening professional participation in the ASA and in sociology, there is general agreement that the ASA cannot rest its efforts in these areas. Some discussion centered on how the ASA might institutionalize further responsiveness to change in the future. The need for instrumentalities for continuing systematic data gathering, self-study and analysis was emphasized. Such research would help identify the needs of persons and groups, e.g., sociologists in small undergraduate departments who have not become part of the ASA activities. Concern was then expressed for finding ways to raise the consciousness of the membership to the importance of maintaining and strengthening racial and ethnic minority representation or participation in the highest elected and appointed offices of the ASA. It was concluded that the issues explored here should be placed on the agenda and discussed further at the next Council meeting.

Whereupon, at 3:37 p.m., Council adjourned.
Respectfully submitted,
J. Milton Yinger
Secretary

Other Organizations

•THIRD INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF SOUTHEAST EUROPEAN AND BALKAN STUDIES will take place in Bucharest, Romania, September 1974. The theme for the meeting will be "The Place, Role and Contributions of Balkan Studies to the Sciences of Man". Questions on submission of papers and further information may be obtained by writing: Professor Irwin T. Sanders, Department of Sociology, Boston University, 96 Cummington Street, Boston, MA 02215.

•EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE has announced that its new Henry Chauncey Conference Center will open in August, 1973. The Center, located on the ETS site on the outskirts of Princeton, New Jersey, will have meeting space, overnight accommodations, dining facilities, and administrative support services to serve groups as small as a dozen or as many as 200. ETS will make the facility available to educational and research organizations and agencies, and to other groups that sponsor conferences or meetings for an educational purpose. For further information about the Center, write to: William G. Shearn, Manager, Henry Chauncey Conference Center, P.O. Box 2605, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

•THE ASSOCIATION OF VOLUNTARY ACTION SCHOLARS, is an autonomous interdisciplinary and interprofessional association of scholars and professionals interested in and/or engaged in research, scholarship, or programs related to voluntary action in any of its many forms. For further information on the Association or membership therein, please write: The Association of Voluntary Action Scholars, Business Office, Room 300, 1507 M Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

•THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL SOCIOLOGICAL CONFERENCE ON PARTICIPATION AND SELF-MANAGEMENT met in Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, December, 1972. Reports submitted at this meeting will be published under the title PARTICIPATION AND SELF-MANAGEMENT. The price of the complete set of six books is \$35.00. Send orders to: Institute of Social Research, 41000 Zagreb, Jezuitski trg 4, Yugoslavia, Attn: Mrs. Vesna Kolaric.

•THE DIVISION OF COMMUNITY PSYCHIATRY, STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, BUFFALO will sponsor a conference to discuss "The Future Role of the State Hospital" on October 11-12, 1973. For further information write: Berna Koren Division of Community Psychiatry, 462 Grider Street, Buffalo, New York 14215.

•INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR RESEARCH ON AGGRESSION was founded on January 1, 1973. Applications for membership from scientists doing active research in problems related to aggression in both its positive and negative aspects are invited. For further information contact: Dr. Ross D. Parke, The Fels Institute, Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387.

•VIII INTERNATIONAL CYBERNETICS CONGRESS will be held in Namur, Belgium September 10-15, 1973. For further information about the congress write: International Association for Cybernetics, Palais des Expositions, Place Andre Rijckmans, 5000 Namur, BELGIUM.

•AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY 1973 annual meeting will be held November 2-6, New York City. For advanced registration contact: Dr. Margaret Zahn, 326 South 19th Street, Apt. 4B, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103.

•WORLD POPULATION CONFERENCE, August 1974. For further information contact: Dr. Antonio Carrillo-Flores, Office of the Secretary-General of the World Population Conference, United Nations, New York, New York 10017.

•SOCIETY FOR CROSS-CULTURAL RESEARCH. At the second annual meeting in Philadelphia, February 17-19, 1973 a discussion was held regarding the possibility of a summer institute on methods in the behavioral sciences. Several comparative and analytical methods were suggested as worthy subjects for an annual or biannual curriculum during a 10-15 week summer get-together. The group suggested that holistic methodology, controlled comparison studies, path analysis, and other techniques of causal analysis of correlations might be included as possible topics for detailed coverage. However, it was decided to solicit ideas from other comparative behavioral scientists interested in testing general hypotheses about human behavior, before sending a program prospectus to granting agencies.

Interested persons are urged to send suggestions on: 1) topics to be covered, 2) participants (graduate students and/or faculty),

Awards & Grants

American Council of Learned Societies offers aid to individual scholars. The Council's programs of fellowships and grants, with the exception of Study Fellowships and Study of East European Languages, are designed to advance research. The fields of specialization included are: philosophy; aesthetics; philology, languages, literature, and linguistics; archaeology; art history and musicology; history; cultural anthropology; and folklore. Proposals with a predominantly humanistic emphasis in economics, geography, political science, psychology, sociology, and the natural sciences will also be considered. Address general inquiries and requests for application forms to the Office of Fellowships and Grants, ACLS, 345 East 46th Street, New York, New York 10017.

The Yonina Talmon Prize will be awarded in 1974 for an article on Kinship and the Family including Gerontological Aspects of the Family. This award carries a stipend of \$350. A manuscript must be submitted in either English, French, or Hebrew and be an unpublished scientific paper appropriate for publication in a social science journal. Preference will be given to junior scholars. Deadline for the receipt of papers is November 1, 1973.

Candidates should submit six copies of their manuscripts and curriculum vitae as follows:

(Hebrew Manuscripts) C/O The Yonina Talmon Prize
Chairman, Department of Sociology
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

(French & English Manuscripts) Mrs. Charlotte Green Schwartz
164 Gardner Road
Brookline, Mass. 02146
U.S.A.

National Endowment for the Humanities. 1974-75 Fellowships and Summer Stipends for junior college teachers. Recipients must devote full time to their study. They may not hold other major fellowships or grants except sabbaticals or grants from their own institutions, either during their tenure or during the balance of the tenure year. Small supplemental grants are permitted if justified. Fellowship applicants may apply directly. Summer stipend applicants must be nominated by their institutions and each institution may nominate only two applicants. For application materials and information write: Division of Fellowships, National Endowment for the Humanities, 806 15th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20506.

3) extent of interest in a summer institute. Send information or inquiries as soon as possible to James M. Schaefer, Secretary-Treasurer, Society for Cross-Cultural Research, Department of Anthropology, University of Montana, Missoula, Montana 59801.

•THE CENTER FOR PSYCHOSOCIAL STUDIES, a non-profit organization informally affiliated with the Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis, has announced that it is compiling a Directory of Psychosocial Investigators. The Directory is intended to improve communication among scholars, research investigators, and clinicians interested in advancing psychoanalytic understanding of social and cultural phenomena. It will be made available to those listed in it and to relevant institutions and agencies.

The Center invites those interested in the use of psychoanalytic approaches (broadly defined) to social behavior, social problems, or culture patterns, to write to the Center for Psychosocial Studies, Suite 2717, 111 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Illinois, 60601. Include: (a) your name, address, institutional affiliations, (b) a brief description of your current interests in this area; (c) (if appropriate) a few citations of your writings or projects in this area. This information will form the basis of your entry in the Directory.

The Sponsoring Committee for the Directory includes Neil J. Smelser, University of California, Berkeley, from Sociology as well as the following members from other fields: Fred Greenstein, Princeton University (Political Science) Robert A. LeVine, University of Chicago (Anthropology), Peter Loewenberg, UCLA (History), George H. Pollock, Chicago Institute for Psychoanalysis and Northwestern University (Psychoanalysis).

The Center is also contemplating a program of fellowships in psychosocial studies, to be announced later this year.

Meeting Calendar

• August 23-26, *Rural Sociological Society*. Annual Meeting, Center of Adult Education, College Park, Maryland. Harry R. Potter, Program Committee Chairman, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907.

• August 24-27, *Society for the Study of Social Problems*. Annual Meeting, New York, Irene Horning, Administrative Officer, SSSP Executive Office, University of Notre Dame, P.O. Box 533, Notre Dame, Indiana 46556.

• August 25-26, *Association for the Sociology of Religion*. Annual Meeting, New York Hilton Hotel. Brother Eugene Janson, 1403 North Saint Mary's Street, San Antonio, Texas 78215.

• August 27-30, *American Sociological Association*. Annual Meeting, New York Hilton Hotel.

• October 26-28, *Society for the Scientific Study of Religion*. Annual Meeting, Sir Francis Drake Hotel, San Francisco, California. Program Chairman: Donald Capps, The Divinity School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637.

• November 2-6, *American Society of Criminology*. Annual Meeting, New York City. D. E. J. MacNamara, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, CUNY, 315 Park Avenue South, New York, New York 10010.

• November 16-17, *New Zealand Sociological Association*. Annual Meeting, Victoria University of Wellington. Stephen D. Webb, Department of Sociology & Social Work, P.O. Box 196, Victoria University, Wellington, New Zealand.

New Programs

• **Southern University, New Orleans, Training Program for the Control of Drug Abuse.** Under the directorship of Associate Professor Thomas P. Lief, the Department of Sociology is presenting its second year of drug abuse courses and offering a minor concentration for undergraduates and a certificate of completion program for local community people. By offering a college level preparation, it intends to provide the community with trainer personnel to combat the multiple problems associated with drug abusing. Its interdisciplinary nature stresses both the theoretical and practical and includes summer internships and field experiences with various clinics and drug-related agencies in addition to course work. For further information write: Prof. Thomas Lief, Department of Sociology, Southern University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70126.

• **The Katz Newcomb Lecture in Social Psychology.** The University of Michigan announces a permanent annual lectureship. The purpose of the lectureship is to stimulate theoretical integration in social psychology and to relate theory to the pressing social problems of our time. For further information write: Social Psychology Program, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104.

• **The Human Ecology Center** in Columbia, Maryland, part of Antioch College has developed a new interdisciplinary degree entitled Master of Arts in Human Services and Social Planning, focusing on the training of human service professionals and social planners. For further information write: The Admissions Committee, Graduate Program in Human Services and Social Planning, Antioch College, Wilde Lake Village Green, Columbia, Maryland 21044.

• **Administration on Aging** training program grant in social statistics of the aged awarded to the Department of Sociology, Pennsylvania State University. The 12-month MA program will emphasize the development of professional ability in the use of methodological and statistical skills, and knowledge of demographic data in application to social research on problems of the aging population. The traineeship stipend is \$3,300 plus tuition and dependent allowance, beginning September 1973. For further information write: Director of Graduate Studies, Department of Sociology, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

EMPLOYMENT BULLETIN

FORMAT: Please list in the following order.

For vacancy listings:

1. Title or rank of position
2. Description of work to be done and/or courses to be taught
3. Abilities, training, experience and any other qualifications desired in applicant
4. Geographic region
5. Approximate salary range
6. Address to which applicants can write
7. Starting date

For applicant listings:

1. Type of position desired
2. At least two areas of competence
3. Highest degree
4. Awards
5. Experience
6. Publications
7. Location desired
8. Other personal information (optional)
9. Date available

DEADLINES FOR SUBMISSIONS:

Deadline for submission of listings is the 1st of the month prior to publication. The Employment Bulletin is published monthly except June, July, and September.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY:

The American Sociological Association endorses equal employment opportunity practices.

and we reserve the right to edit all copy and to refuse ads that are not in consonance with these principles.

FEES:

PAYMENT MUST ACCOMPANY LISTINGS	
Vacancy listing	\$15.00
Applicant listing	\$ 3.00

CONDITIONS:

Applicants and employers are responsible for the accuracy and completeness of their listings. The ASA reserves the right to edit or exclude all items. Please type the listing (double spaced) and send it with a check for the appropriate amount to: Employment Bulletin, The American Sociological Association, 1722 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

RESPONSES:

Replies to listings with box numbers should be individually addressed, stamped, and sent to the appropriate box number in care of the American Sociological Association, 1722 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. These replies will be forwarded, unopened, to the individuals, institutions, or organizations which have placed the listings. Responses must be received in the Executive Office within two months of the date of publication.

PLEASE NOTE: Deadline for submission of listings is now the 1st of the month prior to publication.

INSTITUTIONS CURRENTLY UNDER AAUP CENSURE

As an endorsee of the 1940 Statement of Principles of Academic Freedom and Tenure of the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of University Professors, the American Sociological Association herein publishes the latest listing of institution administrations currently under censure by the A.A.U.P.

Alabama State University
South Dakota State University
Grove City College
College of the Ozarks
Wayne State College (Nebraska)
Amarillo College
Texas A&M University
Southern University and Agricultural and Mechanical College
University of Wisconsin, Whitewater
Troy State University (Alabama)
Northern State College (South Dakota)
Frank Phillips College (Texas)
Central State University (Oklahoma)
Broward Community College (Florida)
Detroit Institute of Technology
Southeastern Louisiana University
Indiana Institute of Technology
Indiana State University
Oklahoma State University

University of Mississippi
Laredo Junior College (Texas)
University of Florida
Southern State College (Arkansas)
Grambling College (Louisiana)
Tennessee Wesleyan College
Onondaga Community College (New York)
University of California, Los Angeles
Armstrong State College (Georgia)
West Chester State College (Pennsylvania)
Ohio State University
Marshall University (West Virginia)
University of Missouri, Columbia
Queensborough Community College, CUNY
Cornell University
Southern Illinois University
Colorado School of Mines
East Tennessee State University
McKendree College (Illinois)
Rider College (New Jersey)

VACANCIES

TEACHING

Cornell University. Three teaching and research positions in the general area of organizations, community and multi-county regional development with a special emphasis on community and organizational processes and social change. Each position calls for one-half time teaching which would consist of two courses and a seminar per year; course subjects to be related to the position description and the special interests of the position holder. The other one-half time research assignment would be organized around general areas associated with the position specialty. Requirements: A PhD with sound methodological and theoretical training, able to analyze and work with local organizations, communities and regions within the context of their state and national linkages. Applicants need to have some combination of the following: organization behavior or dynamics, community and regional development, social system analysis, community or regional planning, application of social psychological principles to organization and community development processes, power and authority, decision making, conflict and conflict resolution or policy formulation and its implementation. Position one is a general position in organizational community and regional development bounded only by the general description presented above. Position two has a central focus on social policy at all levels—national, state, regional and community. This position is linked to a central concern with the development of strategies of planned social change and for coping with the unexpected consequences of change. Most social policy candidates may be specialized at a more particularized level than the above statement implies. Some may have specialized on state, multi-state, regional and national level policies. Others with a background in organizational, community and multi-county regional analysis may have specialized at this level. We are interested in considering candidates with either or both kinds of training or interest. Position three has a special focus on the sociology of physical environments. This position centers on social problems related to environmental quality and its management. Salary: Positions one and three are open ended at the Assistant Professor level. Position two is open ended at the Assistant or Associate Professor level.

George Williams College. Social Psychology—Assistant Professor. Teach social psychology, collective behavior in sociology, small group theory. Educational psychology and psychological measurements desirable. PhD required. Previous small college

experience advantageous. College located in the western suburb of Chicago. Salary dependent on qualifications and experience; range: \$9,130-\$12,570 for academic year. Summer school teaching negotiable. Write: Dean F. Robert Steiger, George Williams College, 555 31st Street, Downers Grove, Illinois 60515. September, 1973.

Ahmadu Bello University. Professor and head of Department for initial two-year contract period beginning September, 1974. Twelve to fifteen person department with post graduate program. Jobs also available immediately at Reader and Lecturer level for specialists in criminology, urbanization, industrial relations and medical sociology. Send applicants, vitae, with names and addresses of three references, to Head of Department of Sociology, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.

Providence College. Assistant professor to teach statistics, research methods, and share with introductory sociology; PhD required. Salary \$12,000 and up, depending on qualifications; write: Nicholas Sofios, Head, Sociology Division, Providence College, Providence, Rhode Island 02918.

Michigan Technological University. Assistant professor; to teach general, introductory courses in sociology, and introduction to geography. PhD or near; salary dependent upon qualifications but will be competitive; write: Dr. A. Spencer Hill, Head, Michigan Technological University, Houghton, Michigan 49931; fall, 1973.

Indiana University Northwest. Associate professor, and assistant professor or lecturer. Additionally, candidates will be considered for the chairmanship for the department. Urban, research methods, introductory and social psychology. Other areas considered. PhD with near PhD preferred for teaching positions. PhD with administrative experience required for chairmanship. Salary depends upon qualifications and experience. Attractive benefit structure. Write: Dr. John R. Maiolo, Chairman, Search Committee, Department of Sociology, Indiana University Northwest, Gary, Indiana 46408. fall, 1973.

Clemson University. Instructor to assistant professor to teach introductory, social problems, social psychology, methodology, plus areas of special interest. PhD required for assistant level. Salary competitive. Write: C. W. Dunn, Head, Department of Political Science and Sociology, 407 Strode Tower, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina 29631. August, 1973.

University of New Hampshire. Assistant professor of sociology; to teach research in criminology, social disorganization, comparative institutions, socio-

logical methods and statistics, experience in philosophy; PhD degree; contact: Dr. Walter Buckley, Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire 03824.

Kirkland College. Selective, innovative liberal arts college (650 women) coordinate with Hamilton College (950 men). One year appointment for instructor or assistant professor, fall, 1973. Specialty areas open, but ability to teach introductory sociology and sociological theory preferred. ABD or PhD, previous undergraduate teaching experience desirable. Send vita to: David J. Gray, Chairman, Division of Social Sciences, Kirkland College, Clinton, New York 13323.

Syracuse University. Assistant professor to teach courses in quantitative methods in the social sciences and sociology of education. A cross-cultural perspective on educational issues and an interest in issues of education and social policy are preferred. PhD or equivalent, write: Chairman, Cultural Foundations of Education, 305 Comstock Avenue, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210.

Ohio Wesleyan University. Opening at the instructor or assistant professor level for a sociologist with or near the PhD. Courses to be offered include introductory, race and minorities, stratification, community and urban. Write: Chairman, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio 43015.

Southern Colorado State College. Two or three positions, rank open, preferred areas: sociology of education, marriage and family, collective behavior, criminology, demography, others considered. Research potential in area. PhD preferred and teaching experience. Salary negotiable. Send vita and recommendations to: Dr. James B. Kashner, Chairman, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Southern Colorado State College, Pueblo, Colorado 81001. September, 1973.

University of Pennsylvania. Assistant professor with special theoretical and methodological competence in one or more of the following areas: comparative institutional analysis, political and urban sociology. Applicant should have PhD by September, 1974. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. Send 3 copies of vita to: Chairman of Recruitment Committee, Department of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19174.

Eisenhower College. Assistant professor of sociology to teach deviance, urban, complex organizations and population problems; PhD preferred, ABD considered, liberal arts background and/or experience helpful; Northeast; salary: AAUP current rating, 1; one year appointment with possibility of being made permanent; write: A. J. Osmann, Jr., Director, Division of Social Sciences, Eisenhower College, Seneca Falls, New York 13148; begin September 1, 1973.

University of Texas at Austin. Assistant professor beginning in January or September, 1974. PhD required. Applicants should have special interest in one or more of the following areas: family, formal organizations, methodology and statistics. Salary competitive. Minorities and women are encouraged to apply. Send vita to: Charles M. Bonjean, Chairperson, Department of Sociology, University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712.

Haifa University. Three full-time permanent positions, instructor, lecturer, senior lecturer, associate professor, professor, depending on training and experience. Preferred fields: communication, industrial sociology, methodology, social psychology, deviance, urban sociology. Facility in Hebrew desirable, however teaching in English for first two years possible. Write: Eugene Weiner, Chairman, Department of Sociology, Haifa University, Haifa, Israel.

University of Canterbury. Lecturer/Senior Lecturer in sociology; teach undergraduate and some graduate courses; applicants should indicate their main research interests; PhD preferred; salary on standard New Zealand scale; write: Registrar, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand; applications close on August 31, 1973.

Clarion State College. Associate or assistant professor to teach introduction to sociology, methodology, sociological theory, and other courses in the area of specialty. PhD or close preferred. Rank and salary negotiable, depending upon education and experience. Write to: Jay Van Bruggen, Chairman, Social Science Department, Clarion State College, Clarion, Pennsylvania 16214.

University of California, Davis. Two positions: one at assistant professor (PhD or advanced candidacy required), and one dependent on qualifications of appointee (PhD required). One position requires competence to teach quantitative methods and statistics at advanced level; the other is open with respect to fields of specialization. The current salary range for assistant professor is \$11,800 to \$13,400. Applications should be sent to: Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of California, Davis, California 95616. Starting dates: September, 1974.

Wichita State University. Assistant professor to teach on undergraduate and graduate levels. Special consideration will be given to applicant with major interest in one or more of the following areas: medical sociology, statistics, education, family; 9 hours teaching load per semester; PhD required. Salary is competitive. Write: Dr. Robert Allegrucci, Department of Sociology, Box 25, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas 67208.

Colgate University. Distinguished Chair. Applicants are invited for the Kenan Chair at Colgate University. The holder of this endowed professorship must be a person of proven intellectual and academic excellence. Applications are open to all fields and disciplines, and applicants need not be in an academic position at present. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. Salary commensurate with the quality of the appointment. Send resume and references to: Dean of the Faculty, Colgate University, Hamilton, New York 13346.

Queensland Institute of Technology. Lecturer in Communications. Applicants should hold a higher degree in sociology or social psychology from a recognized tertiary institution. Experience in the public relations industry and in tertiary teaching is desirable. The appointee will be expected to lecture in sociology, theory of communication, and public relations. He will be expected to take part in the development of a new communication course within the school. Salary: \$A\$8,600-\$A\$11,982 (current exchange rate: \$A 1 approximately equals \$US 1.41). The appointment will be made within the above range according to qualifications and experience. Existing conditions of service and general information can be obtained from the Registrar, Queensland Institute of Technology, P.O. Box 246, North Quay, Brisbane, Australia, 4000. Applications containing a full resume, including the names and addresses of three referees, should be forwarded to Raymond Forer, Chairman, Department of Sociology, State University of New York, Albany, New York 12222. Dr. Forer has agreed to chair a recruitment committee for Q.I.T. Closing date for receipt of applications is Saturday, October 6, 1973. Applicants will be required to take up appointment before the commencement of the Q.I.T. academic year in February, 1974.

V16'S Two assistant or associate professors; a number of areas of specialization acceptable; PhD's with considerable undergraduate teaching experience preferred, others considered; state university located in small midwestern city; excellent salaries, teaching loads, research facilities and support; July or September, 1973.

Harvard University. Two assistant professors in any field of sociology. Research and teaching ability more important than field of specialization. Must have PhD by fall of 1974. Salary normally begins at \$10,500. Send vita to: George Homans, Chairman, Department of Sociology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138. Appointments begin fall, 1974.

RESEARCH

The Economic and Social Research Institute. Applicants are invited from persons of proven research ability for the position of sociologist to undertake research in relation to aspects of Irish society. All research is undertaken with a view to publication. Appointments would normally be made on an initial contract of 5 years, which might be renewed. However, secondments to ESRI for a period of not less than 2 years would be considered. Appointments may be made in the grades of: Research Professor (salary range £5,000-£5,410 p.a., under review); Senior Research Officer (salary range £4,400-£5,040 p.a.). The Superannuation Scheme is similar to FSSU. Application forms, which should be returned as soon as possible, may be obtained from The Secretary. Write: The Economic and Social Research Institute, 4 Burlington Road, Dublin 4, Ireland.

The Institute for Research on Human Resources at the Pennsylvania State University has a recurring need for research assistants to fill non-continuing, non-tenured positions. A multi-disciplinary, inter-college research organization, the institute conducts experimental programs and evaluates public policies and institutions concerned with education, corrections, manpower, medical care, welfare, science policy, and religion. Minimum requirement is a BA or BS in education, psychology, sociology, economics, or statistics. Minimum salary is \$8640 but may be higher depending on additional education and experience. Prospective candidates should send a resume and cover letter to: Professor Jacob J. Kaufman, Director, Institute for Research on Human Resources, 413 Kern Graduate Building, University Park, Pennsylvania 16802.

Johns Hopkins University. PhD with experience; research position in University-affiliated R&D Center. Project is concerned with school, peer and family influences on development of socially valuable attitudes throughout childhood and adolescence (e.g., self-reliance, social commitment). Seek persons with interests and skills in some of the following: educational sociology, organizations, contextual effects, peer group processes, attitude formation, and change. Must have good quantitative skills. Dr. Ellen Greenberger, CSOS, 3506 N. Charles Street, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218. Tele.: 301-366-3300, ext. 1296.

Narcotic Addiction Control Commission. Research sociologist or social psychologist; responsible for conducting and directing both basic and applied drug abuse research; PhD required; experience in drug abuse or deviant behavior research preferred; salary range \$18,585-\$24,051, depending upon experience and qualifications; send vita and copies of relevant publications to: Director of Research, New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, 1855 Broadway, New York, New York 10023; summer, 1973.

ADMINISTRATION

Clemson University. Head of Sociology Department, Associate or Full Professor. Salary competitive. Nine member department. Write: C. W. Dunn, Head, Department of Political Science and Sociology, 407 Strode Tower, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina 29631. July 1, 1974.

University of Connecticut. Director, Corrections Program. The University of Connecticut has recently inaugurated a Corrections Program to train persons at the master's degree level to take middle and upper management positions in the field of corrections. This represents the first of what potentially may become several programs in the broad area of criminal justice. Candidates should possess a graduate degree, preferably a doctorate, and be prepared to teach in one of the behavioral or social sciences. The Director must be a person with the

interest and energy to develop the University's role in criminal justice education. Salary and rank are negotiable; however, at least initially the appointment will be at the "In Residence" status, thus not leading to tenure. Interested candidates should contact: Professor George F. Cole, Acting Director, Corrections Program, Department of Political Science, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut 06268.

Georgia Southern College. a unit of the University System of Georgia. Department head to administer growing Department of Sociology, Social Work, and Anthropology. BA, BS and MA offered. Salary competitive and open. Send vita to: Dr. Charlene Black, Chairman of Search Committee, Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Georgia 30458. September, 1973.

University of Alabama, Huntsville. Director of Graduate Program in Administrative Science. Senior associate or full professor. Innovative multidisciplinary program encompasses management, economics, psychology, sociology and public administration. PhD and academic experience in one of the above areas is required, some administrative experience is desirable. UAH is located in Huntsville, a major center of aerospace, defense, industrial and urban research and development, its close ties with these organizations provide generous opportunity for independent research and consultation. Salary for 12 month appointment is commensurate with qualifications and experience. Women and minorities are encouraged to apply. For further information send complete resume to: Dr. Walter R. Sullins, Chairman of Search Committee, Department of Psychology, University of Alabama in Huntsville, P.O. Box 1247, Huntsville, Alabama 35807.

Mankato State College. President. Comprehensive, multi-purpose undergraduate institution; 12,000 students; largest of the seven institutions within the Minnesota State College System; fully accredited; 330 acre campus. Desirable qualifications: analytical, problem-solving and inter-personal skills; ability to provide strong leadership through consultative decision-making; commitment to educational innovation; doctorate, college teaching, and evidence of increasingly responsible administrative experience. Effective date: as soon as possible after January 4, 1974, and not later than June 15, 1974. Applications from women and minority persons are encouraged. Applications and nominations by September 15, 1973 to: Dr. Garry D. Hays, Vice Chancellor, Minnesota State College System, 550 Cedar Street, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101.

University of Saskatchewan. Head of a department of 16 members, with undergraduate major and Honours and graduate programs. Some teaching duties. Applicant should have proven ability as a teacher and scholar, administrative experience or ability, and some interest in the sociological problems of Western Canada. The salary floor for full professors is \$20,500. Write: D. R. Cherry, Dean of Arts and Science, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada. Duties commence July 1, 1974.

University of Kansas. Chairmanship. Department of Sociology. Senior associate or full professor. PhD in sociology, publications, extensive teaching experience required and administrative experience desirable. University has 20,000 students, department has 60 graduate majors and 120 undergraduate majors. Department has a faculty of 22. Salary dependent upon qualifications but will be competitive. Write and send vita to: Marston M. McCluggage, Acting Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044; August 15, 1974.

University of Maryland. The Department of Sociology, cooperating with the ASA's policy urging open listing, announces that it is seeking to fill the position of department chairperson as well as several other faculty positions for 1974-75. Highly qualified candidates with publications and actively engaged in research are sought for this developing and expanding department. Capitalizing on its location in the Washington, D.C. area, the department is interested in building its program in urban sociology and demography, political sociology, and sociology of education, but appointments are not limited to these areas. Write: Joseph Lengermann, Acting Chairperson, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742.

APPLICANTS

(The Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology urges all members of the American Sociological Association to omit information on marital and parental status from their curricula vitae and from applicant listings.)

PHD WITH EXPERIENCE

A700 Teaching and/or research and/or administration; research methods, statistics, urban sociology, community, demography, bureaucracy, social change, rural sociology, social change, cultural anthropology; PhD; 6 years of university and college teaching; over 10 years of research experience in both rural and urban affairs; grantsmanship; administration of research center; numerous monographs and papers with particular depth on minority groups, public housing, mental health, aging, youth, delinquency, and migrants and immigrants; 39, married, 3 children; June, September, 1973.

A701 Teaching and/or research; adoption diffusion of farm practices and social psychology (SA and SI), political sociology, conflict theory; PhD; 3 years research experience in adoption diffusion of farm technology; no teaching experience; research papers in preparation; location open; 27, single; fall, 1973.

A702 Teaching or teaching and research; theory, social psychology, methods; PhD from Big Ten University; AKD, Masters Honors, teaching assistant-

ships, NIMH Fellowship; 8 years of college and university teaching; extensive background in interdisciplinary theory (psychology, anthropology, sociology); substantial teaching and advising experience at graduate level; varied research experience; article, paper, book under contract; location open; single, 31; August or September, 1973.

A703 Teaching (consider with research or administration); PhD major private university; 17 years private college and public university teaching, 7 in graduate programs; traditional range plus applied and research oriented courses; visiting lectureships in Europe and Latin America; experience in securing and administering long-term research grants; department chairman; academic program coordinator; monograph; contributor to textbooks; editor; domestic and foreign journal articles; early fifties; young family; fall, 1973 or 1974.

A704 Teaching and/or research; social ecology, methodology, introductory statistics, social organization, theory; PhD; 11 years teaching experience; married; September, 1973.

A705 Teaching and research; political, urban, stratification, social movements; PhD; fellowships, Fulbright; 8 years graduate and undergraduate teaching, 4 years research experience; 1 book, papers, 1 book in press; location open; 43, married, 1 child; September, 1973.

A706 Teaching and Research; deviance, urban sociology, social psychology, sociology of leisure, ethno-methods; PhD; Fulbright student, scholarships; 7 years teaching, research and field experience; book and many articles, book and articles in preparation; location open; 32; married; fall, 1974.

A707 Teaching and/or research and/or administration; urban, demography, complex organizations, methods, and Southeast Asia; PhD, two MA's; 8 years teaching at the university level, 1 year full time research, excellent teaching record, several publications; book on modernization in press, book reviews; scholarships and fellowships, research grants; location open; married, 1 child; September, 1973.

A708 Prefer long-term research, usage, training, or consulting commitment. Teaching considered on merits of position. Specialties include but not limited to social psychology, broadly conceived; public policy evaluation, sociolinguistics, field methodology, intergroup relations and conflict, education, PhD research (including evaluation) and teaching experience in and out of federal government, similar experience abroad. Seven publications. East, Midwest, South. From June, 1974.

A709 Teaching and/or research; thought, theory, change, comparative, sociology of sociology, area studies; PhD; national and international awards; 11 years teaching experience in different countries; publications; location open; September, 1973.

A700 Teaching or teaching and research; introductory, political sociology, social problems, social change, modernization, peasant society, interdisciplinary interests; PhD; 9 years experience in teaching and research; numerous awards; articles and other publications; 36, married; location open; September, 1973.

A701 Visiting professorship for one or more years desired at a quality college or university by presently employed professor of sociology. Interdisciplinary in interests with more than 28 books and monographs, plus innumerable book reviews and extensive research in the US, Europe and Asia. Received six awards for being an outstanding teacher. Have had SSRC grants and Fulbright Research Professorship as well as plaques for outstanding service. Interested chiefly in comparative industrial urban civilization and in problems of modernization but can give the gamut of departmental offerings. Location and size of college or university as well as its prestige immaterial. Prefer an environment with a regard to merit.

A702 Teaching, consider chairmanship; full professor; history of sociological theory, contemporary theory, social stratification, organizations, deviant behavior, social change, introductory, and others; PhD; many scholarships, etc.; 9 years teaching and committees; one book on change submitted, two on theory in process, articles, papers, reviews; prefer West Coast or East Coast in or near a city, wish some graduate students if possible; 43, married; September, 1974 (September, 1973 possible).

A703 Teaching, research, and/or administration; PhD; 18 years of undergraduate and graduate teaching experience; theory, methods, deviance, social change, race relations and others; in addition to teaching conventional courses current special interest in developing a departmental orientation toward the sociology of societal guidance, and in teaching at least one course on guided social change on the basis of the notion of society as a continuous emergence, which, being modulated by the ongoing intervention roles of individuals and groups may be guided for maximization of human benefits; publications in progress; 45, married, children; fall, 1973.

A704 Teaching; introduction to sociology, social problems, community, population, minority problems, family, stratification, urban sociology, social change, research methods, statistics, criminology, corrections, delinquent behavior, penology, and Oriental sociology; Eastern sociologist; PhD; 7 years teaching experience; 38, married.

A705 Teaching, university, Liberal Arts; urban sociology, theory, demography, community; PhD; NSF overseas postdoctoral; 11 years undergraduate and graduate instruction experience; linguist with extensive preprofessional travel experience; articles, reviews; close to West or East Coast Harbor outside megalopolis; 43, married; September, 1973, for two year terminal contract.

A706 Teaching and/or research; methodology/statistics, social problems, complex organizations, deviance; Unidel and NSF Fellowships; teaching experience; competent computer programmer; location open; 29, married, 1 child; September, 1973.

NEAR PHD OR MA

A810 Teaching and/or research; introductory, social psychology, small groups, collective behavior, social movements, organizational structure and change, open to others; MA, PhD expected during 1973-74 academic year; 4 years college level teaching plus teaching assistant, 1 year research assistant; location open; 31, married, 1 child; August, 1973.

A811 Teaching and/or research; urban, minorities, social problems, introductory; ABD; PhD expected August or December, 1973; 3 years as instructor at large state university (plus 3 years part-time teaching); 1 year research experience; publications; prefer Midwest; 31, married; fall, 1973.

A812 Teaching or teaching and research; political sociology, sociology of work, stratification, theory, sociology of knowledge, basic courses in other areas including social psychology, methods, introductory; ABD (PhD expected in early 1974); teaching assistantships, fellowship; 1½ years teaching, ½ year research; prefer that place of employment be within commuting distance (75 miles) of graduate sociology department (for spouse), but will seriously consider any location; married, 26, strong interest in undergraduate education; mid-August, 1973.

A813 Generalist, has taught most subjects in standard undergraduate curriculum—from theory to statistics—seeks teaching position in apolitical, value-free atmosphere; MA, ABD; PBK; 7 years college teaching; location open; September, 1973. (212-582-2539)

A814 Teaching or sociologically related administrative positions desired; interested in teaching introductory, social problems, family, or stratification; MA; graduate assistant, AKD; California or Arizona; female, 23; fall, 1973.

A815 Teaching, introductory, stratification, Eastern religions, bureaucracy, and political sociology; 2 years research experience as research assistant; location open; fall, 1973.

A816 Teaching; Marxist sociohistorical approach to political sociology, family, industrial sociology, urban sociology, minorities, stratification (strong mainstream background as well); ABD (PhD expected spring, 1974); 1 year teaching experience; location open; Marxist and mainstream references, married; September, 1973.

A817 Research, teaching, free lance data analysis and consulting; social epidemiology, demography and ecology, methods and statistics, cultural anthropology; MA, near PhD; Community Mental Health Research Trainee Fellowship, 1961-64; 14 years research on epidemiology of health and behavioral problems, some teaching and data-analysis consulting work; 11 articles; location open; special skills in secondary analysis and analysis of small samples; September, 1973.

A818 Teaching and/or research; social stratification, methods, social theory, political sociology, social control, sociology of women, introduction, race relations; MA; location open; 26, married; June or

September, 1973.

A819 Teaching; theory, sociology of occupation, social organization, and ethnic relations; completed all but PhD dissertation, the degree expected in October, 1973; 2 years college teaching; all locations considered; 38, married, 1 child; fall, 1973.

A820 Teaching and/or research; research methodology, political, urban sociology; PhD expected June or August, 1973; AKD; computer, research, and teaching experience; publications; location completely open; 24, single; September, 1973.

A821 Teaching; introductory, social problems, deviance, ethnic and race; MA; PhD candidate; 6 years teaching experience; location open; 31; September, 1973.

A822 Teaching or teaching and research; theory, methodology, race and ethnic theory, stratification and mobility; ABD (dissertation by August, 1973); teaching and research experience; publications; 29, married; September, 1973.

A823 Teaching or research; introductory, religion, race, social stratification, social change, process of socialization; MA, ABD; Safford Fellow, AKD; 7 years of teaching experience; 43, married, 1 child; fall, 1973.

A824 Teaching and research; mathematical sociology, methodology, sociology of education; BS (mathematics), MS (engineering), BA (sociology), MA (sociology), recent GRE advanced sociology test score: 780; 104 semester hours effective teaching experience; 13 publications, 7 presented papers (some non-trivial); prefer West; fall, 1973.

A825 Teaching and research or teaching; criminology-penology-deviant behavior combination, sociology of education, family, social problems, and minority-majority relations; MA+, near PhD (dissertation in progress-research completed); KDP, AKD, PDK, NSF-National Teaching Fellow, university teaching fellowship; 6 years undergraduate teaching experience; published articles in criminology and deviance; book reviews; papers presented; location open; assistant professor with state college that will cut post from budget within next two years; seek permanent position at college in or near urban area; 33, married, 2 children; September 1973 or 1974.

A826 Teaching and/or research; social psychology, research methodology, interdisciplinary teaching and research, small groups, collective behavior, marriage and the family, social structure and personality, information-systems theory; ABD (PhD expected August, 1973); NIMH intermediate predoctoral fellow, dissertation research grant; assistant professor for 2 years; 3 published papers; September, 1973.

A827 Interested in institution that appreciates demonstrated teaching ability; collective behavior, criminology/deviance, social psychology, sociologies of the future, small groups, introductory; MA, ABD; PBK, outstanding teacher award; 7 years university teaching experience; publications; location open; 35, married, 1 child; January, 1974, September, 1974.

REGION	RESIDENCE	FAMILY COMPOSITION	INCOME	AGE
DIVORCED	AGE FIRST WED	SIBLINGS	MOTHER'S WORK STATUS	ETHNICITY
MARITAL STATUS	LABOR FORCE	WORK IF RICH	JOB SUPERVISION	UNEMPLOYED
SPOUSE'S LABOR FORCE STATUS	JOB SATISFACTION	SPOUSE'S OCCUPATION	WORLD AFFAIRS	INCOME
INTERMARRIAGE	WAR	GOVERNMENT AID	UNITED NATIONS	COMMUNISM
CARE FOR THE AGED	CIVIL LIBERTIES	HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION	DEATH PENALTY	GUN PERMIT
UNION MEMBERSHIP	GRASS	EDUCATION	MOTHER'S EDUCATION	FATHER'S EDUCATION
NATIONAL PROBLEMS:	SPACE-ENVIRONMENT-HEALTH-CITIES-CRIME-DRUGS-EDUCATION-MILITARY-BLACKS-FOREIGN AID-WELFARE			
BURGLARIZED	ROBBED	TRAFFIC TICKET	ARRESTED	STRAIKE
PRO WAR	ANTI WAR	SCHOOL	APPROVE OF VIOLENCE	DINNER
OPEN HOUSING	BLACKS PUSH	NEIGHBORHOOD INTEGRATION	CONFIDENCE:	BUSINESS-CLERGY-EDUCATION-GOVERNMENT-LABOR-PRESS-MEDICINE-TV-COURTS-SCIENTISTS-MILITARY-CONGRESS
EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE	COURT DECISION ON ABORTION	EXTRA-MARITAL SEX	ABORTION	JOB CHARACTERISTICS
X-RATED MOVIE	PARTY IDENTIFICATION	HOMOSEXUAL SEX	VOTE '68	FORNOGRAPHY
RELIGION	RELIGION - AGE 16	ATTEND RELIGIOUS SERVICES	VOTE '72	SPOUSE'S RELIGION
RACE	COOPERATION	UNDERSTANDING	SEX	

NORC
1973 GENERAL SOCIAL SURVEY
DATA NOW AVAILABLE
ROPER CENTER
Williamstown, Mass. 01267

COMPUTER DEMONSTRATION
OF '72 AND '73 FINDINGS
ASA:NY, August 27, Booth #3

For Additional Information See FOOTNOTES, April, 1973, or write NORC, 6030 So. Ellis Ave. Chicago, Ill. 60637